

---

## The Effect Of The Romantic And The Philosophical Understandings Of The Imaginative Approach On Developing Pragmatics Skills And Language Functions For Prep School Students

**Dr. Manal Elsayed\***

### **Abstract**

The study aimed at developing the required pragmatic skills and the use of language functions for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students through the romantic and the philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach. Participants of the study were randomly selected and divided into two groups (30 for the experimental group and 30 for the control group). The study used a pragmatic skill test and a language functions test. The necessary pragmatic skills for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students were determined through the use of a checklist approved by a jury of specialists in teaching EFL. During the experiment, the experimental group received instruction through using the romantic and the philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach while the control group received regular instruction. The experiment lasted for two months. The analytical descriptive method and quasi experimental design were followed. The statistical analysis of the obtained data from the two administrations of the pragmatic test and the two administrations of the language functions test confirmed the effect of the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach on developing pragmatics skills and language functions for the 3<sup>rd</sup> prep school students. Thus, the aim of the study was achieved as using the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach showed a large effect size on developing pragmatics skills and language functions for the 3<sup>rd</sup> prep school students. Based on the results, it was recommended that developing pragmatics skills and language functions for the 3<sup>rd</sup> prep school students through other kinds of understandings of the imaginative approach.

**Keywords:** the romantic and the philosophical understandings, the imaginative approach, pragmatic skills and language function

### **Introduction**

Learning English language is essential and its use is spread all over the world nowadays. Enhancing students' learning of English requires not only knowing the structural side of language, but also recognizing how to use the linguistic forms through the social and cultural aspects of language. So, there is a shift from previous theoretical teaching framework which is based on using the grammatical rules towards the communicative aspects. The focus directs to highlighting the development of the functional abilities to produce language used in communicating different ideas. Communication fulfills various

goals at the personal and social levels. It also supports using language appropriately to interact with others in different types of situations.

Shankulie (2012) pointed out that the shift from language usage rule to language use rule is considered a result of the advent of pragmatics .Pedagogical intervention plays a facilitative role in learning pragmatics in foreign language contexts. Pragmatic refers to the social language skills that are used in daily interactions with others .This includes what people say, how they say, non-verbal communication and how effective interactions are in a given situation. In addition, pragmatic studies the factors that decide the selection of language in social interaction. It takes into account the social rules that affect the choice. It also considers the meaning of speech acts and the intentions of the speakers.

Generally , pragmatics include three components

- 1- The ability to use language to achieve different purposes such as informing, requesting and demanding
- 2- The ability to adapt language to satisfy students' needs in definite situations such as talking differently to different people and giving background information to unfamiliar listener
- 3- Following the unspoken rules while making dialogue or conversation such as taking turns in conversation, introducing topics in conversations, rephrasing when misunderstood and using appropriate body language (Ahlander and Akademi, 2020) .

One important area of pragmatics is that of speech acts, which are the communicative acts that convey language functions. Parker (2009) indicated that language functions refer to the purposes in which people use language to communicate. They use language for formal and informal purposes with specific structures and vocabulary suited for each situation. Function of vocabulary and structures can be differentiated at varying proficiency levels .Students with low level can practice easier vocabulary and structure than high level proficiency. A learner with high proficiency is the one who can make functional use of the new language in different contexts with a certain degree of fluency.

As language consists of four skills, they can be developed through language functions. Language functions are important aspect of teaching language .The main aim of teaching language functions is to make students speak appropriately according to the context .It can deliver some meaning to the hearer to understand what the speaker tells .In addition, other skills such as listening, reading and writing can also be developed directly or indirectly .They help the reader understand what the writers tell. The reader tries to guess who speaks to whom, what about ,in what ways and where they speak .So, before answering these questions, students should pay due attention to the setting or the context of the speaker because it can help the hearer understand what is talked ( Hotnida and Simany, 2019).

Although researchers realized the main role of developing pragmatic and language functions, little has been presented about the nature of what must be taught and how to

develop them in an appropriate way. Teaching pragmatics in general and language functions in particular is one of the neglected sides in English language teaching. Students are found to have lack of knowledge of pragmatics and language functions (Harmer , 2008). Hence, Moron and Others (2009) assured that the major problem in teaching pragmatics is the sheer number of speech acts. The large number of language functions and speech acts makes teaching of speech act unachievable goal.

Lastly, many calls seek to incorporate pragmatics and language functions in teaching and learning foreign language .The focus should be on using language through ongoing discourse. Teacher should make students more aware about pragmatic and language functions in language. So, effective teaching of second language should involve teaching pragmatics and language functions factors that is due to encouraging students not only use language in classroom but also can function language in real life context.

Teaching authentic language use through pragmatics and language functions is meaningful. It resembles the way the language is used outside the classroom and depends on engaging students' emotions and imagination in the curriculum (Shankulie, 2012). One of many approaches that meets these objectives is the imaginative education approach .Egan (2001) assured that students learn actively when their imaginations are involved. On the other hand, teachers teach effectively when they can see the subject from their students' points of views. The approach suggests that, the more teachers are knowledgeable about the subject , the more easily they are able to enhance their students ' imaginations. So, teachers should be imaginatively energetic and committed to the approach

Generally, developing students' thinking deeply and enhancing their imagination and emotions are not new. What is unique about this approach is that it offers a theory and a set of frameworks and techniques for actually accomplishing this within the academic curriculum .It presents a new understanding of how knowledge grows in the mind and how imagination works and changes during life. The new change is tied with the ways it uses feelings, images, metaphors and jokes, hopes, rhyme and rhythm to engage the imagination of both teachers and students (Cant , 2018) .

Ryan and Mercer (2013) stated that theories discussed the connection between imagination and language learning approaches is to be virtually nonexistent. Recent development focused on the role of factors such as identity and self-realization in learning language, then moving to imagination. The best known attempt to link the imagination process to foreign language is Bonny Norton's adaptation of the concept of an imagined community. He explored how feelings of belonging to imagined community affect learner's motivation, investment or resistance to learning a language.

Imaginative education can be effective in language learning. It draws on socio constructivist thinking as in Vygosky's work in 2004. It views the socio cultural environment around the students as an essential factor. This means that

- a- The actions of the teachers in the classroom are significant. Teachers should create warm non-threatening environments using imaginative education tools. They create

positive relationships with students. They push them to higher levels of language learning through the zone of proximal development.

- b- Students' language learning is shaped by their socio cultural background. Teachers should become familiar with the students .They should consider kinds of understanding that are most relevant to their students and their personalities (Broom, 2011).

The theory of imaginative education is based on five distinctive kinds of understanding that enable individuals to make sense of the world. Its purpose is to enable each student to develop these five kinds as follows:

- 1- Somatic understanding: From birth till age. It refers to the physical pre- linguistic way that student comes to know the world around him/ her. S/he makes sense of experience through the information provided by his/her senses.
- 2- Mythic understanding: From about ages 3-7. Students rely on language to discuss, represent and understand even things s/he has not experienced before.
- 3- Romantic understanding: From about ages 8-14. Student begins to learn and understand experience through written language. S/he relates readily to extremes of reality. S/ he seeks to make sense of the world in human terms.
- 4- Philosophic understanding: From about ages 15-20. It focuses on connections among things. Student begins to see that there are laws and theories that can bring together and help in making sense of details and experiences that were disconnected. S/he is developing the systematic understanding.
- 5- Ironic understanding: From about ages 21 +. Student begins to realize that there are limits to systematic thinking. S/he begins to appreciate that theories are too limited to capture everything that is important about the world. S/he makes sense of the world depending on his/ her historical and cultural perspective (Cant, 2018).

The five kinds of understanding are not completely distinct from one another. The latter kinds of understanding are not important or better than the earlier ones. Each one has its own capacities, but these work best if it can be related to earlier capacities rather than replacing them. The challenge is to master the new tools of understanding with the previous one even at different ages and for different tasks ( Mielsen, Fitzgerald and Feltes, 2007.)

So, the present study focuses on using more than one kind of understanding ie the romantic and philosophical ones. As mentioned students ' age during the romantic understanding ranged from 8:14 years and their age in the philosophical understanding ranged from 15:20 years. So, the participants chosen were 3<sup>rd</sup> prep school students as their ages ranged from 14:16. Hence, they were appropriate for following and applying both the romantic and philosophical understandings.

Broom (2011) stated that romantic understanding exists where students acquire written language. They are introduced to reading, writing and grammar. They practice language

through romantic narratives, identification with heroes. They explore human potential and its limits. They are interested in reading and writing about the achievement of the heroes who engage in idealistic actions.

As for the philosophic understanding, it is based on the idea of how to frame the topic in terms of general theory. Students begin to move from the particular aspects of what they learnt to a more general explanation. It involves an understanding of the methods and processes by which new knowledge in the field is generated. It also includes an understanding of the story of a subject and of the relationship between concepts in a particular subject (Egan, 2008).

At the stage of the philosophic understanding, students acquire theories to interpret the world around them. As language learners, they are interested in grammar and the underlying rules that structure words. They search for the truths about syntax. They are willing in discussing the form of language. So, grammar not only deepens understanding of the language itself but also improves practical language skills (Broom, 2011).

Therefore, the researcher of the present study suggested using romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach for developing pragmatics skills and language function for the 3<sup>rd</sup> prep school students.

### **Context of the Problem.**

In spite of the importance of developing pragmatic skills and the use of language functions for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students as emphasized through reviewing the Ministry of Education, Egyptian Standards of Education, the researcher noticed that the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep students had difficulty in using pragmatic skills in general and language functions in particular in EFL classroom. Thus, to make sure of the existence of the problem, the researcher did the following procedures

#### **First: Interview**

The researcher held informal interview with fifteen teachers of EFL preparatory schools stage. It aimed at identifying the following

- the importance of teaching pragmatic skills and language functions
- the pragmatic skills that should be developed for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year preparatory school students
- the methods and strategies used for developing pragmatic skills and language functions.

The results of the interview revealed that teachers were not knowledgeable about the importance of developing pragmatic skills in general and language function in particular. They also indicated that the pragmatic skills that should be developed for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students were conversational skills. Most teachers used teaching strategies which did

not put emphasis on developing pragmatic skills and language function. They used regular instruction in teaching language function that is based on asking and answering questions. This resulted in a meager development of these skills. Teachers assured that students were not given sufficient opportunities to practice the pragmatic skills in the classroom. They did not use the target language in meaningful contexts.

**Second:** Using a Pragmatic Skills observation sheet

To be more sure, the researcher of the present study applied pragmatic skills observation sheet for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students. It included different items concerning using nonverbal communication, expressive skills conversational skills, speech convention and peer skills. The researcher noticed that most of the students were weak in these pragmatic skills. They could not use appropriate gestures or conversational skills.

**Third:** Administering a language functions test

The researcher administered a language functions test to 20, 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students .It included two main questions. The first was “ what would you say in specific situations? “It contained ten situations .The second was “Choose the correct answer” as students were asked to choose the suitable word that reflected the situation. 14 students (70 %) could not pass the exam which referred to their weakness in using and practicing language functions. So, there was a pressing need to develop the EFL use of language functions for those students.

**Fourth:** Reviewing previous studies

Some previous studies ensured that there was a weakness in pragmatic skills such as Deda (2012) and the language function as Ramadan (2018). So, having been sure of the existence of the problem of the weakness of the pragmatic skills and using language function, the researcher conducted this study in a trial of developing those skills for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year preparatory school students

**Statement of the Problem**

The problem of the present study is represented in the weakness of the required pragmatic skills in general and the use of language functions in particular of the 3<sup>rd</sup> preparatory school students. Thus, in a trial of overcoming this problem, the present study attempted to investigate the effect of the romantic and philosophical understandings of imaginative approach as the most appropriate understandings functions for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students on developing the required pragmatic skills and language functions.

**. Questions of the Study**

In order to tackle the above problem, the present study attempted to answer the following main question:

What is the effect of the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach on developing the required pragmatic skills and language functions for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students?

From the main question, the following three sub- questions were derived:

- 1- What are the required pragmatic skills in English that should be developed for 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students?
- 2- What is the proposed framework of using the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach for developing the required pragmatic skills and the use of language functions of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students?
- 3- To what extent will the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach affect developing the required pragmatic skills and the use of language functions for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students?

### **Hypotheses of the Study**

The present study hypothesized that:

- 1-There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and the control groups' students on the post administration of the pragmatic skills test at the level of (0.05 ), in favour of the experimental group
- 2-There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group students on the pre and post administrations of the pragmatic skills test at the level of (0.05 ) , in favour of the post administration of the test
- 3- There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and the control groups' students on the post administration of the language function test at the level of (0.05), in favour of the experimental group
- 4-There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group students on the pre and post administrations of the language function test at the level of (0.05 ) , in favour of the post administration of the test
- 5-The romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach are effective in developing each of the required pragmatic skills for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students

### **Aim of the Study**

The present study aimed at developing the required pragmatic skills and language functions for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students through the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach

### **Variables of the Study**

The present study variables are as follows:

1-The independent variable: refers to the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach

2-The dependent variable: refers to the performance of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep aschool students on pragmatic skills and language functions

In the present study, the researcher measured the effect of the independent variable (the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach) on the dependent variable (developing the required pragmatic skills and language functions) for the 3rd year prep school students.

### **Delimitations of the Study**

The present study was confined to

- 1- 60 students that were randomly selected of the 3rd year preparatory school students. The reason for choosing this sample was due to that it is their first time to be allowed to practice the use of language functions in EFL classroom and use the pragmatic skills in real life situations.
- 2- Using the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach in reformulating the content of lesson 4 in the nine units of the first term in the academic textbook New Hello for 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep.
- 3- Developing only the required pragmatic skills (using nonverbal communication, expressive skills, conversational skills, speech convention and peer skills). In addition, developing the language functions identified in the academic book for the 3rd year prep school students

### **Significance of the Study**

The present study significance lies in the fact that it attempted to develop the required pragmatic skills and the language functions for the 3rd year prep school students. It is hoped that the results of the present study would contribute to:

- 1- Providing language teachers, supervisors and curricula designers with a list of the required pragmatic skills and the use of language functions for the 3rd year prep school students.
- 2-Attracting the attention to the importance of developing the required pragmatic skills and language functions for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students.
- 3-Encouraging the use of the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach for developing the required pragmatic skills and the use of language functions of the 3rd year prep school students.

### **Definition of Terms**

#### **The romantic understanding**

Egan (2005,p 233) defined the romantic understanding as ‘ a way of making sense of the world and experience through an association and even identification with heroes and heroic



---

qualities through the experience of a sense of wonder , through contesting of convention and conversational ideas and through focusing on the extremes and limits of reality and experience.”

Hadzigeorgiou (2014 ,p 342) also defined the romantic understanding as” a narrative kind of understanding which enables students to become aware of human contexts that are supposed to be learnt, by associating ,at the same time , such content with heroic qualities , with the extremes of reality and experience with a contesting of conversational ideas and also by experiencing a sense of wonder.”

In the present study the romantic understanding is defined as “ a kind of understanding that is based on a narrative with heroic qualities. It highlights a sense of wonder and search for information. “

### **The philosophic understanding**

Hadzigeorgiou (2016, p 344) defined the philosophic understanding as “searching for truth, probing for generality (general laws and theories, looking for patterns and connecting among ideas).Building relationships among things, problem solving, hypotheses formation and testing, and the learning of laws are tools associated with a higher level of philosophic understanding.”

Egan and Madej (2019, p 33) gave another definition to the philosophic understanding as “ The understanding of the explanatory structures or paradigms of a field and syntactic knowledge (an understanding of the methods and processes by which new knowledge in the field is generated). It includes an understanding of the story of a subject and of the relationship between concepts in a particular subject.”

In the present study,the philosophic understanding refers to “ a kind of understanding that connects ideas to get the general fact and create relationships among concepts to reach the new ones.”

### **The imaginative approach**

Kayan (2015, p 247 )defined imaginative approach by saying that “it is all about how we can connect imagination to education’s central tasks and set students ’ imagination to learning on routine tasks ,on everyday classroom , on everyday of the school year.”

Lopez (2015, p 45) defined the imaginative approach as “ a complex educational approach which cannot be only applied as a set of simple steps to follow ,its underlying principles and philosophy require in depth analysis , which sometimes includes the personal beliefs or underlying assumptions about the purpose of education itself .”

In the present study , the imaginative approach is defined as “an approach that is based on connecting the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students’ imagination with the learning process with the aim of developing the pragmatic skills and the use of language function in the EFL classroom.”

---

### **Pragmatic language skills**

Murphy (2019, p75) defined pragmatic language skills as'' selection of the appropriate message or interpretation in relation to the communicative context.''

Socher & Others (2019, p2) gave another definition for pragmatic language skills as ''They have been shown to be related to core language ability including language comprehension and vocabulary skills, and also to cognitive skills as inhibition, shifting, working memory and reasoning skills.''

In the present study, they are used to refer to the ability to use appropriate language to communicate in a definite situation .They include using nonverbal communication, speech convention, conversational, expressive and peer skills.

### **Language functions**

Parker (2009, p23) indicated that language function refers to'' what students do with language as they engage with content and interact with others.''

Shrestha (2014, p 231) defined language function as '' It is the purposes for which human beings speak or write. By performing the function, you are performing an act of communication.''

Language function is defined in the present study as the suitable language used by 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students to interact and communicate in real life situations.

### **Review of literature**

#### **Part one: The romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach**

##### **The importance of imagination approach**

In education, some researchers pay due attention to the importance of developing students' knowledge (curriculum content, subject matter and structures of knowledge). Others focus on improving the psychological side (stages of development , multiple intelligences and cognition ). On the other hand, the imaginative education approach has a double weapon as it deals with knowledge , psychology and emotions together (Tyers , 2016).

Generally, MCQuillen ( 2014 ) stated that the imaginative approach can help students of foreign language in encouraging them to work in groups ,increasing their motivation and incentives to learn the new, increasing their concentration on the lesson, encouraging them to explore the new learning, helping them distinguish between facts and opinions. expressing their opinions feely , being able to behave properly in the classroom and developing their positive attitudes towards English

##### **Theoretical foundation of Imaginative Education**

Imaginative education approach is a 21<sup>st</sup> century approach , but it derives some of its inspiration from old resources as follows:

The first source was based on the work of Russian psychologist Vygotsky 1896-1934 . He focused his work on how children gained development and rich understanding of the world by gradually accumulating cognitive tools . It was a challenge for teachers to stimulate , use and develop these tools to enhance students' learning and understanding.

The second source of imaginative education approach involved studies of thinking in traditional oral cultures. By understanding the tools that enabled human cognition gradually to emerge and develop historically , a better grasp of how to help people learn can be got. Many of the cognitive tools were found in oral cultures such as storytelling , forming images from words helped in understanding how everyday teaching might be made more imaginatively engaging to students.

The third foundation was the systematic work done during the past decade and a half by the (IERG) in Simon Fraser University. This group was formed at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century .Its focus had been to show how the emotions and imaginations of all students had to be engaged for learning to be effective and efficient (Egan 2008 ).

### **Tips for implementing imagination**

The following tips should be taken into account when applying the imaginative education approach

- 1- Beginning with a story on the topic or a general question that needs elaboration or discussion.
- 2- Introducing aspects / ideas that show many and varied connections between the new structure and students' emotions and experiences.
- 3- Supporting students' previous experiences as concrete and practical by using cognitive tools
- 4- Keeping it relevant and interesting through promoting students' thinking in the topic from different perspectives
- 5- Starting with known and moving gradually toward the unknown.
- 6- Applying each idea in one class period.
- 7- Offering modules if students are unable to create language (Al Jamal ,2016)

### **Imaginative Education and Kinds of Understanding**

Teacher can identify which kinds of understanding their students have acquired by analyzing their cognitive tools. That is by identifying students' language use in their native language. Students who have oral skills can be considered to have the mythic toolkit available . Other students who are able to read and write in their native language would be at the romantic or even philosophic level if they are able to understand within general theories. When students reflect on specific topic , they would be at the ironic kind of understanding .

Students' kinds of understanding will be separated from their knowledge of English. Teachers should keep in their minds that kinds of understanding are not developmental stages through which students move. Students add new kinds of understanding as they mature. All kinds of understanding with their toolkits remain, and can be drawn on by teachers to enrich second language learning (Tyers 2016).

The theory of imaginative education is based on five distinctive kinds of understanding (somatic, mythic, romantic, philosophical and ironic) that enable individuals to make sense of the world. Its purpose is to enable each student to develop these five kinds. It views student as agent equipped with cultural tools for making meaning. Each kind of understanding unfolds from the previous one, and the use of its cognitive tools engages students imaginatively in learning. In second language learning, it is different. The kinds of understanding have links with English language levels by matching a progression of activities based on teaching the cognitive tools. (Judson, 2008)

### **The cognitive tools**

While the theory of imaginative education was built in part on Vygotsky's ideas about cognitive tools, he did not develop his ideas about cognitive tools nor did he explore their implications in education. The IERG has done just this. Cognitive tools are not developed singly, each independent of others, but rather develop in sets; in other words, they come not as separate cognitive tools but rather as cognitive toolkits (SFU, Simon Fraser University, 2015)

Students usually know how to use the different kinds of cognitive tools. The imaginative teacher should use these tools to help students retain the knowledge they gain. There are three types of cognitive tools as follows:

1-Tools of oral language stage; including story binary, opposites. They used by young children before seven, before literacy affects their thinking. They are effective in organizing and memorizing knowledge.

2-Tools that mature with the literacy stage; involving sense of reality, extremes of experience, sense of wonder, knowledge and human meaning and changing the context. Children between 7:9 can use these tools as they become more fluent and more realistic while thinking. They make knowledge about the world more meaningful to students.

3-Tools that develop with them theoretical thinking stage; including sense of abstract reality, grasp of general ideas, meta narrative understanding. Young adults picked up the sets of these tools. They are effective in developing students' thinking, generating flexibility and constructing their theories (Kayan, 2015).

In the present study, two kinds of understanding; the romantic and philosophical ones would be dealt with in more details

## Part 2

Part two: is divided into two cores including

### First : The Romantic Understanding

The word romantic was derived from the France romance which referred to a species of fictitious writing. It was based on organizing experience through exploration of the extremes and limits of reality. This exploration gave a sense of the boundaries within which students make sense of experience. It also dealt with a wonderful tale about the adventures of hero or heroine. This event showed that human beings not only lived with constraints but also they managed to overcome these constraints (Cant ,2018).

The romantic understanding occurs from the ages 8-9 to about 14-15. Learners between the ages of 8 and 15 begin to develop a more realistic kind of understanding. They move beyond magic and fantasy toward a logical and realistic conception of the world. Students are attracted to literacy characters with heroic events. Although partly illogical or irrational ideas, these elements represent rational thinking that still retains some aspects of the mythic understanding ( Donoghue, 2017). In addition, Egan and Madej(2019) assured that students may be associated with a heroic quality which is neither explicit or implicit in what they say or write. They seek to develop a context of reality . They want to know everything related to any topic. They identify with struggles towards glory of such characters . The stories are not real in the sense of seeking literary true . Rather, they are concerned to be possible with real world.

Romantic understanding is a kind of understanding that is based primarily on the idea of romance and the emotional dimensions of understanding . It is developed when students move from orality to literacy. It is a transitional kind placed between mythic and philosophical understandings (Hadzigorgiou, 2016). According to Egan (2012), the center of romantic understanding is the creation of human meaning as each one can realize the humanistic dimension of all knowledge differently according to his/ her perspective.

The romantic students are characterized by engaging effectively as they are affected by the power of the story, searching for heroic qualities, focusing on limits and extremes of reality as imaginative grasp can be highlighted ,capturing an interest in the pursuit of details and fascinating by what it means to be a human and wanting to explore the best a human can be as well as the words (Donoghue, 2017).

### The principles of the romantic understanding

Lye (2010) mentioned the main principles of the romantic understanding :

- 1-using the story form: Students are engaged by curriculum embodied in story form.
- 2-selecting topics : It can be articulated in terms of binary opposites

3-including knowledge of the scale of reality :Teachers should search for material that gives their students a sense of the contexts of the everyday world

4-including knowledge about the limits of experience: Teachers should seek out aspects that make the content more humanly meaningful .

5-enabling students to form romantic associations: When selecting the content, the focus should be on human qualities that can engage romantic associations

6-providing a strong affective component: Selecting content that engages emotional life of students should be the main feature of the curriculum

7-focusing on human motives, intentions and emotions : It addresses the forms and the nature of human background of the topics to be taught.

8-providing opportunity for detailed study: Students are interested in collecting things or finding out details about the chosen topics

9-stimulating the imagination and literal thinking :Encouraging imagination can lead to developing literal thinking and scientific understanding.

### **The romantic framework**

The framework is based on highlighting the use of binary opposites to increase students' interests and involve them in meaningful meaning. It goes through the following

1-Topic selection: Finding important and effective topic encourages students to participate actively

2-Finding binary opposites: It deals with the most appropriate binary opposites that catch the importance of the topic and highlight its significance.

3-Organizing content into story form: It involves using the content that functions the binary opposites to provide access to the topic.

4-Conclusion: It deals with finding the best solution and alternative for the ongoing conflict inherent in the binary opposites.

5-Evaluation: It aims at knowing whether the students understand the topic, get its importance and learn the topic (Egan, 2008).

### **The cognitive tools of romantic understanding**

Egan (2008) stated that the cognitive tools of the romantic understanding are distinguished by

1-making use of students' imaginative power. It is a way of understanding the world through the narrative mode of thinking.

2-Representing a different way of making sense of the world and human experiences through stimulating their strange and powerful features.

3-being human as it is based on the idea that knowledge is human construction. So, knowledge should be considered in the context of its construction.

4-Having aesthetic dimension . it is effective if knowledge is constructed and not merely discovered or found in books .

### **Evaluation of romantic understanding**

Romantic understanding requires evaluation . It can be assessed informally and formally . Students engaged in discussions about the content knowledge inside or outside the classroom. Teachers should evaluate students to know and make sure of their development in romantic understanding .Their performance should reflect the presence of the specific characteristics and elements of romantic understanding. So, journal writing can be content analyzed to identify the features of romantic understanding in students' products(Mielsen , Fitzgerald and Feltes, 2007).

### **Second : Philosophic understanding**

The word philosophic has come from the Greek philosophia love of wisdom. The philosophical mind focuses on the connections among things , seeing laws and theories. It seeks to tie things together such as disconnected phenomena and experiences . In addition, generalization is central to philosophic understanding. It tries to find out new formed principles and search for organizing aspects to make sense of multitude of experiences (Cant ,2018).

The philosophic tools deliver a kind of understanding that comes from grasping in general terms and organizing the content around one or more general schemes. The focus is on power of ideas as generating many facts into a general scheme. The mind seeks the truth in general schemes. It aims to know the nature of the historical process. It tends to make sense of the world in terms of process rather than discrete events . The philosophic mind sets about charting or making map of the world (Mielsen , Fitzgerald and Feltes, 2007).

It occurs between 14-15 and 19-20 . Students ' focus is directed from extremes and detailed romantic events to the strengthening realization . All bits and pieces are interconnected parts of general unit. They become agents rather than players. Students at this age are characterized by searching for truth and generalizations(Egan and Madej,2019). In addition, Broom (2011) assured that students' awareness of the connection between concepts are begun to develop.They become more interested in the grammar and the underlying rules that structure words. They search for the truth about syntax and enjoy dissecting the form of language. Grammar not only deepens understanding of the language itself but also improves language skills.

Students with philosophic understanding are supported in thinking about abstract ideas and questions often realize that the world exists in a completely separate theoretical realm .

This is immensely appealing to theoretical minds. The world of theory and abstraction attracts students' imagination differently (Judson, 2016). Students who are encouraged to explore abstract ideas can begin to seek certainty and truth in great ideas. The ideas or theories that explain how things work begin to contribute in their own identity. Theory is important in gaining a sense of intellectual security and expressing personal agency

### **The characteristics of the philosophic understanding**

Mielsen & Others (2007) stated that the characteristics of the philosophic understanding include developing classification schemes, explaining how theories and laws work, developing a theory about the topic, focusing on the power of ideas and fitting many facts into a general schema, organizing the content around one or more general schemes and choosing the most clear, powerful and relevant theories for organizing the content.

### **The cognitive tools**

They are characterized by framing the topic in terms of general idea or theory. Students move from the particular aspects of what they have been learned to a more general explanation. Also, their sense of agency can be engaged. The theoretic tools deliver a kind of understanding that come from grasping in general terms. The mind seeks the truth in general schemes. It finds the nature of the historical process (Egan, 2008).

Cant (2018) stated that the cognitive tools of the philosophical understanding include hypothesis and experiment, processes rather than highlights, the search for authority and truth, from transcendent player to historical agent, general schemes and their anomalies, definition of self and graving for generality.

### **The philosophical understanding framework**

Calor (2005) identified the philosophical understanding framework in the following

#### 1- Identifying powerful underlying ideas

The core task is to clarify and make conscious of these ideas and to enable students to recognize them as undergirding the area that they learn about and begin to question them. Teacher should consider the main controversies surrounding the topic.

#### 2-Shaping the lesson

It is based on shaping what is taught in an imaginative and emotionally engaging way. It also involves how the underlying idea can be vivid and what content best exposes it. So, teacher can use the following tools.

- a- Finding the meta narrative : it includes what meta narrative provides a clear structure to the lesson and what support that meta narrative provides for students for authority and truth.



- b- Finding the anomalies to the general theory : It involves what content is anomalous to the general idea and how to begin with minor anomalies and gradually challenge the students' general theory that makes the theory sophisticated .
- c- Presenting alternative general theories : It deals what alternative general theory that can organize the topic and the other theories that used to explain the same phenomena.
- d- Encouraging development of students' sense of agency: It involves the different features of knowledge that encourage students' development of sense of agency.
- e- Drawing on tools of previous kinds of understanding: It includes how students can use some of the toolkits of somatic and romantic understanding in learning.

3-Resources : It involves the resources that are effective in learning more about the topic .

4-Conclusion: It includes the concluding activity that supports and shows problems with students ' theories or meta narratives.

5-Evaluation: It focuses on how teachers know whether the content has been leaned or understood and whether they develop a theory and elaborate it.

### **Part 3 Pragmatics**

#### **The importance of pragmatics**

Developing pragmatics has a great benefit for students . They can build and create social relationships with others. Pragmatic is essential to the attainment of communicative competence . As for the academic importance, many activities in all syllabuses are based on group work and communication between peers. So, developing pragmatics enhances students' grammatical and functional skills. Also, pragmatic knowledge gives students a sense of ownership of the language and membership within the speech community (Puse , 2019).

Hui( 2007) mentioned that teaching pragmatic is due to the following reasons:

- 1- Avoiding miscommunication caused by cultural difference
- 2- Providing students and teachers with a research based understanding of the language forms and functions that are related to the contexts

#### **Components of pragmatics**

The components of pragmatics include

1-Pragmalinguistics : It involves the integration of grammar with pragmatics . It provides practical explanation on grammar . It finds the most practical structures to be used in sentences with specific purposes.

2-Socio pragmatic: It refers to the social perceptions that underlie the students interpretation and performance of communicative action.

3-Psycho pragmatics: It focuses on how students learn foreign language and how teachers teach(methodology) ( Amanepesov, 2016) .

### Pragmatic Skills Classification

Ghalarish and Hassani 2017 stated that Orion's classification of pragmatic language skills included

1-Non verbal communication involves looking at the eyes of the person speaking with, using facial expressions ,observing facial expressions appropriate to content of words ,understanding the emotions of others and responding appropriately and recognizing non verbal clues and gestures

2-Expressive skills include speaking clearly , taking another' person perspective, speaking with varied and appropriate tone and volume and arguing and making an argument when others disagree

3-Conversational skills : include

A- Topic maintenance involves choosing a topic appropriate to the setting, expressing and finding relevant information, introducing and discussing topic clearly and changing topic appropriately

B- Turn taking includes taking turn in conversation, paying attention to what is said and reacting and responding quickly when interrupting both peers and adults

4-Speech conventions deal with introducing self appropriately to others, asking for help when needed and initiating conversation

5-Peer skills deal with establishing and maintaining appropriate friendship, responding to verbal conflicts appropriately, demonstrating empathy and offering and accepting others appropriately

6- Other involves recognizing and expressing own emotions, demonstrating remorse when appropriate ,understanding the purpose of rules and caring what others think of him/her

In addition, Prakovic (2019) identified the pragmatic skills as follows:-

- 1- asking for help and seeking the new,
- 2- initiating and terminating conversation appropriately ,
- 3- asking for, giving and responding to information,
- 4- turn taking in conversation over multiple exchanges,
- 5- avoiding repetition or irrelevant information and
- 6- adjusting language based on the situation or the person

### Theories of pragmatics

Amanepesov (2016) stated that the theories of pragmatics are based on the assumption that words do not have meaning by themselves . Some theories of pragmatics are as follows:

1-Speech act theory : Austin as a founder of speech act theory thought that people not only use language to say things but to do actions. There are three components of speech acts as follows:

a-locutionary act : it involves speaker's use of utterance

b-illocutionary act : it deals with speaker's intention and the real meaning of an utterance.

c- per locutionary act : it includes hearer's reaction and his/ her reflection on the actions

- 2-Relevance theory: It considers the meaning of a concept as the sub total of its implication for possible observation and actions
- 3-Cooperation theory: The way people used to make conversation work effectively. It assumes that participants cooperate in conversation by contributing to the continuous speech event. It is developed into 4 maximums ; maximums of quality, maximums of quantity, maximums of relation and maximums of manner.
- 4-Argumentation theory: It involves interdisciplinary study how people arrive at conclusion through social reasoning
- 5-Conventional implicature : Grice created conversational implicature theory.
- Implicature is something meant or suggested from what is said.
- 6-Politeness theory: It can be expounded with respect to a limited number of universal phenomena, the construct of face and social variables.

### Aspects of pragmatics

Shokouhi and Rezqej ( 2015) mentioned the following aspects of language studies in pragmatics :

- 1-Deixis : In verbal communication, it involves the contextual meaning what is meant by a specific utterance in a given context.
- 2-Pre supposition : It deals with the logical meaning of an utterance or meanings associated with sentence
- 3-Performance : When speaker produces sentence, s/he not only says something but also does certain things
- 4-Implicature: It contains indirect or implicit meaning of statement . It is derived from context and is not presented in its conventional use.

### Teacher and the development of pragmatics

Moran and Others (2009) indicated that teachers should make students aware of the importance of pragmatics in language. They should know more about speech acts and their aspects and elements. Teacher should consider the acronym SURE

- S: See: students see the language in context. Teacher should attract and direct students' attention to the important role of pragmatics in communication
- U : Use :teacher provides students with opportunities to practise activities based on using language in context. Their interaction depends on their understanding of the situation.

-R : Review: teacher should review the areas of pragmatics skills and focus on the weakness points to be developed.

-E : Experience :students should experience and observe the role of pragmatics in communication through various activities and tasks

### **Teaching pragmatics**

Teaching pragmatic in classroom seeks to fulfill the following functions:

- 1- Exposing students to appropriate target language input
- 2- Increasing students' pragmatic and meta pragmatic awareness about pragmatic
- 3- Providing authentic opportunities to get pragmatic knowledge (Oda and Mohamed 2016).

According to Deda ( 2012) and Amanepesov (2016) , teaching pragmatics should go through the following

1-Explicit instruction of pragmatic rules: It includes three stages as follows

A-Presentation stage : it involves presenting samples of language in use.

B- Practice stage : Students practise tasks and activities that aim at enhancing their pragmatic knowledge.

C-Production stage : Teacher administered test or role play to evaluate students' progress .

2-Implicit teaching approach : Various ways of developing students' pragmatic

awareness can be training students how to make requests, using dialogue:

students pretend to Be the real characters in real situation and make a dialogue and using films as students observe the characters' language use in specific

situations through TV shows and video programmes .

### **Difficulties with pragmatics**

Students have various difficulties with pragmatics as follows:

1-maintaining and remaining on topic in conversation,

2- standing too close to the speaker without considering personal space,

3-dominating conversations and avoiding listening ,

4-being unable to get and understand another 's person opinion and point of

View,

- 5-misinterpreting the tone of voice and intonation of the speaker ,
- 6-being unable to complete academic work as s/he can not understand both oral and written instructions and
- 7-being unable to manipulate information and to update this information as the change occurs (Ahlander and Akademi2020).

### **Evaluation of pragmatics**

Because of the nature of pragmatics as the complicated and elusive part of communication, it is almost impossible to construct a standardized test that focuses on the essence of social communication. The assessment of pragmatics is so important to check students' competence in language use. Also, the techniques of evaluating students' progress in pragmatics are reluctant to focus on pragmatics in teaching even though a number of assessment instruments is available ( Adama and Shanker, 2012)

As pragmatics involves three major language skills , they should be tested while evaluation as follows:

- 1- Communicative intentions and engagement: They include paying attention to object, topic or person, initiating verbal exchanges and using language for various purposes
- 2-Non verbal rule of conversation : It involves using non verbal communication such as body language and gestures
- 3-Verbal rules of conversation: They focus on choosing appropriate vocabulary, varying tone of voice ,introducing topics gradually, interrupting politely and maintaining a topic for several turns ( Marasco &Others , 2004 )

### **Part 4 : Language functions**

#### **The importance of teaching language functions**

With respect of the importance of learning language functions, Parker (2009) stated that language functions have benefited in various ways ; students can communicate in various situations by getting information from classroom and apply them in reality. In addition, learning language functions can develop students' abilities to communicate effectively in various life situations by performing functions. Students can get a lot of fixed expressions and memorize them better and use these items effectively . Students are encouraged to speak spontaneously in various social situations. They are provided with opportunities to share information naturally in their group as they are in real life situations ( Sky teach ,2016).

Ellam (2019) stated that learning language functions can enhance students' learning . It is one of the major factors that students need to learn language . The potential communication has been created from the classroom first and the actual success will consequently appear in

the real life interaction. The more language functions students know, the more real life situations they can interact in. Students can acquire various expressions for different contexts. Some expressions are more suitable for a formal situation than an informal one . Students can also learn numerous vocabulary and grammatical structures.

### **Language functions and students' level**

Beare (2018) mentioned that using language function by levels can be classified as follows :

- 1- Beginning level : includes expressing likes, describing people, places and things, asking Yes/ No and information questions, comparing people ,places and things ,ordering thing and expressing abilities
- 2- Intermediate level: involves making predictions, showing preferences, expressing opinions, disagreeing, comparing and contrasting people , places and things , relating past events, describing spatial and time relations,making suggestions, asking for favor and asking and giving advice
- 3- Advanced level : persuading someone, interpreting data , generalizing about topics, hypothesizing and speculating, summarizing and sequencing a presentation or speech

Parker (2009) mentioned that functional vocabulary and structures can be differentiated for students with their proficiency levels. Students with lower levels can practise simple vocabulary and structures under the guidance of teachers. As for students higher levels of English proficiency ,they should use more abstract and complicated vocabulary and structures.

### **Types of language functions**

Shresth (2014) indicated that language functions can be classified into two kinds:

1-Grammatical function: It refers to the rule of linguistic units in the structure of a sentence .It is also the relationship that a constituent has with other constituents in a sentence.

2-Communicative function: It is the communicative goal . Language is used as means in community. It is the purpose for which it is used. So, it is used to get work done.

There are two types of language functions as Bellahcen (2017) stated :

- 1-Social functions: They involve expressing one's thoughts or feelings ; expressing agreement /disagreement and asking for information
- 2-Rhetorical functions: The language functions used in academic ,spoken or written texts; defining and cause and effect

### **Tips for teaching language functions**

Teachers should take into account the following tips when using language functions in classroom

- 1-There are many functions in English and numerous exponents that can be used to express each function.
- 2-It is difficult to understand the meaning of sentence out of the context as one structure can have more than one functional meaning.
- 3-The kind of functional exponent depends on the relationship between the two Speakers.
- 4-Pronunciation, sentence stress and intonation play the main role in learning language function.
- 5-Some functions can be indirect and subtle .So, students should know their Meanings.
- 6-Teacher should create the situation and direct students in a certain activity progressively.
- 7-Learners should understand what they are required to do in each activity.
- 8-Teachers should model and demonstrate the activity with students.
- 9-Teachers should provide students with expressions and language forms needed for doing the activities.
- 10-Selecting activities that highlight students' linguistic and creative abilities (Ramadan, 2018).

### **Teaching language functions**

In classroom, teacher should teach the following Language functions in EFL classroom

- 1- synthesizing ; it involves drawing connections between components.
- 2- evaluating ; it means making value judgments about things and assessing their value and usefulness.
- 3- justifying ; it deals with giving reasons for a particular position ,action , convincing others of position and persuading.
- 4- arguing ; it includes providing arguments for or against something.
- 5- analyzing ; it means separating whole into parts , focusing on connections between parts , compare and contrast (Baneen,2014).

Ramadan (2019) stated that teaching language functions based on communicative principles should go through

- 1- Presenting the functions in a dialogue: it follows selecting real interactions between real speakers, setting relationships between speakers, making the target function occur naturally and avoiding dialogues that include artificial context
- 2- Highlighting the function in the dialogue through exploiting the dialogues and students discover the instances of the target function and line them. It also includes transferring the linguistic forms of the target function out of the dialogue and order them according to formality level
- 3- Practice stage : It contains producing good linguistic form of the function, encouraging the exchange of personal information while communicating, presenting

exercises concerning the linguistic forms of the target function and providing opportunities for practice exchanges

El Fadil (2019) mentioned that using language functions in classroom depends on

- 1- The choice of teaching content.: Teacher should write a short conversation. It should be authentic , contain a few number of unfamiliar vocabulary or cultural items , be recorded in the voices of native and non native speakers and contain many repetitions of the to 'be learned 'response .
- 2- The choice of teaching aids : Teachers need to record the conversation by using a cassette recorder , native and non native speakers, blank cassette and preparing a poster with names and pictures.
- 3- The selection of tactics :It involves how teacher can best introduce and explain the to 'be learned 'language function and how students have learnt.

### **Problems with teaching language function**

Baneen (2014) mentioned that students do not know when language functions are used in the situation and how they talk with the receiver. In addition, Ramadan(2018) assured that students struggle to communicate effectively in various social situations. That is due to most teachers focus only on teaching vocabulary and grammar and often neglect teaching language functions. So, they do not practise how to say and use language function in classroom. In addition, Beare ((2018)stated that teaching language function can lead to confusion because it requires using a wide range of vocabulary and grammatical structures for each language function . So, it is better to associate the definite language functions with grammar and vocabulary while presenting them in classroom.

### **Evaluation of language function**

Teachers should assess language function in the exam for the following reasons:

- 1-offering students a link to the outside world and making connections with actual classroom tasks.
- 2-practising idiomatic or phrase level as it is important when students need to communicate in and out the classroom.
- 3-developing fluency and building self confidence as students seek to speak as native speakers and use their daily life language.
- 4-deepening students' knowledge and broadening their range of vocabulary. As functional language can take students beyond the exam , they can use what they learn and apply it in various contexts ( Hobbs ,2019).



---

## Instruments of the Study

### 1-Pragmatic skills test

To ensure the progress of the participants in pragmatic skills, a pre-posttest for measuring the required pragmatic skills for the 3<sup>nd</sup> year prep school students was designed. It consisted of five questions dealt with the five main pragmatic skills (the communication, conversational, conventional, expressive and self

skills). It was submitted to jury members specialized in the field of methods of teaching English to test the validity

To measure the reliability of the test, the test-retest reliability was counted. It was  $r=0.78$ . So, the test was reliable and could be used before and after the experiment. The final version of the test is shown in appendix (2)

### 2-Pragmatic skills rating scale

To evaluate the pragmatic skills questions in the pragmatic skills test, the researcher designed pragmatic skills rating scale for the 3<sup>nd</sup> year prep school students. It consisted of five items dealt with the five main pragmatic skills (the communication, conversational, conventional, expressive and self skills). It was submitted to jury members specialized in the field of methods of teaching English to test the validity

To measure the reliability of the test, the test-retest reliability was counted. It was  $r=0.79$ . So, the test was reliable and could be used before and after the experiment. The final version of the test is shown in appendix (c)

### 2-Language functions test

In order to measure the participants' progress in language functions, the researcher designed a language functions test as a pre-post measuring instrument. It included two items. The first one entitled choose the correct answer as students were asked to choose the word that reflected the situation. The second one was to write what would be said in each situation. It was submitted to jury members specialized in the field of methods of teaching English to test the validity and appropriateness. Having done their modifications, the test became valid. Also, the test was reliable as  $r=0.78$ . The final version of the test is shown in appendix (d)

## Method of the study

The present study followed the descriptive analytical method for reviewing the theoretical background of the study. Furthermore, the quasi experimental pre-post tested two groups 'design was used in the experimental part of the study. The study investigated the effect of the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach on developing the required pragmatic skills and language functions for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students

---

### **Participants of the study.**

The participants of the study consisted of 60 , 3<sup>rd</sup> year preparatory stage students. They were divided into two groups (the experimental group and the control group). The reason for choosing the participants was due to the fact that their ages ranged between 14: 16 years. The study followed two kinds of understanding. The romantic understanding occurred in 8: 14 and the philosophical understanding occurred in 15- 20. So, the participants were able to apply both of the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach for developing their pragmatic skills and language function.

### **Duration of the experiment**

The experiment lasted for three months, one period (45 minutes )per a week. It started on 28<sup>th</sup> Sept., and continued to 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2017. It is worth noting that the pre administration of the test was on 27<sup>th</sup> September while the post administration was on 25<sup>th</sup> December .The instruments of the study were used before and after the experiment for the two groups. The experimental group was taught through the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach while the control group received regular instruction.

### **The Suggested steps for using the proposed framework**

#### **1- The proposed framework for romantic understanding**

##### **Procedures**

##### **1- Starting with narrative**

Teacher began the lesson by attracting students' attention through using different teaching aids (white board, a film, and computer). The teacher retold the fantastic story. S/he asked students to notice the language used to express suggestion and recommendation and asked them to take notes if they can.

Teacher wrote down specific expressions

Teacher used facial expressions through drawing on the white board .

##### **2- Creating a crisis through binary opposites**

Teacher presented a crisis in the story. It included humans with binary opposites. They should face and overcome the problem through their heroic qualities. Students acted using visual expressions and body language. Teacher asked students to think for five minutes and chose the character that they wanted to present For example in the story of the girl and Robert . Teacher said while visiting different countries, the girl faced many problems such as fear, speaking different languages , treating with different people with various traits , if you were the Robert how to help her overcoming these problems.

### 3- Humanizing the form

In groups, students started a conversation. Each one represented a character in the story. Some characters had good qualities while the others had bad ones. They reacted towards the crisis. Each student defended his/ her points of view and recommended the other to do something using specific expressions. Teacher offered help when needed. For example, students should express their feelings using body language. Students were asked to use the following statements

Did the trip make you feel happy?

How did you feel when ending the trip?

I felt

I did not feel

### 4- Engaging

Teacher asked students to imagine some situations. Each situation included a romantic event with romantic characters. Students began to tell their situations, Teacher and other students chose the best situation and students began to pretend their characters. They used their body language with specific expressions. For example, in pairs, students exchanged the roles of Emmy and people in specific country and took turns in the dialogue. They asked questions about what can be seen in each country and what people were distinguished by.

### 5- Evaluating

Teacher asked students to write what they would say in some situations.

## 2- The proposed framework for philosophic understanding

### Procedures

#### 1- Presenting the general idea

Teacher attracted students' attention towards a philosophic idea such as the idea of success and its relation with work and effort. It is based on a problem needed to be solved. Teacher used different teaching aids (smart board). The solution should be created from their points of views. They thought for ten minutes then each one presented his/ her own. It was allowed for students to search for data if they needed as the class was supported via computer with internet.

#### 2- Guessing the meaningful ideas

Teacher asked students to think while answering these questions

- What did they get from this problem?
- What did they think the end of the story?
- Who could help them?

#### 3- Exploring alternative perspectives

Teacher asked students to imagine that they actually created new idea. Each student thought and tried to answer the following questions

- 
- What could s/ he add to improve the idea?
  - Did s/he have additional ideas?
  - How could s/he modify this idea?

After answering the questions, each student could modify his/ her proposal and suggest the new.

#### 4- Creating the new perspective

In group of four, students exchanged different opinions for improving the idea. Teacher asked students how to modify their friends 'ideas. Then, the same pairs met again, each student tried to present his/ her perspective and persuade the other. They argued together until each of them reached the applicable idea. S/he could use specific expressions.

Each student should present his/her own creation. S/ he could justify his / her points of view using different materials as possible. In addition, students could use drawing to explain their ideas.

#### 5-Evaluating

- Teacher asked students to write what they would say in each situation
- Teacher asked students to answer some questions with using body language

For example :Teacher asked students to answer the following questions with using body language

What would you do if

- 1-Someone takes your bag
- 2-You see an old man crossing the street
- 3-Someone refuses to lend you money

### **Data Analysis and Results**

The results of the study are discussed and interpreted in relation to the study questions and hypotheses, mentioned earlier, as follows:

#### 1-Answering the first sub- question

To identify the required pragmatic skills for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students, a checklist was designed by the researcher. The checklist was submitted to jury members who approved it. It included five main skills in its final version (see appendix A). Thus, the first sub- question of the present study was answered.

#### 2-Answering the second sub -question

The second sub- question was answered as a suggested framework for using the romantic and philosophic understandings of the imaginative approach was designed and displayed as shown before. For more details, the suggested framework of the present study is shown in appendix (E).

### 3-Answering the third sub -question

Answering the third question is related to verifying the hypotheses of the present study. So they will be dealt with together as follows:

#### A-Findings related to the first hypothesis

The first hypothesis stated that “There is a statistically significant difference between the mean score of the experimental and the control groups’ students on the post administration of the pragmatic skills test, in favour of the experimental group”. The pragmatic skills test was administered to the control and experimental groups after the experiment. Data obtained were treated statistically. Findings are shown in table (1)

Table (1 ) T- Test Results Of the Experimental And the Control group Students' Performance On The Post Administration Of The Pragmatic Skills Test

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Calculated t value	Level of significance
Control	6.41	5.73	14.07	(0.01)
Experimental	14.29	11.12		

Table (1) revealed that the calculated (t) value (14.07) was significantly higher than the tabled (T) value (2.75) with (58) degrees of freedom at the (0.01) level of significance. Thus, using the romantic and philosophic understandings of the imaginative approach significantly improved the experimental group pragmatic skills. Hence, the first hypothesis was verified.

#### 2-Findings related to the second hypothesis

The second hypothesis stated “There is a statistically significant difference between the mean score of the experimental group students on the pre and post administrations of the pragmatic skills test, in favour of the post administration of the test.”The pragmatic skills test was administered to the experimental groups before and after the experiment. Data obtained were treated statistically. Findings are shown in table(2).

Table (2 ) T- Test Results Of the Experimental Group Students' Performance On The Pre- Post Administration Of The Pragmatic Skills Test

Experimental Group	Mean score	Standard Deviation	Calculated t value	Level of significance	The Effect Size
Pre	6.83	7.43	22.25	(0.01)	0.95
Post	14.29	11.12			

Table (2 )revealed that the calculated ( t ) value (22.25 )was significantly higher than the tabled (T )value (2.75 ) with (29) degrees of freedom at the (0.01) level of significance .Thus, using the romantic and philosophic understandings of the imaginative approach had significantly improved the experimental group pragmatic skills . Hence, the second hypothesis was verified.

Moreover, the effect size was calculated using eta square . It was (0.95 ) i.e higher than the large effect size value (0.8) .This showed that using the romantic and philosophic understandings of the imaginative approach significantly improved the experimental group pragmatic skills .

### 3-Findings related to the third hypothesis

The third hypothesis stated that “There is a statistically significant difference between the mean score of the experimental and the control groups’ students on the post administration of the language function test, in favour of the experimental group”. The language function test was administered to the control and experimental groups after the experiment. Data obtained were treated statistically . Findings are shown in table(3)

Table (3 ) T- Test Results Of the Experimental And the Control group Students' Performance On The Post Administration Of The language function Test

Group	Mean score	Standard Deviation	Calculated t value	Level of significance
Control	5.7	5.6	17.8	(0.01)
Experimental	21.6	11.7		

Table (3) revealed that the calculated (t) value (17.8) was significantly higher than tabled the (T ) value (2.75) with (58) degrees of freedom at the (0.01) level of significance . Thus, using the romantic and philosophic understandings of the imaginative approach significantly improved the experimental group’ use of language functions. Hence, the third hypothesis was verified.

### 2-Findings related to the fourth hypothesis

The fourth hypothesis stated “there is a statistically significant difference between the mean score of the experimental group students on the pre and post administrations of the language function test, in favour of the post administration of the test.”

The language function test was administered to the experimental groups before and after the experiment. Data obtained were treated statistically. Findings are shown in table (4).

- Table (4) Test Results Of the Experimental group Students' Performance On The Pre - Post Administration Of The language Function Test

Experimental Group	Mean score	Standard Deviation	Calculated t value	Level of significance	The Effect Size
Pre	8.5	7.8	14.7	(0.01)	0.88
Post	21.6	11.7			

Table (4) revealed that the calculated ( t ) value (14.7) was significantly higher than the tabled (T) value (2.75) with (29) degrees of freedom at the (0.01) level of significance. Thus, using the romantic and philosophic understandings of the imaginative approach significantly improved the experimental group' use of language functions. Hence, the fourth hypothesis was verified.

Moreover, the effect size was calculated using eta. It was (0.95) i.e. higher than the large effect size value (0.8). This showed that using the romantic and philosophic understandings of the imaginative approach significantly improved the experimental group use of the language functions. Thus, the main question was answered.

### 3-Findings related to the fifth hypothesis

The fifth hypothesis stated that 'the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach are effective in developing each of the required pragmatic skills for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year prep school students'. The pragmatic skills test was administered to the experimental group before and after the experiment. Data obtained were treated statistically for each main skill. Findings are shown in table(5).

Table (5) T- Test Results Of the Experimental group Students' Performance On The Pre - Post Administration Of The Pragmatic Skills Test in each sub skill of the test

Experimental Group	Mean score of the pre and post administrations	Standard Deviation	Calculated t value	Level of significance	The Effect Size
Communication skills	<u>1.6</u> <u>7.5</u>	<u>2.2</u> <u>4.6</u>	<u>17.2</u>	<u>(0.01)</u>	<u>0.91</u>
Conversational skills	<u>2.3</u> <u>6.3</u>	<u>7.2</u> <u>7.3</u>	<u>15.3</u>	<u>(0.01)</u>	<u>0.89</u>
Conventional skills	<u>3.2</u> <u>8.9</u>	<u>16.92</u> <u>17.2</u>	<u>16.3</u>	<u>(0.01)</u>	<u>0.90</u>
Expressive skills	<u>3.1</u> <u>6.1</u>	<u>8.3</u> <u>18.2</u>	<u>19.8</u>	<u>(0.01)</u>	<u>0.91</u>
Self skills	<u>3.1</u> <u>4.8</u>	<u>2.91</u> <u>4.46</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>(0.01)</u>	<u>0.51</u>

Table (5) revealed that the calculated ( t ) value of each pragmatic skill was significantly higher than the tabled ( T )value with (29) degrees of freedom at the (0.01) level of significance. Thus, the romantic and philosophical understandings had significantly improved each main pragmatic skill of the experimental group. Hence, the fifth hypothesis was verified.

Moreover, the effect size of each skill was calculated using eta square formula. It was higher than the large effect size value (0.8) as shown in table 5 expect for one skill (peer skill) . It had a medium effect size .This showed that the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach had a large effect size on developing most of the main pragmatic skills for the experimental group. Thus, the third sub question was answered as shown before in table (5). In turn, the main question of the study was answered as the effect size on the pragmatic skills as a whole was large (0.95) as shown too in table (4)

Findings of the study assured that the main question and its three sub questions were answered as the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach significantly improved the experimental group pragmatic skills and had a large effect size on the pragmatic skills as a whole and all of the pragmatic skills separately, except for one. In addition, it had a large effect size on using language functions.

### Discussion of results

The previous statistical analysis was carried out with the purpose of answering the research questions and verifying its hypotheses. Results revealed the effect of using the romantic and philosophical understandings of the imaginative approach on developing the pragmatics skills and language function for the 3<sup>rd</sup> prep school students. This was due to the following reasons:

1-Implementing imaginative approach made the learning process more effective and imaginative Students were always in a process of interaction with their classmates and exchanging information and ideas. This is agreed with Lapez 2015 who stated that ‘‘Imaginative approach suggested that by engaging students and teachers’ imaginations and emotions with regular curriculum, learning will become memorable and significant. It encourages teachers to shape content in different way , trying it with emotional meaning which will empower the development of students’ imagination through the use and development of certain cognitive tools’’.

2- Students became more familiar with the context they have been brought into. They knew about the key vocabulary about the topic. They knew the function. They practiced these functions as they were in real life situations. They were monitored to use these functions rightly. So, learning English became more exciting and interesting. This is agreed with Elkaissy (2012) who stated that ‘‘Teachers ‘target goals of teaching language function should direct to helping students become more excited by learning. So, students not only learn knowledge but also understand the meaning of knowledge to improve their performance and academic achievement’’



3-Using more than one kind of understanding added variety. Students were attracted to the romantic ideas then they used their minds in philosophical issues. So, connecting the two kinds of understanding made difference. That is consistent with Egan (2001) who stated that in each zone, students understand the world in different ways . That is to say the romantic students saw each idea from its an emotional perspective while the philosophic students returned each idea too its basic It is important to realize that all kinds of understanding are not completely district from one another, but these work best if they can be combined with earlier capacities rather than replacing them.

4-The nature of the tasks changed and varied according to students' abilities .So, they were arranged to meet the various students 'levels and needs. This is consistent withKinsop (2009) who indicated that'' For higher functioning students, they only have difficulties with implementing imaginative tasks at the beginning. As for average functioning students, they try to get the idea and carry out details to achieve progress. In other words, lower functioning and less engaged students are weak and have serious problems in applying imaginative tasks.''

5-The focus on developing pragmatics skills and language functions together led to students 'progress in the area of language use. They had not had knowledge about when and how to use the pragmatic skills and the different language functions in real life situations. This was agreed with Veyselkilic (2015) teaching should be based on using language to express and understand different kinds of functions. The most important thing in communication is to achieve language functions by using strings of words.

6-The learners had a fearless atmosphere where they discussed and exchanged experiences freely. In addition, the enriching environment improved students 'mental capacities to create the meaningful products. This is consistent with Shresth (2014) who stated that ''Teachers should create suitable learning environments. So, students are able to use language functions fluently and accurately in practical situations in the appropriate time''.

6-Teacher's changeable role in the imaginative classroom created engaging environments using imaginative education tools. Teacher developed positive relationships with students, aroused their curiosity by asking questions and telling a narrative and pushed them to imagine and create. The imaginative teacher enriched her students' imagination and showed a flexibility of mind that enabled her to present a subject in a new and innovative way .She not only made her practice vividly engaging but also thought about how to develop the imaginations of the students. She thought about the emotions, images, stories, sense of wonder and other imaginative tools that could give these concepts and content life and energy. This is agreed with (Kayan, 2015) who stated that ''Teachers should regard classroom as a place from which one takes off into other environments .So, they can easily engage students' imagination in learning.''

7-Posing imaginative situations that evoked wonder and ignited the emotions and imaginations needed a discussion to be made or a question to be answered. This sparked thinking and imagination. So, students could express their views. This was consistent with

---

Cunninghun's (2015) opinions who indicated that the characteristics of imaginative learning are generating unusual, unconventional and original ideas and activities . It is also flexible and adaptive in response to the unique demands of practice.

8-Using cognitive tools that tied to emotions and thinking. Students acquired them from their cultural environments through education. They helped students think and do things more effectively. They included

- Stories that helped students remember things and made knowledge more applicable.
- Metaphors that enabled students to understand one thing by seeing it in terms of another
- Binary opposites that helped students organize and categorize knowledge
- Sense of abstract reality to enhance their thinking abilities

9-Students' eagerness to communicate and discuss with each other in English as their imaginations were provoked. In imaginative tasks, students were told by their teacher to listen carefully to a story that she narrated. They imagined and drew a mental picture about what they already have listened to, then teacher asked students about the pictures which they imagined in order to assess their comprehension. This was agreed with Egan and Fraser's (2011) findings who argued that "When teachers appeal to the imagination in their lessons, learners become engrossed in the subject matter and willingly participate in the learning process".

10-The philosophical understanding highlighted negotiation and thinking. It developed students' mental abilities and using their open minds. Students created the new perspective and learned how to argue and persuade the others. They practiced how to communicate ideas and support points of view. This was agreed with Egan (2001) who stated that discussion and negotiating meaning are the main characteristics of the imaginative approach where students are responsible for their own learning through ongoing negotiation of content, practice and assessment. So, recent studies indicated the effectiveness of imaginative teaching s on increasing students' achievement as well as promoting students' higher order thinking skills. The use of such cognitive tools can help students improve their creative skills which are related to imaginative teaching.

11-Overcoming the challenge of using imaginative approach in EFL classroom as many teachers neglected using this approach because of its difficulty and they were not trained on how to use and apply it. The researcher applied it with the experimental group and provided the opportunities for many teachers to attend her class to see and learn how to use the imaginative approach. This is agreed with Kinsop (2009) who assured that "the challenge issue of the imaginative education is its nature. It involves various principles and dimensions that the teachers are not used to or train before. In professional development teacher programmes, much time and due attention are given to the organization of curriculum, content, and classroom management techniques and teaching methods. However, imagination as educational approach is not a routine topic and important area because it is thought to be

something too vague, cannot be taught. . So many teachers feel that they do not have or possess the imaginative competence even if they might admire other teacher's imaginative lessons ‘’.

### Recommendations

In the light of the results of the present study, the following recommendations are suggested

1-More emphasis should be placed on developing students' pragmatic

Language skills in different educational stages

2-Students should be given opportunities to use their minds and imagination to

practice language in real life situations freely

4. Teachers are recommended to use the imaginative approach to encourage students to use their own perspectives.

5. Integrating more than one kind of understanding of the imaginative approach to add variety in the learning process

### Suggestions for further research

1-Further research is needed to examine the effect of the imaginative approach

on developing language skills for the prep stage students.

2-Using other kinds of understandings of the imaginative approach for developing the pragmatic skills for primary school students.

3-Further research is suggested to investigate the effect of some social learning strategies on enhancing students' use of language function in the secondary stage

### References

Ahlander, V., and Akademi, A., (2020) *Pragmatics*, University of Copenhagen. Kid Sense Child Development . com .

Amanepesov, E ., (2016) *Pragmatics*, Suokulda Orgrenci, Haci Bektas , Veli Universitesi.

Baneen,S. ,( 2014) *Language Functions* , Education Technology ,England

Beare, K., ( 2018 ) *Using Language Functions to Learn and Teach English*,wwwenglish teaching

Broom, C ., (2011) Second Language Learning through Imaginative Theory TESL Canada Journal , 28 ( 2)

Cant ,J., 2018.*What is Imaginative Education*, Un fold Theme by Kriese 2.

Deda ,N., ( 2012) The Role of Pragmatics in English Language teaching Pragmatic Competence , Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies , 2( 4) (MCSERCEMAS) Sapienza University of Rome.

Egan , K., (2001) *Imagination in Teaching and Learning from Ages 8 to 15* , Great Britain , Antony Rowe Lt D

Egan, K., (2008) *Imaginative Education : The Tools of Engagement* , Simon Fraser University Research Gate Gmb4

Egan,K ., and Madej, S., (2019) *Engaging Imagination and Developing Creativity in Education*,www imagination yahoo.com

El Fadil , H ., (2019) *The Teaching of Language Function A Systematic Objective Based Approach* , University of Qatar

Ellam, M ., (2019) *Online Language Learning .What is Functional Language*,www languagelearning

Hadzigorgiou , Y .,(2014) *Imagination and Learning Science* , Living Reference Work Entry .

Hadzigorgiou , Y .,(2016) *Teaching for Romantic Understanding* , University of the Aegean , Imaginative Science Education

Harmer,J ., (2008 )How to Teach English London, Person Longman

Hobbs, S., (2019) *Functional Language and Why We Should it to Exam Students* , Cambridge Unibersity Press

Hotnida, I., and Simany, R., ( 2019) *Function of Language as Found in Economical News* ,Sondang man 1k@ yahoo.

Judson , G.,(2018) *Imagination is not Just Hook*, Amadeous Fly Free Media

Kayan, F., (2015) *Review of Work for an Imagination Approach to Teaching*,Eurasia Journal of Mathematics ,Science &Technology, Education ,3(4)

Judson , G., (2016) *Three Toolkits to help Maximize Student Learning and Engagement* , Gillian Smart. Com .

Lopez,C.,(2015) *Implementing Imagination Education as an Additional English Focus*

Lye ,S., (2010) *Romantic Understanding* ,University of Wales : Teaching Thinking of Creativity, V :9 : 2(

Marasco, K., &Others ( 2004 ) *Pragmatic Language Assessment Guidelines*, ECIC MC Standards and Guidelines Speech Sub Committee , Early Childhood Intervention Council of Monroe Country

- Martinez,J., (2014) *Language Function Activities* ,Universidad Central Del Ecuador, The TKT Teaching Knowledge Test Course, Education Technology
- MCQuillen, Ch., (2014) Capacities for Imaginative Learning , Inspire Imaginative Learning
- Mielsen , T., Fitzgerald, r., and Feltes, M., ( 2007) *Imaginative in Educational Theory and Practice , A many Sided Visions* . www egan imagination
- Moron, R., and Others (2009) Pragmatics Applied to Language Teaching and Learning , Cambridge Scholars ,New Castle
- Oda.A ., and Mohamed , S.,( 2016) Investigating the Challenge of Opportunities for Developing Pragmatics Competence of EFL Learners in Iraq. Unpublished PhD
- Parker, A (2009) *Why Teach Functions* <http://www.teflangand.co.uk/blog.asp?blogid=25>
- Prakovic , R.,(2019) *Pragmatic Language Skills to Develop Fluid and Functional Communication*, England , Longman
- Puse ,K., (2019) Using Film and Television to Teach Pragmatics , Northern Arizona University
- Ramadan , M.,( 2018) How to Teach Functional Language , www bizo graphics .com
- Ramadan , M .,(2019) Teaching Language Functions www bizo graphics .com
- SFU Simon Fraser University 2015, Imaginative Education web Design .joericant IFRG, British Columbia
- Ryan,S., and Mercer, S., (2013) The Role of Teacher Imagination in Conceptualising the Child as a Second Language , Department of English Studies , Faculty of Pedagogy and Five Arts ,Adam Micklewics University
- Shankulie, K., ( 2012) Investigating the Challenges and Opportunities for Developing Pragmatic Competence of EFL Students The Case of Student Joseph School in Adama , Adama Science and Technology University , School of Humanities and Law , Department of English .
- Shokouhi , S., and Rezqej, A., (2015 )The Importance of Teaching Pragmatics in the Classroom , Journal of the Study of the English Linguistics , Department of Language Teaching , Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University , Zanjan , Iran
- Tyers, C. , (2016) A brief Guide to Imaginative Education , in association with the imaginative education research group.
- Veyselkiloc , M ., (2015) Language Functions and Distance Learning , International Journal of Media Culture and Literature ,year1 ,N1

## فاعلية الفهم العاطفي والفلسفي للمدخل التخيلي في تنمية المهارات البرجماتية واستخدام الوظائف اللغوية لدى طلاب الصف الثالث الإعدادي

د/ منال السيد

أستاذ مساعد - كلية التربية-جامعة حلوان

### المستخلص

هدفت الدراسة الي تنمية المهارات البرجماتية و استخدام الوظائف اللغوية لدي طلاب الصف الثالث الاعدادى باستخدام الفهم العاطفى و الفلسفى للمدخل التخيلى وقد تكونت عينة البحث من ٦٠ طالب وتم تقسيمهم الي مجموعة تجريبية ومجموعة ضابطة كما تم استخدام اختبار المهارات البرجماتية و كذلك مقياس تقدير واختبار استخدام الوظائف اللغوية لدي طلاب الصف الثالث الاعدادى . تم تصميم قائمة بمهارات البرجماتية لدي طلاب الصف الثالث الاعدادى وقد استخدم البحث المنهج الوصفى التحليلي والشبه التجريبي وقد تم معالجة البحث مع المجموعة التجريبية استخدام الفهم العاطفى و الفلسفى للمدخل التخيلى وطريقة التدريس المعتادة مع المجموعة الضابطة و قد تم عمل التحليل الاحصائى واسفرت النتائج عن فاعلية استخدام فاعلية الفهم العاطفى و الفلسفى للمدخل التخيلى فى تنمية مهارات البرجماتية و استخدام الوظائف اللغوية لدي طلاب الصف الثالث الاعدادى .وبالتالى تحقق الهدف من الدراسة حيث اثبتت فاعلية الفهم العاطفى و الفلسفى للمدخل التخيلى فى تنمية مهارات البرجماتية و استخدام الوظائف اللغوية لدي طلاب الصف الثالث الاعدادى .

**الكلمات المفتاحية :** الفهم العاطفى والفلسفى – المدخل التخيلى – المهارات البرجماتية – الوظائف اللغوية