Copyright

by

Andréanne Cloutier

2015

The Report committee for Andréanne Cloutier

certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:

Let's grab coffee sometime! : enhancing pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks
through metapragmatic discussions.

APPROVED BY

SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor: _____

Carl Blyth

_____

Diana Pulido

Let's grab coffee sometime! : enhancing pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks
through metapragmatic discussions.

by

Andréanne Cloutier, B. Ed.

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of the University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2015

Dedication

À mon amour qui a été à mes côtés durant la rédaction de ce mémoire et qui a su m'encourager à persévérer à coups de rires et de crème glacée.

Acknowledgements

Through my career as a graduate student, I encountered brilliant individuals who care deeply about the global future of foreign language education. Thus, I am thankful for the impact they had on my academic experience as well as my growth as a foreign language teacher. Their invaluable constructive criticism in addition to their expert guidance and professionalism greatly inspired me. For these reasons, I would like to acknowledge their hard work:

To begin with I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Carl Blyth, for providing me with thoughtful insights on this project as well as his constant support throughout the redaction of this Master's Report. Also, I am thankful for Dr. Diana Pulido's precious feedback during the revision process of this project. Moreover, I would like to highlight the intellectual contribution of Dr. Elaine K. Horwitz and Veronica Sardegna, whose mentoring was precious to me during my time at the University of Texas at Austin. Furthermore, I would like give a very special thanks to my colleagues Jessie Trawick, Jenna Nichols, Fanny Macé and Elizabeth Mayne for being great motivational forces throughout the redaction of this paper.

I would also like to acknowledge LDR Spine for the opportunity to teach their French to their employees, which inspired me to explore ways to make learning more *usage-centered* for professionals and adult learners.

***Let's grab coffee sometime!* : enhancing pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks through metapragmatic discussions.**

by

Andréanne Cloutier, M.A.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2015

Supervisor: Carl Blyth

As perspectives on second language teaching and learning evolved throughout the decades, SLA specialists are reconsidering the traditional ways of teaching languages. Since languages are dynamic systems constantly morphing to adapt to their speech communities, focusing on usage in L2 classroom appears to be inevitable. Instructors must think of teaching at the intersection of language and culture in order to foster fully competent L2 learners. Therefore, this paper aims at providing a thorough literature review on the subject of instructional pragmatics and metapragmatic discussions (MPD). Anchored in foundational tenets of the field, this paper presents a variety of instructional techniques that intend to raise the learners' consciousness of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic elements of a target languaculture. Finally, the review will be followed by pedagogical recommendations explaining how to recreate the conditions necessary for an effective metapragmatic discussion to take place, based on current research in the field of second language acquisition.

Keywords: focus on language usage; instructional pragmatics; metapragmatic discussions; pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction and Key Concepts

A language is a system composed of lexicon, syntactical structures, phonology and semantics. While it is tempting to teach it as a set of rules; one has to remember that this system is dynamic, constantly morphing and adapting to its communities of speech. Thus, I believe that teaching a language requires to focus not only on these prescriptive aspects of languages but rather on the intersection of language *and* culture, as a starting point for developing learners into fully competent second language speakers. Otherwise known as pragmatics, this aspect of language teaching has been getting more and more attention in the field of second language acquisition. In her state-of-the-art article, Taguchi reports that "the last two decades have seen a swift expansion of instructional intervention studies in L2 pragmatics" (Taguchi, 2015, p.44). While the effects of instruction on the acquisition of pragmatics as well as techniques to teach this language component have been studied, tested and revisited, there appears to be a gap in the literature concerning the possible use of metapragmatic discussions as a means to enhance pragmatic instruction.

Through a thorough literature review of the foundational tenets in the field of instructional pragmatics, I will explore how instructors can teach pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features of a target language in a second language (henceforth, L2) classroom environment as well as how that instruction can be enhanced by introducing metapragmatic discussions in conjunction with other instructional techniques. I will then suggest optimal conditions for an efficient metapragmatic discussion to happen in the classroom, based on past studies summarized in the literature review. Concepts such as critical language awareness (Fairclough, 1992), languaculture (Agar, 1994) and pragmatic failure (Thomas, 1983) will be introduced in this chapter in order to clearly frame the use of metapragmatic discussions for enhancing pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks. In Chapter 2, the *National Standards for Foreign Language Learning* will be addressed as well as the definition of pragmatic competence and how it develops throughout the course of instruction according to second language acquisition (SLA)

specialists. Additionally, that section will explore the teachability of pragmatics in the L2 classroom setting as well as learners' perspectives on instructional pragmatics. Chapter 3 will highlight the importance of pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks and present the numerous instructional techniques that have been featured in SLA research on instructional pragmatics. Chapter 4 will introduce the notion of collaborative dialogue, inherent to metapragmatic discussion. Furthermore, this chapter will suggest a list of the optimal conditions to conduct productive metapragmatic discussions in the L2 classroom as well as possible pedagogical applications. Finally, Chapter 5 will tie the ideas presented in this paper together to create a concise summary of the elements that have been discussed.

1.1 Critical Language Awareness

In order to allow students to reach their full potential as global citizens, fostering a learning environment that promotes diversity and cultural understanding is essential. This becomes particularly important in the context of L2 education. As a result, language instructors are expected to teach languages not only as structural linguistic systems consisting of phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics; but also as multifaceted tools for effective communication.

In the early 1990s, the theory of *critical language awareness* (CLA) initially emphasized the idea that language brought social power to the speaker (Fairclough, 1992). Cultural components such as language ideology, sociopolitical context and morals vary from one speech community to another; therefore culturally appropriate use of the target language is crucial. For example, in a discussion led on the Cultura forum in Spring 2013[1], differences arose between American English and Hexagonal French speakers on the aspect of individualism. The American students tended to understand individualism as a positive personal value often employing the first-person singular pronoun *I* in their

---

[1] Retrieved from: https://cultura.mit.edu/culturaexchanges/year/2013/semester/spring/host/mit/guest/enseirb-matmeca/word-association/individualism-individualisme

posts. In contrast, the French students used the first-person plural pronoun *nous*, (*'we'*), which denotes a sense of community. As the participants involved in the forum noted, the use of the pronouns in Hexagonal French and American English seemed to influence their perception of the target language group and often perpetuated erroneous perceptions of the target culture. Thus, ignoring such a fundamental difference between the two languacultures can lead to further misunderstandings. Because aspects of language use are often less obvious to learners than formal properties of language, it is essential for instructors to raise awareness about culture-specific patterns of language use.

However, those inherent properties of the target languaculture are rarely encountered in the traditional teaching setting unless the instructor creates opportunities for learning them. Therefore, constant authentic input in addition to interactions with speakers of the target language is essential to increase the learners' exposure to those phenomena and gain understanding of them. Thus, as CLA theory established, it is crucial that the learners understand the ideologies and sociopolitical components related to relevant linguistic variations and discourses. By highlighting these elements of the target language, otherwise referred to in this paper as the pragmatics of a languaculture, language instructors should aim at teaching their learners the culturally authentic and appropriate usage of language rather than solely prescriptive language.

1.2 Languacultures

The modern term *languaculture* (Agar, 1994) was coined to emphasize that language and culture are fundamental elements of each another. The concept originates from *linguaculture* which, as outlined by Friedrich (1989, p.307), sought to reconcile the relationship between 'language *and* culture' (semantics) and 'language *in* culture' (pragmatics).As a result, the two concepts share responsibility in shaping communities of speakers.

For the purpose of this paper, I shall refer to languaculture as a combination of semantics and pragmatics particular to a given speech community. In the context of foreign language education, it is essential to teach learners how to understand and analyze cross-cultural utterances based upon the languaculture of a target language. In other words, learners need to notice the gap between the literal meaning of the words (semantics) and the intended meaning of the utterance (pragmatics). Additionally, language learners who are aware of gaps between the target languaculture and their own have a considerable advantage when they come across speakers of the target language in a non-classroom environment. Framing language learning as studying a 'languaculture' allows instructors to reconcile the often neglected domains of liberal arts such as literature, sociology and history within second language education (Risager, 2005).

In an effort to demonstrate how learners can encounter and explore cross-cultural discrepancies, Agar (2006) suggested the use of *rich point anecdotes* in L2 education: "Rich points are those surprises, those departures from an outsider's expectations that signal a difference between LC1 [languaculture 1] and LC2 [languaculture 2] and give direction to subsequent learning." (p.2). In such an approach, the instructor provides the learners with narratives of successful or unsuccessful interactions between native and non-native speakers of a given languaculture. This is primarily to encourage them to notice the contrasting elements of the two cultural perceptions represented by the interaction. Thus, reflecting on these issues will raise the learner's awareness of critical differences, namely pragmatic elements of the target languaculture. Sometimes stemming from personal experiences, these rich point anecdotes establish grounds for analysis and allow for explicit or implicit teaching of pragmatics through consciousness-raising tasks.

Rich point anecdote: Let's grab coffee sometime !

As a second language learner of English, I have encountered many misunderstandings of my own, otherwise known as pragmatic failures, over the course of my learning. One utterance in particular comes to mind: *Let's grab coffee sometime!* As a French Canadian

who had just moved to Europe for the summer, the prospect of building friendships with Americans overseas was comforting: the cultural gap seemed comparatively small and I had a better grasp of English than any of the other languages spoken around me. Moreover, the Americans I met overseas seemed sincerely interested in spending time with me as a friend. As soon as I had received an invitation for coffee ("Let's grab coffee sometime"), I enthusiastically contacted my new friends to plan a coffee date. Despite my best efforts, however, the plans invariably fell through and my feelings got hurt. Finally, I spoke with one of the Americans and shared with her my concerns. Deeply saddened and upset, I asked her why Americans manifest a desire to spend time with somebody, if they are not serious about it. My friend replied "I don't know, it's just something we say in the moment...you know, to be polite."

This rich point was a highly valuable lesson for my growth as a competent English speaker. I was unaware that this kind of invitation in American English, known in the pragmatic literature as an *ostensible invitation*, conveys five important properties. As outlined by Isaacs and Clark (1990), the pragmatic model for ostensible invitations unfolds as follows in an example where A, a speaker of American English, invites B, a second language learner, to event E:

> "1) pretense (i.e.: A pretends to make a sincere invitation.);
> 2) mutual recognition (i.e.: A and B mutually recognize A's pretense);
> 3) collusion (i.e.: B responds appropriately to A's pretense.);
> 4) ambivalence (i.e.: When asked, "Do you really mean it?" A cannot sincerely answer either "yes" or "no."); and
> 5) off-record purpose (i.e.: A's main purpose is tacit)"
>
> (Isaacs & Clark, 1990, p.496)

Applying this model to my own experience abroad, it was my failure to acknowledge the pretense behind the invitation (i.e.: the invitation was not literal but instead a way to end the conversation) that led to this series of misinterpretations, resulting in a phenomenon referred to as cross-cultural pragmatic failure.

1.3 Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure

Cross-cultural pragmatic failure, a term first coined by Thomas (1983), refers to a breakdown in communication, a gap between *what is said* and *what is meant* by the speaker (p.91). As mentioned in the section above, the literal meaning of the words in an utterance and the intent of that utterance may differ according to the pragmatic norms of a given languaculture. The previous example demonstrated that the non-native speaker, while understanding the literal meaning of the utterance, failed to recognize the pragmatic norms governing ostensible invitations in American English. As a result, feelings were hurt and friendships damaged.

There are two elements embedded in cross-cultural pragmatics, namely pragmalinguistics and the sociopragmatics (Leech, 1983; Thomas, 1983). The pragmalinguistic component refers to the strategies used to perform a communicative act, whereas the sociopragmatic component encompasses everything that could potentially affect the dynamics of interaction, including but not limited to: culture, social distance, social power, age, and gender. In other words, pragmalinguistics can be thought of as linguistic tools while sociopragmatics represent the cultural frames motivating those linguistic choices to successfully accomplish a communicative goal. Van Compernolle (2014) illustrated the differences between these two concepts by analysing how a learner of French negotiated the usage of *tu/vous* (informal and formal '*you*') during a job interview scenario. The learner was asked to play the role of a student being interviewed for a position as a waitress or a front desk agent in a work-study program in France. Usually, in the context of a job interview in French, the use of the conventionally formal *vous*, *nous* and the complete *ne...pas* negation sentence structure is expected. These forms were part of the learner's 'pragmalinguistic toolbox', meaning that she was aware of their appropriateness for this specific context. However, while she used *vous* when addressing

her interviewer, she also used *on* (informal form for '*we*') during the scenario and dropped the *ne* in *ne...pas*. Later, she justified her choice of informal structures by explaining that the job was more casual, thus, she wanted to show her personality and approachability. The fact that the learner consciously chose those informal structures in order to better communicate her intent shows that she has an understanding sociopragmatics (p.43-44). Additionally, as introduced in our 'Let's grab coffee sometime' rich point, simple awareness of pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics behind ostensible invitations in American English could have resulted in a much more successful interaction. Simply put, the pragmalinguistics of the interaction leads the learner to think he/she received an invitation because of how the sentence is formulated: the use of 'would like' and the adverb 'sometime' in the form of a question. The pragmatic failure happens at the sociopragmatic level, when the learner misunderstands that the intent behind the invitation is to end the conversation.

In terms of Critical Language Awareness (CLA), understanding sociopragmatics is essential to grasping social power dynamics as negotiated in a given languaculture. However, this component of cross-cultural pragmatics is a degree of abstraction above the pragmalinguistic conventions for the learners. The sociopragmatic meaning has to be scaffolded by the instructor in order for the students to notice the gap between the languacultures, whereas pragmalinguistic conventions are more commonly encountered in the L2 classroom as the teaching of speech acts such as requests, apologies, refusals, etc. With this in mind, one question arises: what can foreign language educators do to avoid pragmatic failure in our students? Even though the field of pragmatics is underdeveloped in comparison to other prescriptive aspects of language, research has shown in the last decades that pragmatic competence can be taught in the classroom setting (Alcòn-Soler, 2005; Kasper & Rose, 1999; Rose, 2005; Taguchi, 2014; Takahashi 2010a, 2010b*).* The major challenge that remains is that while instructors cannot possibly teach every subtlety of every languaculture, they can nonetheless foster open-mindedness and help students raise their own awareness of pragmalinguistic conventions and sociopragmatic meanings (Fernández-Amaya, 2008).

7

Chapter 2: Instructional Pragmatics – Teaching and Learning

This chapter addresses the *National Standards for the Teaching of Foreign Languages* established by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and how this publication affects the teaching pragmatics in the L2 classroom. In addition to describing the concept of pragmatic competence, this section presents how it develops in language learners. Moreover, this chapter summarizes the research on the teachability of pragmatic competence (Alcòn-Soler, 2005; Kasper & Rose, 1999; Rose, 2005; Taguchi, 2014; Takahashi 2010a, 2010b). Most of this research investigates the benefits of explicit instruction versus implicit instruction, including the efficacy of various teaching techniques. Furthermore, this line of research explores learners' perceptions and the role of motivation in the development of pragmatic competence (Chen, 2009; Ishiara & Cohen 2010; van Compernolle, 2014).

2.1 The National Standards for the Teaching of Foreign Languages

ACTFL published its *National Standards for Foreign Language Learning* in 2006. The publication categorizes language competencies or standards into five groups, commonly known as the 5 Cs: *Communication*, *Cultures*, *Connections*, *Comparisons* and *Communities*. While no explicit rubric of pragmatic learning is portrayed in the report, *Standard 2.1* implicitly addresses cultural practices, which can be interpreted as pragmatic competence and more precisely in relation to sociopragmatics:

> " [...] Cultural practices refer to patterns of behavior accepted by a society and deal with aspects of culture such as rites of passage, the use of forms of discourse, the social 'pecking order,' and the use of space. In short, they represent the knowledge of 'what to do when and where.' " (ACTFL, 2006, p.6)

In addition to Standard 2.1, pragmatic competence is referred to in other standards identified in by the ACTFL 5 Cs. For example, the *Communication* standard, refers to conversational skills such as understanding what is appropriate to say in a given social

contexts, and the *Cultures* standard refers explicitly to knowledge of ideological discourses in the target languaculture. Through the *Connections* standard, pragmatic knowledge helps the students to gain insight of the general viewpoints of the target languaculture, through the *Comparison* standard, students highlight the differences between the target languaculture pragmatic norms and their own, and finally, through the *Communities* standard, extensive knowledge of the target culture's pragmatic norms allows the students to have meaningful productive conversations with members of the languaculture community.

Furthermore, pragmatic knowledge is part of the rubric for evaluating future foreign language educators submitted by ACTFL to the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). According to the second standard of the ACTFL Program Standards For The Preparation Of Foreign Language Teachers (*Cultures, Linguistics, Literatures, and Concepts from Other Disciplines*), future educators seeking to conform to the national standards and fulfill CAEP requirements should demonstrate that "They understand and can identify the sociolinguistic features of the target language; that is, ways in which target language discourse can be tailored for a particular person or cultural or social context." (ACTFL, 2013, p. 20). As such, while pragmatics does not often feature prominently in language courses, we can see that the development of learners' pragmatic competence is at the very least acknowledged by policy makers.

2.2 Pragmatic Competence

Pragmatic competence reflects the capacity of a second language learner to appropriately use the target language in a variety of social situations (Taguchi, 2009). Several second language acquisition specialists have investigated the development of this competence in the last two decades. Bialystok (1993) identified three components within pragmatic competence: *turn-taking*, *cooperation* and *cohesion*. Firstly, she defines turn-taking as a speaker's capacity to "[use] the language for different purposes so that the speech act [...]

is properly distinguished from other intended effects of language use" (Bialystok, 1993, p.43). Secondly, cooperation is the ability for a listener to go beyond literal meaning and understand the intent behind the language. Finally, cohesion refers to awareness of how utterances are bound together pragmatically in order to appropriately convey an idea.

Despite the promising findings in the field of SLA, the patterns of development of pragmatic competence are not completely understood to this day. However some variables seem to play a role in the cognitive process of acquiring this competence, as echoed in numerous studies. Notably, the most important consensus reached by research is that the acquisition of pragmatic competence is a "long-term process because it requires abilities to manage a complex interplay of language, language user, and context of interaction" (Taguchi, 2012, p. 2). Furthermore, according to Taguchi (2012), the complexity of this process resides partially in the two facets of pragmatics: pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. This distinction between pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features of a target languaculture explains why instructors cannot assume that high degrees of proficiency will automatically result in a similarly high level of pragmatic competence.

2.3 The Teachability of Pragmatics

Since pragmatics language skills are more abstract than prescriptive grammar language skills, legitimate questions can be asked concerning the teachability of pragmatic competence: is pragmatics worth teaching in the L2 classroom? Do learners benefit from pragmatics instruction, whether implicit or explicit? Does the learning of pragmatics only happen outside of the classroom setting, where students are exposed to a more authentic environment? Rose (2005) investigated the use of request strategies on learners of English after they received explicit, implicit or no pragmatic instruction. He found that learners benefited from the teaching of pragmatics, whether explicit or implicit over learners that had no pedagogical intervention. While Rose (2005) does not deny that

pragmatic features can be learned outside of a scaffolded environment, he supports the idea that "a variety of discoursal, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic targets of instruction, such as discourse markers and strategies, pragmatic routines, speech acts, overall discourse characteristics, and pragmatic comprehension" (p. 396) can be taught. Thus, scaffolding request strategies through instruction makes learning pragmatics behind those notions easier for the learners, allowing them to process the information in a way that is challenging, yet accessible.

Alcón-Soler (2005) established pedagogical recommendations based on an experiment on the development of the pragmatic competence of Japanese learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The study called for the researcher to observe the learners' awareness and usage of request strategies in English. The study included a group that received explicit instruction, and another group that received implicit instruction. By raising the issue of context in the instruction of pragmatics in a foreign language classroom, Alcón-Soler touches on a crucial point: the absence of meaningful opportunities for communication outside the classroom in an environment where the L2 is considered a foreign language. The main obstacle facing instructional pragmatics is "the lack of naturally occurring input and direct or indirect feedback on pragmatic issues" (p.14). Nonetheless, the results of Alcón-Soler (2005) showed that well planned instruction, authentic input, and adequate scaffolding may help overcome the difficulties related to instructional pragmatics in the foreign language classroom.

Finally, a review of research conducted by Taguchi (2014) suggests an array of factors that should be considered in future research on instructional pragmatics. According to Taguchi, researchers aspiring to further the knowledge of the teachability of pragmatics should orient their projects towards "learners' subjectivity, investment, orientation to opportunity for practice, and societal and local positioning in the context when considering the role of learning context for pragmatic development." (p. 14). It is likely that future research will continue to assess the teachability of pragmatics in the classroom environment through multimodal designs and the use of a variety of

11

instructional techniques, furthering the understanding of the processes involved in the acquisition of pragmatic competence.

2.4 The Second Language Learner

As previously mentioned in Chapter 1 through the rich point anecdote, developing pragmatic competence is essential for a language learner. Because pragmatics is quite an abstract concept for students to understand, educators have to remain attentive to student feedback while conducting pragmatic instruction. Whether this is achieved by being aware of their body language or through asking them directly, it is crucial to monitor the students' attitudes in regards to pragmatic instruction since motivation plays a major role in effective learning (Ishiara & Cohen, 2010; Takahashi, 2005, 2014). One of the goals of foreign language classes should be to create lifelong learners, and by fostering a low-risk environment (Sykes, Oskoz & Thorne, 2008), instructors create opportunities for students to engage meaningfully with the target languaculture in an environment that does not induce anxiety (Horwitz, 2008).

To begin with, few studies have addressed learners' perceptions of instructional pragmatics in the L2 classroom. However, the learners' feedback present in Chen (2009) confirmed that they highly value pragmatic instruction. Furthermore, language learners seem to exhibit a preference for explicit instruction of pragmatic features by the teacher (Takahashi, 2005; Tateyama, 2001). Moreover, as individuals, learners perceive and engage with languacultures differently. In order for pragmatic instruction to be effective, they need to "develop personally significant and relevant understandings of the sociopragmatic concepts and the pragmalinguistic forms that instantiate them." (van Compernolle, 2014, p. 90). For instance, this could be achieved through participation in intercultural online exchanges with native speakers or other learners of the languaculture, showing authentic input from television shows or engaging in any other activity that

corresponds to the learners' interests and portrays the target languaculture in a positive light.

Overall, motivation is an important factor to take into account when learning pragmatics. The L2 learners may connect more with the target languaculture and the speech community if they are interested and curious about it. According to a study conducted by Ishiara & Cohen (2010), the impact of motivation on the development of the pragmatic competence is significant in the context of foreign language learning:

> "Learners' attitude, motivations, feelings, values, and perceptions (i.e., their subjectivity influence their social and psychological distance from the target community. [...] when learners are in favor of the target culture or individual members of that culture, they are more likely to take on linguistic features of target-language speakers or characteristics of the language." (Ishiara & Cohen, 2010, p.109)

Therefore, it is crucial to factor in the learners' motivation level as well as their perceptions of the target languaculture on learning L2 pragmatics in a classroom environment. Moreover, motivation can have a noteworthy effect on the learning of specific pragmalinguistic features. Indeed, as stated in Takahashi (2014), there is a positive correlation between motivation and pragmalinguistic awareness (p.58). This is also supported by Takahashi (2005): this study suggests that "motivation and proficiency operate on pragmalinguistic awareness independently rather than jointly, and that motivation plays a more crucial role than proficiency in learners' allocation of attention to pragmatic input" (p.113). Those conclusions brought by the two Takahashi studies (2005, 2014) are incredibly interesting since it sets forth the idea that motivation could have a greater influence than proficiency when it comes to raising a student's pragmalinguistic awareness. In order for the learners to benefit from pragmatic instruction in these conditions, it is crucial that instructors foster a low-risk environment with motivating tasks that help the learners relate to the target languaculture meaningfully.

Chapter 3: Focusing on usage

This chapter aims at demonstrating how educators can focus their teaching on language use through a multiplicity of pragmatic consciousness-raising activities. First, the notion of metalanguage and metapragmatic awareness is defined. Second, pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks are explored as a means to help students notice the pragmatic norms of a target languaculture. Third, the classroom implementation of these consciousness-raising tasks is discussed. Finally, instructional techniques are explained and supported with evidence from studies that have tested their efficacy.

3.1 Metalanguage & Metapragmatic Awareness

When introducing the concepts of metalanguage and metapragmatic awareness, the prefix *meta-* immediately implies the existence of several layers of language. Jakobson (1985) established the distinction between two levels of language as follows: "namely the "object language" speaking of items extraneous to language as such, and on the other hand a language in which we speak about the verbal code itself [metalanguage]." (p.116). Simply put, the *object language* is the language used for communication: thus, using English to ask a friend what are their plans for the weekend would be an example of object language. Jakobson (1985) defined metalanguage as the way people use a language to talk about a language, for instance, using English to explain the structure of a tag question in English. Additionally, it encompasses different dimensions of language such as metalinguistic awareness as well as metapragmatic awareness. While metalinguistic awareness can be thought of as knowing how a language is constructed in terms of its formal properties; metapragmatic awareness can be described as knowing how language use is used according to the social contexts of a given languaculture. For instance, recognizing a noun from a verb, distinguishing the /e/ from /ɛ/ sounds in French and locating the direct object in a sentence would all be demonstrations of metalinguistic knowledge. In contrast, knowing how to respond in an appropriate manner to an

ostensible invitation in American English, as illustrated by our *Let's grab coffee sometime!* rich point anecdote in Chapter 1, would exhibit metapragmatic awareness. According to Verschueren (2000), metapragmatic awareness acts as "[...] anchoring devices locating linguistic form in relation to context, and functioning as signals of the language users' reflexive interpretations of the activities they are engaged in." (p. 439).

3.2 Pragmatic Consciousness-Raising Tasks

According to Schmidt (1990, 2001), the *noticing hypothesis* can be described as "an hypothesis that input does not become intake for language learning unless it is noticed, that is, consciously registered." (Schmidt, 2010, p.722). In other words, a learner must be made aware of the functions of language before subsequent processing of the form can be undertaken in the student's mind. Hopefully, this process of noticing features of a target language would ultimately lead to a more successful learning of said feature. In SLA theory, this hypothesis has been investigated by numerous scholars but rarely through the lens of teaching the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features of a target languaculture. With this in mind, pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks aim at increasing a learner's awareness of features of a language similar to the noticing hypothesis. Beyond explicitly teaching how features of a language (i.e.: speech acts) are performed, pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks "attempt to sensitize learners to context-based variation in language use and the variables that help determine that variation" (Rose, 1994, p. 59). Some scholars have tried to measure the effectiveness of pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks while others have concentrated their efforts on certain instructional techniques as tools or instrument in their study design (Fukuya 2008; Narita, 2012).

3.2.1 Metapragmatic information/Explicit explanation of rules.[2]

One of the most common ways to teach pragmatics in the L2 classroom is to present usage rules of thumb in a textbook. This method aims at providing the students with a clear layout of pragmatic rules and facilitating rapid understanding of the components taught. With the help of documents supporting the instruction, the teachers can effectively communicate these rules to the students. For instance, a way to use this pragmatic consciousness-raising task would be for the instructor to scaffold the pragmatic norms step-by-step through a successful pragmatic interaction scenario and an unsuccessful pragmatic interaction scenario. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the benefits of explicit pragmatic instruction in comparison with implicit pragmatic instruction have been explored by several researchers (Kasper and Rose, 1999; Rose, 2005; Soler, 2005; Taguchi, 2014; Takahashi 2010a, 2010b). Two studies in particular investigated how providing explicit explanation of rules could benefit the teaching of request forms.

The effects of explicit explanations of rules were analyzed by Kubota (1995). His study focused on the instruction of English conversational implicature to 126 Japanese learners of English who had not received previous instruction on the pragmatic rules underlying this aspect of language. To begin, the students were divided into three groups, two experimental (group A and B) and one control (group Z). Group A received explanations of the rules while Group B were assigned with consciousness-raising tasks in group discussions. Group Z received no treatment. Two types of tests were administered to the three groups both before and one month after instruction: a multiple-choice test and a sentence-combining test. Group A and B significantly outperformed the control group in the post-test feedback task. Additionally, the group that performed consciousness-raising tasks (Group B) significantly improved their scores on the post-test. Despite the fact that the study illustrates the potential benefits of using this instructional technique, a major question on the long-term effects of instruction enhanced by metapragmatic information remains unanswered.

---

[2] Metapragmatic information and explicit explanation of rules are used interchangeably in this paper.

Additionally, explicit instruction has been compared with the use of implicit methods of teaching pragmatics. For example, Takahashi (2001) measured the effectiveness of different input conditions (metapragmatic information, form-comparison, form-search and focus on meaning) on the production of target request strategies of 138 Japanese learners of English. Over the course of a four week period, the treatment groups that were assigned to the composition exercise packet which included Japanese-English translation exercises of the target request forms. Moreover, the instructor clearly explained during class-time some key pragmatic features of the request strategies, specifically their usage in discourse through the use of role-playing and the relationship between requester and requestee which can be affected by status, social distance, etc.

Kubota (1995) and Takahashi (2001) both conclude that the usage of metapragmatic information to teach key pragmatic features of the language is significantly superior to no instruction or implicit instruction. Explicit metapragmatic information helps learners to employ the target forms more appropriately (Kubota, 1995) and improves their self-confidence concerning the formulation of the target request forms (Takahashi, 2001). However, research has yet to indicate the long-lasting effect of this instructional technique on the mastery of the pragmatic features. Both studies were conducted during a short period of time and did not include a delayed post-test to assess long-term learning of the target forms.

3.2.2 Metapragmatic judgment tasks

In a metapragmatic judgment task, the learner assumes an active role. Generally consisting of a pragmatic scenario, a Likert scale and possible interlocutor reactions, these tasks encourage learners to interpret and evaluate a statement. Starting with a scenario, the students rank the appropriateness of a verbal response according to a scale, from highly inappropriate (1) to highly appropriate (5). An example of a metapragmatic judgment task is given in (Example A):

Example A

After running into each other for the first time in the semester, Sarah and William talk in the hallway. Sarah expresses her desire to spend more time with William. William isn't really friends with Sarah and is indifferent to the thought of seeing her again but wishes to end the conversation so that he can go to class. William says:

1 2 3 4 5   A) I don't care if I ever see you again, really.
1 2 3 4 5   B) I have to run to class but, let's grab coffee sometime!
1 2 3 4 5   C) I have to go, bye.
1 2 3 4 5   D) I don't have much time before class starts, see you !

The pragmatic parameters (i.e.: appropriateness, stance, social distance, can all be addressed through metapragmatic judgment tasks.) in combination with a Likert scale help the learners understand the type of behavior to adopt if they encounter a similar pattern of interaction. Interestingly, this instructional technique allows the instructor to present the different perspectives of the actors in the scenario. The learners will then judge and decide which possible reaction statement is the most correct and rank them accordingly.

An interesting follow-up to this classroom activity would be to reveal the results of the same metapragmatic judgment task conducted on native speakers as presented in Chen (1995). Despite selecting metapragmatic judgment tasks as instruments, Chen (1995) does not investigate this tool as an instructional technique per se. Rather, the research method called for 42 native speakers of English to judge and rate the pragmatic appropriateness of statements related to refusal scenarios. The statements were uttered by both native and non-native speakers of English (Chen, 1991) and aimed at supporting the hypothesis of a certain consistency across the pragmatic appropriateness from speakers of the same language. What is pragmatically appropriate is primarily a matter of intuition for a native speaker; therefore, by asking native speakers to holistically rate the statements, the researcher discovered that what is perceived as a pragmatically appropriate statement is also consistent across time. Furthermore, the subjects could distinguish the statements made by native English speakers and learners of English. The implications of this study resonate with our goal of achieving effective pragmatic

instruction in the following ways: first, it shows that the perception of pragmatic appropriateness is similar within a community of language speakers; secondly, using metapragmatic judgment tasks with foreign language learners could be beneficial in exposing the target culture norms.

Similarly, a metapragmatic judgment task was included in Morrow (1995) but was conducted as a prelude to the other tasks included in the research (such as speech-act formulae, for instance). However, the metapragmatic judgment task was used in lieu of an instructional activity for investigating politeness and appropriateness in the production of complaints and refusals. Instead, the researcher briefly commented on the task after its completion but without further scaffolding for the learners. This does not allow us to draw significant conclusions of the effectiveness of this instructional technique for teaching pragmatics.

The fact that the research briefly mentions a metapragmatic judgment tasks in conjunction with other types of tasks reinforces the position that some activities require a more in-depth instruction or supporting activities. As a result, an instructor should explore metapragmatic judgment tasks if properly enhanced by post-completion tasks, such as metapragmatic discussions which will be discussed further in Chapter 4.

3.2.3 Speech-act formulae

Most educators are familiar with teaching formulaic expressions, fixed groupings of words that are context-dependant. Based on a similar principle, speech-act formulae are a grouping of utterances, for instance compliments and compliment responses. While it is strange to think of meaning as fixed', adopting speech act formulae as an instructional technique in the L2 classroom can help the students notice the patterns of pragmatic interaction and address certain generalizations that stem from the fixed form. Speech act formulae have been featured in research designs as components of the instructional intervention (Kondo, 2001; Morrow, 1995).

In Morrow (1995), participants were presented with prescribed speech act formulae before undertaking a role-play activity. The study aimed at determining if this approach led to potential gains in the development of pragmatic competence. The twenty intermediate-level learners of English of mixed origins (Korea, Japan, Colombia and others) were students of an intensive English program taught in the United States. The learners were explicitly taught the speech-act formulae related to refusals and complaints in American English. Then, the instructor showed dialogues modelling the speech-act in action and finally let them perform a role-play activity to test their ability and measure the benefits of this approach. An analysis confirmed that pragmatic instruction had an impact on speech-act production, demonstrating successful and promising results.

Also invoking speech-act formulae as a mean to teach pragmatic features of the target language, Kondo (2001, 2008) examined how instruction impacts the way Japanese learners of English perform refusals as well as how explicit instruction contributes to a learner's awareness of pragmatic norms. The 38 learners were all low-intermediate students majoring in English at a Japanese women's junior college. Kondo (2008) used a textbook which organized each chapter according to speech acts. Each of these chapters was divided into five parts or phases, namely: the *feeling* phase, also referred to as warm-up; the *doing* phase, where the students played with the speech act; the *thinking* phase, in which students reflected on the language play; the *understanding* phase, where the students were introduced to the speech-act formulae and discussed it; and the *using* phase in which the students performed the speech act (p.155-156). Kondo concluded that instruction did have an effect on the way the participants performed the speech act since the learners adopted patterns that were closer to the ones used by native speakers of American English. While the Japanese learners of English used speech acts in a way that resembled native speakers, the scholar also noted that they "retained some culturally specific characteristics of their pragmatic behavior" Kondo (2008, p.172). This demonstrates that their performance contained traces of their identity as a native speaker of Japanese. Moreover, it implies that imposing a certain way to perform speech acts

might not enhance their pragmatic ability but awareness-raising allows the learners to build their own interlanguage identity composed of both languacultures.

These two studies can provide guidelines on how to teach specific pragmatic interactions. Nonetheless, there is one element that distinguished Morrow (1995) from Kondo (2001): the discussion of the pragmatic norm surrounding the speech-act formulae in the third phase of Kondo's study. While Kondo's study does not specify which components of the speech act were discussed, the learners' performance gives strong support for using metapragmatic discussions as a means to enhance the learning experience.

3.2.4 Narrative reconstruction tasks.

Narrative reconstruction tasks are another way of directing learners' attention to pragmatic norms. These tasks consist of showing learners a scenario that highlights a certain interactional norm between native speakers of a given languaculture. Preferably, the conversation is spontaneous and can be delivered in a variety of media (video, chat logs, scaffolded role-playing activity, etc.). The interaction between native speakers is then broken into segmented that are rearranged into a different order. The learners must take these segments and put them back into the appropriate order. In this way, narrative reconstruction tasks require the learners to understand the individual segments in order to correctly reconstruct the interaction according to the pragmatic norms of the languaculture.

In their study on the instruction of interactional norms of the utterance *Did you have a good weekend?/T'as passé un bon weekend ?* between Australian English and French, Liddicoat & Crozet (2001) used a narrative reconstruction task in the second phase of their experiment. The goal of this study was first and foremost to measure the efficacy of instruction on the acquisition of the pragmatic norms governing the aforementioned utterance. The participants were ten university-level students in Australia

who had already completed one year of French. Considering that French is taught as a foreign language in Australia, it is safe to assume that the learners had little to no opportunity to engage in authentic interactions with native speakers of French. The study was divided into four phases: awareness-raising, experimental (using narrative reconstructions), production and feedback.

The first phase of this experiment consisted of awareness-raising phase of the pragmatic norms prevailing in the sequence of interaction in: *T'as passé un bon weekend?* in French. By juxtaposing two sequences of interaction that appear to be 'identical', namely the utterance in Australian English and the target language, this first phase challenges the learners' assumptions surrounding the interpretation of said sequences in order to respond appropriately. The utterances *Did you have a good weekend/T'as passé un bon weekend* qualify as appropriate to introduce these pragmatic norms because of the discrepancies between them. For instance, *Did you have a good weekend?* is a formulaic expression that is expected to be followed by a formulaic answer. In Australian English, this sequence of interaction is generally short and does not become a topic of conversation in contrast to the French expression *T'as passé un bon weekend?* After receiving explanation about how French speakers typically respond to *T'as passé un bon weekend?*, the learners listened to a videotape of an authentic conversation between native Francophones as part of the experimentation phase of the study. The learners were then invited to recall and recognize the interactional norms learnt in the awareness-raising phase as well as reconstruct the interaction which had been divided into nine segments for assessment. The production and feedback phases of this study consolidated what the learners had been taught about interactional norms in French versus Australian English.

The data analysis of Liddicoat & Crozet (2001) suggested that interactional norms can be acquired even within the confines of a short-term program because "students showed differences in the ways in which they were constructing their talk" (p.143). Additionally, focusing on those pragmatic norms created the opportunity for the students

22

to debunk their stereotypes surrounding the target culture. It is important to note that while narrative reconstruction tasks contribute to effective learning of interactional norms, the awareness-raising phase played an important role in introducing the cultural differences in the discourse of French speakers versus that of Australian English speakers. Therefore, the results of this research support the use of awareness-raising tasks in conjunction with other instructional methods for pragmatic instruction, such as narrative reconstruction tasks.

3.2.5 Rule discovery

Rule discovery is a student-centered instructional method for teaching pragmatics that employs scaffolded questions to direct the students' attention towards pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features. Similar to metapragmatic judgment tasks, this approach encourages students to take an active role in their learning. By guiding the students in an exploration of the pragmatic norms of interaction, instructors enhance the potential for gains in pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge (Rose & Ng, 2001).

Rose & Ng (2001) investigated the potential benefits of instruction concerning compliments and compliment responses to Japanese students of English. In addition, they sought to explore whether a deductive or an inductive approach would produce different learning outcomes. The participants were undergraduate business students from the University of Hong Kong, whose L1 was Japanese. The study followed three groups: one control group and two treatment groups (a deductive group and an inductive group). The inductive approach group received no explicit metapragmatic information prior to the lesson; they were simply presented with segments of movies and the instructor provided questions to allow the students to explore the pragmatic patterns that they discovered about compliments and compliments responses in English. In contrast, the deductive group received explicit metapragmatic information before carrying out analyses of compliments and compliment responses. The researchers found that both the explicit and

implicit instruction conditions to benefit learning of the pragmalinguistic features of compliments and compliment responses in English. While the researchers observed gains in pragmalinguistic knowledge in both the inductive and deductive groups, it appears that sociopragmatic knowledge improvement was only observed in the deductive treatment group. Rose & Ng (2001) suggest that this might be due to the formulaic nature of English compliments and compliment responses.

Another aspect to consider with this instructional technique is its potential negative effect. For instance, the researchers noted that using rule-discovery tasks might cause more confusion than comprehension due to the nature of the task. Therefore, Rose & Ng (2001) suggest that educators should consider enhancing rule-discovery tasks with metapragmatic discussion.

3.2.6 Input enhancement

Implementing an approach that focuses on meaning in the L2 classroom may lead to gains in the pragmatic competence for learners (Fukuya & Clark, 2001; Takahashi, 2001; Tateyama, 2001). One way to integrate meaning-focused instruction into the curriculum is to enhance the input that the students are exposed to. The main purpose of input enhancement is to direct the learners' attention to a precise form so that they can process it more effectively. This is achieved by prompting students to notice repetitive formulaic expressions; this can be achieved by using textual markers such as colored fonts or highlighting certain words or any linguistic element in order to increase the learners' capacity to notice patterns in the target languaculture.

Three studies have considered input enhancement as a possible method for teaching L2 pragmatics in a classroom environment. For instance, Tateyama (2001) examined approaches in the teaching of Japanese routine expressions to English speakers. By exploring the data first collected in Tateyama et al. (1997), the researcher aimed at further nuancing his earlier findings. More precisely, the study examined whether implicit

or explicit treatment of the Japanese routine expression of *sumimasen* was more effective. The study also explored the short-term and long-term effects of such type of instruction. Twenty-seven English-speaking students at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa enrolled in Japanese 102 were divided into two groups: explicit instruction (13 students) and implicit instruction (14 students). The explicit treatment group received an explanation of the use of the routine formula by the instructor in addition to viewing short videos that were part of two Japanese television programs. Furthermore, the participants in this group were provided with handouts that outlined and illustrated the differences in the usage of *sumimasen*. In contrast, the implicit treatment group did not engage the explicit metapragmatic activities listed above, but rather they watched the videos twice and were asked to focus their attention on the formulaic expressions they might encounter. As a result, the researcher noted that explicit instruction, while not resulting in higher scores, succeeded in raising the learners' consciousness of the notions explored by this exercise thus, appearing more effective than implicit instruction. However it is important to consider the other factors mentioned by Tateyama (2001) that might influence these results, namely the learners' motivation, contact with native speakers, and general academic performance.

Fukuya & Clark (2001) explored the learners' ability to notice the correct use of mitigators, which are pragmalinguistic items, in English with the help of input enhancement. The study investigated whether input enhancement, an implicit instructional technique, was as effective as explicit instruction. To accomplish this, they made the pragmalinguistic items (mitigators) more salient, to give the learners the opportunity become aware of them. The researchers grouped the 32 participants into three groups of adult ESL learners: *Focus on Form* (input enhancement), *Focus on FormS* (explicit treatment) and a control group. The groups were shown the same videotaped interaction, including one group that received enhanced input (all the mitigators in the transcript were highlighted), and another group received explicit explanations on the use of mitigators in addition to explanations about pragmalinguistic norms relation to power, social distance and imposition. Fukuya & Clark (2001) observed that while learners

noticed the mitigators, typographical enhancement were not sufficient for pragmatic learning. To support their claim, Fukuya & Clark (2001) establish the following recommendations:

> "[...] future researchers may want to arrange pragmalinguistic saliency in such a way that at least the following four factors are salient to learners; (1) a pragmalinguistic form; (2) its function; (3) a situation in which such a form is required; and (4) the particular Power, Distance and Imposition values involved." (Fukuya & Clark, 2001, p.12)

Despite the fact that the statistical results were inconclusive due to the small sample size and the short period of instruction, the study suggests that input enhancement (Focus on Form instruction) may have potential benefits for teaching pragmalinguistic features of a target languaculture, if appropriate measures are taken to highlight the four aforementioned factors in a meaningful way.

Another study analyzed how different degrees of input enhancement impacted pragmatic instruction, in this case of request strategies. Takahashi (2001) presented findings similar to those of previous studies on input enhancement. Consequently, a higher degree of input enhancement in the instruction of pragmatic features still appears to be more efficient. Based on the results presented in this study, one could make the assumption that providing the students with metapragmatic information of the target languaculture results in increased opportunities for the learners to improve their pragmatic competence.

According to Fukuya & Clark (2002), Takahashi (2001) and Tateyama (2001), input enhancement as an instructional technique still requires more attention from instructors and researchers. While certain avenues seem more conclusive than others, "simple noticing and attention to target pragmatic features in the input does not lead to learning." (Takahashi, 2001, p.198). Therefore, it might be beneficial to consider activities to reinforce the pragmatic features learned through consciousness-raising tasks to achieve a better retention.

3.2.7 Interaction enhancement

Similar to input enhancement, this instructional technique is defined as an interaction between the learner and the instructor in which the focus is on enhancing the output rather than the input. By eliciting production in the target language and encouraging uptake, the instructor can direct the learners' attention towards the gap in their languaculture and give them an opportunity for correction "within the framework of strategic interaction" (Doughty and Williams, 1998, p.242). According to the Doughty and Williams (1998), the structure of an interaction enhancement task typically includes three phases: the rehearsal phase, the performance phase and the debriefing phase.

Fukuya, Reeve, Gisi, and Christianson (1998) framed their study around the use of a Focus on Form approach punctuated with interaction enhancement tasks in order to teach a broader spectrum of language aspects rather than solely prescriptive grammar. Targeting request-making as the main sociopragmatic component to be taught in their study, the researchers asked the participants to perform enhanced role-play tasks. The aim of this study was to determine the benefits of having various types of debriefing phases: Focus on Form, Focus on FormS and a control group that did not received any form of debriefing from the instructor. While the findings were initially inconclusive, it is important to account for the short length of treatment of this experiment. The authors argued that the slight differences in performance found in one of the measurement criterion suggested that the learners in the Focus on Form treatment group were making gains in their pragmatic competence. Additionally, the scholars offered a few recommendations for carrying out this type of task in a classroom:

> "...narrowing the focus of instruction, training instructors to recognize, isolate and address pragmatic breakdowns in the targeted area without losing track of their own role in furthering communicative goals, and developing assessment measures and rating systems which efficiently and accurately reflect the effects of Focus on Form on students' pragmatic competence." (Fukuya, Reeve, Gisi, and Christianson, 1998, p.18)

The prospect of enhancing the students' output through interaction seems promising but instructors have to ensure that the task is appropriately scaffolded in order for students to notice corrective feedback. With this in mind, it is also important to investigate how their uptake can efficiently translate into long-term retention of the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic elements taught.

3.2.8 Recasting

Pragmatic recasts are a form of implicit corrective feedback provided by the instructor to the learner (Long, 1996; Lyster, 1998a). A recast is a correction of the learner's original erroneous utterance that is achieved through reformulating or paraphrasing. Fukuya and Zhang (2002, 2006) present a framework for pragmalinguistic recasts, taking into account linguistic accuracy and pragmatic appropriateness. If the learner produces an utterance that is grammatically incorrect but is pragmatically appropriate, the teacher would recast the form the same way they would address a grammatical recasts. In Fukuya & Zhang (2006), this is illustrated with an example of a learner trying to perform a request which turned out to be grammatically incorrect: "*Would I mind ~? Even though this was used in an appropriate context, it was linguistically inaccurate. In this case the instructor would recast it by correcting the form (Would you mind ~?)" (p.64). In that example, the instructor performed a strictly grammatical recast by repeating the form, thus correcting it. In the case of a strictly pragmalinguistic recast, Fukuya & Zhang suggest this example:

> " [...]in a scenario involving a professor and his/her student in which the student says 'I want you to take a look at my paper by next Monday', this utterance is linguistically correct, but pragmatically inappropriate. It should thus be recast as, for instance, 'I was wondering if you could take a look at my paper by next Monday'. " (Fukuya & Clark, 2006, p.64).

Fukuya & Zhang (2002, 2006) claim that recasting in the context of pragmatic instruction not only improves the learner's understanding of the pragmalinguistic notions taught but

also builds students' confidence in their language skills. The scholars came to this conclusion by observing the effect of pragmalinguistic recasts in the context of a role-playing task eliciting the production of requests in the target language. Twenty-four Chinese learners with an intermediate proficiency in the English language participated in the study and were initially divided into one control and one treatment group. The control group did not receive pragmatic recasts on their production of requests as opposed to the treatment group, which was provided with their instructor's implicit feedback. As a result, the scholars discovered that pragmatic recasts had a significant effect on learning pragmatically and grammatically accurate requests. Additionally, the researchers reported an increase in the students' confidence levels while addressing individuals of higher status. While pragmatic recasting appears to be a possible instructional technique for the teaching of pragmalinguistic features of a target languaculture, Fukuya & Zhang (2002) remind instructors that "the foci should be narrow, the combination(s) of sociolinguistic variables selective, and the treatment focused, consistent, and lasting." (p.30)

3.3 On the Importance of Enhancing Pragmatic Consciousness-Raising Activities

As seen in this chapter, a wide variety of instructional techniques exist to teach L2 pragmatics in a classroom setting. Varying in degrees of explicitness, these pragmatic consciousness-raising activities have been considered and investigated by SLA specialists. However, these instructional techniques have rarely been used on their own in the studies where they were featured. Thus, we can only speculate about the efficacy of these instructional techniques when used alone.

While it seems evident that implicit instruction of pragmatic norms would benefit from being enhanced by other instructional techniques, most of the more explicit instructional techniques have been combined with other pragmatic consciousness-raising activities and yielded significant results. Because educators want to ensure that the students notice the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features of the target

languaculture, it seems necessary to include tasks that allow the students to reflect on the pragmatic norms and negotiate their implications in the target languaculture. According to Tateyama (2001), instructors should not neglect the benefits of "including retrospective reviews into foreign language teaching on a regular basis" (p.221). With this in mind, there is a potentially powerful tool to facilitate the processing of pragmatic norms for the learners: metapragmatic discussions.

The following chapter will explore the notion of collaborative dialogue implied by the concept of metapragmatic discussion. In addition, the chapter will offer a description of the optimal conditions for conducting metapragmatic discussion.

Chapter 4: The Benefits of Metapragmatic Discussions (MPD)

As previously mentioned in Chapter 3, while there are instructional techniques applicable to teaching L2 pragmatics in the classroom, it might be beneficial to supplement them with retrospective activities to reinforce learning. In other words, instructors want to make sure that the students picked up on the notions they were encouraged to notice—the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic elements of the target language through pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks. With this in mind, this chapter aims at exploring the affordances of metapragmatic discussions in the L2 classroom as a way of wrapping-up the pragmatic features learned. By consolidating implicit knowledge of usage through metapragmatic discussions, instructors assist the learners in unpacking and negotiating these components of the target languaculture in order to further their understanding of it.

4.1 Languaging and the Principles of Collaborative Dialogue

Described as the "process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language" (Swain, 2006:98), '*languaging*' activities are the basis of learning a second/foreign language. According to sociocultural theory, considering language as an inherent component of thoughts rather than a separate entity allows it to be used as a mediation tool in cognitive processes. Therefore, encouraging students' languaging through interactions in the classroom might be highly valuable for their acquisition of the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features of the target languaculture.

When integrating metapragmatic discussion into pragmatic instruction, it is essential to consider the basic principles of various types of interaction that can be encountered while languaging in the classroom setting. For example, Swain (2006) distinguishes between "private speech," when the student talks to themselves; "student-instructor interaction", in which the instructor scaffolds the discussion to make it accessible to learners; and "peer-to-peer interaction", in which the learners negotiate meaning as part of problem-solving. While student-instructor interaction remains the

most popular type of interaction in the classroom, there are advantages to collaborative peer-to-peer dialogue. For instance, learners can benefit from this interaction by scaffolding the notions being negotiated with each other (Donato, 1994). Moreover, collaborative dialogue is a form of languaging which can be adapted to any subject but is particularly relevant for language learning when observing the mechanics of negotiation of meaning: "Speaking produces an utterance, a product (an artifact) that can be questioned, added to, discredited, and so forth. This action of co-constructing meaning is collaborative dialogue, and is a source of language learning and development." (Watanabe & Swain, 2013, p.1). Therefore, the learners provide guided support to their peers as well as gain insight about the others' perspective that deepens their own understanding.

Some scholars have investigated how collaborative dialogues provided opportunities for more efficient language learning. For example, Swain & Lapkin (2002) reported on a case study of two French immersion learners who were required to write a story in French. Afterwards, the learners were presented with a reformulation of their story written by a native-speaker and were prompted to collaboratively discuss the modifications made to their story. The scholars analyzed how the participants compared the two texts and how they decided to edit their text following the collaborative dialogue. Ultimately, the two learners concluded that they should reject the native-speaker reformulation and were able to justify their decision with arguments that they negotiated during their collaborative dialogue. In this case, collaborative dialogue helped the students negotiate the true intent of their story and what they wished to communicate to their reader. While they acknowledged the native-speaker's reformulation, they consulted each other, reaffirmed their position and reconfirmed what they wanted to convey. Thanks to their collaborative dialogue, the learners were able to justify their editorial decisions. Other studies have investigated collaborative dialogue and revealed that certain noticing tasks elicit longer collaborative dialogues than other types of tasks (Watanabe & Swain, 2007). Furthermore, most of the language problems encountered by the learners are often solved during the activities (Brooks & Swain, 2009). The researchers concluded

that language output, is best understood as a manifestation of the cognitive process of language learning.

Thus, it seems like the benefits of collaborative dialogue could potentially be transposed to pragmatic instruction in the classroom. Since there is never a shortage of misunderstandings when becoming acquainted with a second languaculture, collaborative dialogue could offer the students the opportunity to do some languaging of their own and negotiate meaning in order to process pragmatic information at a deeper level of cognition.

4.2 Metapragmatic Discussions (MPD)

Metapragmatic discussions (henceforth, MPD) consist of a dialogue about the dynamics of a pragmatic phenomenon of the target languaculture, after the learners witnessed its usage in context. It is best understood as a way to enhance pragmatic instruction by letting learners explore and draw their own conclusions about the pragmatic patterns present (i.e.: illocutionary force, implicature, etc.) in the target languaculture. By speculating and negotiating meaning with their colleagues, they can co-construct pragmatic norms of the target languaculture and fill in the gaps in their interlanguage, thus facilitating the development of their pragmatic competence.

For instance, in the rich point anecdote presented in Chapter 1, the pragmatic norms concerning responses to ostensible invitations in American English are the foci of the interaction. One way for students to understand these norms (i.e.: recognize the presence of a pretense, respond appropriately to the pretense, etc.) is to address these issues with their peers through MPD. Following explicit or implicit instruction via one of the techniques mentioned in Chapter 3, the instructor can present two scenarios of interaction: one that was successful and one that resulted in pragmatic failure. The students can then grouped into teams and invited to engage with the two situations. They should discuss various aspects of the scenarios: What was the intent of the inviter and the

invitee? Where did the break in communication happened? What could be done to repair it? Following their collaborative reflexion, they should share their findings with their classmates. The example featured here follows the model of MPD as an enhancement task, after a period of implicit or explicit instruction of the pragmatic norms of the languaculture. Most researchers included tasks related to MPD in their research designs but only one of them examined the sole effect of metapragmatic discussions on instructional pragmatics (Takimoto, 2012b). Nonetheless, important discoveries were made prior to this publication.

One of these findings was that explicit instruction appeared superior to implicit when students engage in metapragmatic activities along with explanation from the teacher (Tateyama et al., 1997). As already established in Chapter 3, the data of Tateyama et al. (1997) was explored again in Tateyama (2001) to analyze the effect of instruction of the pragmatic routine surrounding the use of *sumimasen* in English learners of Japanese. First, the learners in the explicit treatment group examined the forms through MPD. Next, they were exposed to explicit teaching of these pragmatic routines by the teacher and watched videos that explicitly explained the notion. Unlike the learners who received explicit instruction, the group receiving implicit instruction did not participate in MPD. Finally, the learners took a series of tests that measured their pragmatic development. Tateyama et al. (1997) had claimed that there was a significant advantage for the group that received explicit instruction of the pragmatic routine of *sumimasen*. However, it was argued that implicit instruction might require a bit more time to take effect; this was refuted by Tateyama (2001) after having extended the instruction period from a single 50 minute lesson to an 8-week program that included 4 sessions of 50 minutes each. The additional time did not show significant changes to the original results; explicit teaching along with MPD yielded a better outcome than implicit instruction.

Additionally, Rose (2005) suggested that better retention of sociopragmatic features of the target languaculture was likely achieved through MPD in deductive instruction. He came to this conclusion after reinvestigating the result of his previous

study (Rose & Ng, 2001). As noted in Chapter 3, Rose (2005) undertook a study of MPD with a deductive treatment group that included pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks and an inductive treatment group that did not call for other pragmatic tasks. While both groups improved their use of the pragmalinguistic features of compliments and compliment responses, the group that received explicit instruction outperformed the other learners on their sociopragmatic treatment of the same pragmatic notion. Rose (2005) concluded that the sociopragmatics gains made by the members of the explicit instruction group were due to the presence of MPD. While Rose (2005), Rose & Ng (2001), Tateyama et al. (1997), and Tateyama, (2001) did not explicitly study the effects of MPD in isolation from other pedagogical tasks, they nevertheless make a strong argument for the efficacy of MPD in conjunction with other pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks.

Pearson (2001) investigated the acquisition of "gratitude, apologies, commands, and polite requests" (p.8) by low-level Spanish learners. In this study, Pearson investigated whether the acquisition of these pragmatic notions in Spanish by L2 learners was facilitated by MPD. In order to achieve this, the researcher separated the learners into two treatment groups—a metalinguistic discussion group and a control group without metalinguistic discussion. The learners were all shown segments of *Destinos,* a video resource to teach Spanish. After viewing the video segments twice, learners in the first group were invited by the instructor to discuss speech acts and mitigators with each other:

> "[...] identify the speech act and speculate on the differences between the scenes in terms of the context and the hearer(s). Attention is also focused on the choice of the various forms as well as accompanying language such as mitigators (e.g., por favor) appearing in the scenes." (Pearson, 2001, p.297)

In contrast, the second group traded the MPD component of the task for two additional viewings of the *Destinos* video segments. The analysis of the data demonstrated that the MPD group ultimately outperformed the control in using appropriate expressions of gratitude, apologies and directives.

Mwinyelle (2005) also investigated the benefits of MPD on the acquisition of the advising speech act: The study was conducted using college-level learners enrolled in

35

their fourth semester of Spanish. Mwinyelle (2005) exposed each of his three treatment groups to a different subset of pragmatic instruction: "(1) video scene viewing with a transcript, comprehension questions, MPD with explicit pragmatic information, and role-play; (2) video scene viewing with a transcript, comprehension questions, and role-play; (3) reading a transcript, comprehension questions, and role-play." (Mwinyelle, 2005 as cited in Takimoto, 2012, p.1243). In the end, video input enhanced with MPD and classroom instruction yielded the best results. According to Mwinyelle (2005), even though the learners' grammatical competence had not fully developed, they were still able to experience gains in their pragmatic competence through MPD-enhanced tasks (Mwinyelle, 2005, p. 211).

In an attempt to measure the effects of MPD, these two studies made interesting discoveries. Without succeeding to completely isolate the effect of MPD on their own, Mwinyelle (2005) and Pearson (2001) demonstrated how MPD-enhanced tasks and lesson plans led to the improvement of L2 pragmatic competence in a classroom environment. Additionally, these studies indicated that MPD-enhanced tasks led to a better performance of certain speech acts and had an overall beneficial effect on second language acquisition. Although embedding the MPD into the pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks renders measuring the effect of them alone difficult, the aforementioned studies started to unravel the mechanics of this instructional technique. Therefore, it appears that one of the most effective ways to develop pragmatic competence is to incorporate MPD-enhanced tasks into the foreign language curriculum.

Takimoto (2012) conducted the first study that compared two treatment conditions and one control group in problem-solving tasks in the instruction of English language downgraders: (1) problem-solving tasks with MPD; (2) problem-solving tasks without MPD; and the control group who received no pragmatic instruction. The fact that Takimoto (2012) isolates MPD tasks in one of his treatment groups is particularly relevant, since they had never been investigated as a stand-alone activity before. The Japanese learners of English participated in four different activities: pragmalinguistics-

focused, sociopragmatics-focused and two pragmalinguistics-sociopragmatics connection activities (p.1245). The only difference between the two treatment groups regarding participants was that the participants first engaged in all activities both individually and in pairs (treatment group 1) whereas the participants in treatment group 2 only participated in the tasks individually. The results showed that members of both treatment groups performed better than members of the control group. However, the learners that participated in the MPD-enhanced group had a significant advantage over their peers who engaged in the problem-solving tasks without MPD. The MPD-enhanced group also outperformed the other treatment group and the control group on written tasks, proving the efficacy of MPD to enhance consciousness-raising tasks: "[the learners] attended to the target linguistic forms, its functional meanings, and the relevant contextual features more intensively thereby developing more firmly established and thus more easily and rapidly accessible knowledge about the target features." (Takimoto, 2012b:1). The scholar concluded that the success of MPD in this study can be attributed to the metapragmatic information negotiated by the learners in their pairs during the MPD portion of the activities.

MPD in this case, similarly to Mwinyelle (2005), allowed the learners to draw upon their own metapragmatic knowledge. Through sharing and challenging their ideas on the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic notions of the target languaculture, they were able to improve their interlanguage and experience gains in their pragmatic competence. Despite the fact that MPD has only recently been exploited as an instructional technique, the research summarized in this section has established its potential and efficacy in the L2 classroom.

4.3 Pedagogical Recommendations: Leading Effective MPD

Since MPD are still being investigated at the experimental level in addition to being a fairly new topic in academia, there is no concrete framework dictating how to effectively

use them as a tool for teaching L2 pragmatics in a classroom environment. Drawing from this literature review, below is a draft of the four optimal conditions that need to be in place for a MPD to be productive and enhance the learners' pragmatic knowledge.: (a) a highly motivating, low-risk environment; (b) a narrow focus on a single pragmatic feature; (c) a pragmatic consciousness-raising activity that serves as the background to the MPD, and; (d) peer collaboration. It is important to note that these optimal pedagogical conditions are presented as flexible guidelines that can be adapted to the context in which the instructor is teaching.

a) *Foster a highly motivating low-risk environment for the learners*

As discussed in Chapter 2, the environment plays an important role in the acquisition of pragmatic competence and so do the learners' attitude towards pragmatic instruction. Because learners reported that they are more at ease with explicit instruction of pragmatic features of a target languaculture (Chen, 2009), MPD-enhanced activities, where students discuss explicitly pragmatic norms and how they convey meaning appropriate to the context, contribute to keeping the students in a low-risk learning environment. The role of the teacher in establishing this optimal condition is (1) to keep the students motivated by not always associating the MPD with the same pragmatic consciousness-raising task; (2) to act as a monitor, mediating the discussions of the learners to make sure the interactions remain productive and respectful; (3) to allow the students to express themselves and their concerns about the pragmatic norms in their L1 or their L2.

As previously mentioned, motivation is a crucial factor in the development of he pragmatic competence (Ishiara & Cohen, 2010; Takahashi, 2005, 2014) and can even be a better predictor of successful acquisition than grammatical competence. Thus, it is important for educators to vary the nature of the activities used in the classroom as well as to employ different team layouts throughout the school year, for example. Moreover, a low-risk environment is characterized by the fact that the students feel comfortable

enough to express themselves in non-threatening interactions. It is important to remember that during MPD tasks, students speculate and negotiate cross-cultural meanings with their peers which can lead to disagreements and heartfelt debates. Because cultural elements can be perceived differently, it is essential that the instructor remain available as a monitor and mediator for these discussions in order to keep the classroom environment as low-risk as possible. Furthermore, allowing the students to express themselves in the language of their choice, whether it is the L1 or the L2, removes the burden of performance and encourages learners to direct their focus towards communicative intent rather than prescriptive language.

b) *Narrow the focus of the pragmatic feature taught*

Since pragmatics is an abstract component of language learning, it is important for the instructor to focus on a very precise feature, such as responses in ostensible invitations as presented in the *Let's grab coffee sometime!* anecdote, with few pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic variables (Fukuya & Zhang, 2002). This optimal condition facilitates the students' on-task behavior and helps maintain their focus on the pragmatic feature with activities that are challenging, yet accessible (Rose, 2005). Following this recommendation, the instructor must carry out (1) well-planned pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks leading to the MPD; in addition to (2) scaffolding the MPD and; (3) offering support as needed to lead the students in the right direction.

As we established in Chapter 1, pragmatics requires a higher degree of input processing (Thomas, 1983) on the learners' end. Thus, for the MPD discussion to be effective, it is crucial that the instructor choose pragmatic consciousness-raising activities that are adapted to the students' level. By planning in advance and researching appropriate pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks, educators ensure that the MPD-enhanced activity is more likely to lead to productive collaborative dialogues. Furthermore, scaffolding −or readjusting the explanations to help the learners'

progression- is especially important in the context of instructional pragmatics because of the difficulty of the input to be processed. However, the instructor has to keep in mind that his or her role is to assist rather than lead the MPD. For example, the instructors can check for comprehension in each pair or group and scaffold if needed, redirecting the focus of the learners' toward the pragmatic feature under investigation without taking over the interaction. Moreover, in order to provide effective support and scaffolding to the learners during an MPD-enhanced activity, the instructors must be able to identify communication breakdowns and provide support to redirect the learners (Fukuya, Reeve, Gisi, and Christianson, 1998).

c) Keep MPD embedded within a pragmatic consciousness-raising task.

Since there is only one study (Takimoto, 2012b) to this day claiming that MPD are effective on their own, it is safer to assume that this kind of activity is an instruction-enhancer rather than a stand-alone solution to teaching pragmatics. As stated in Chapter 3, the benefits of embedded MPD mentioned in several studies (Mwinyelle, 2005; Pearson, 2001; Rose & Ng, 2001) make a strong argument for using this instructional technique in conjunction with others. The role of the teacher in creating optimal conditions translates into enhancing the pragmatic consciousness-raising task with MPD. Keeping MPD embedded in a pragmatic consciousness-raising task accomplishes three things: (1) it allows for a multiplicity of combinations of instructional techniques; (2) it frames the discussion around the specific pragmatic feature taught; and (3) it presents the possibility of referring the students to the task related to the MPD if an impasse in communication is reached.

Combining instructional techniques such as explicit explanation of rules or metapragmatic judgments with MPD not only reinforces learning that occurred in previous activities but also helps the instructor make sure that the students move beyond noticing, leading to better retention of the pragmatic norm (Rose & Ng, 2001; Rose,

2005). Additionally, keeping the MPD within the pragmatic consciousness-raising task further puts the emphasis on the specific pragmatic feature being taught (Pearson, 2001) since the pragmatic consciousness-raising tasks all converge on the same pragmatic feature. Moreover, if the learners encounter difficulties during the MPD (i.e.: hesitations, conflicting ideas, etc.), they still have the frame of reference of the pragmatic consciousness-raising task to reorient the conversation in a more productive way.

d) Capitalize on peer-collaboration

As stated in Chapter 5, collaborative dialogue presents an array of benefits for L2 learning. By letting the students generate meaning from the pragmatic consciousness-raising task and incorporate it into their peer-led reflexion during the MPD, instructors have a better chance at making an impact on their learners' development of pragmatic competence (Watanabe & Swain, 2013). The role of instructors in fostering this optimal condition is to (1) provide meaningful opportunities to negotiate the target languaculture; (2) to monitor the students and ensure that they contribute to filling in each other's interlanguage gaps; and (3) to act as a facilitator during MPD.

First and foremost, conducting collaborative dialogues in the L2 classroom allows students to do some languaging of their own, negotiating meaning and pragmatic norms of the L2, while being in a low-risk environment. Collaborative dialogue prompts learners to take an active role in developing their pragmatic competence (Swain & Lapkin, 2002). Additionally, by giving attention to each group of students, the instructor can quickly assess how involved the learners are in the MPD and if their interventions contribute to furthering their individual understanding of the pragmatic norms. This becomes especially important when thinking of how an instructor can provide support for their learners during MPD. Since learners can scaffold notions for each other (Donato, 1994), the instructor needs to remain attentive during the MPD, while not using them as a

platform for teacher-student instruction. Rather, teachers should aim at facilitating MPD by asking students questions whenever they reach an impasse, for example.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

In this report, it has been argued that whatever a teacher's beliefs about language pedagogy may be, it is crucial for him or her to address students' motives for language learning in a meaningful way. For instance, my personal rich point *Let's grab coffee sometime!* was employed as an illustration of pragmatic failure, an experience shared by most language learners. We realize now that this utterance can convey different meanings other than the one suggested by its grammatical structure. When one considers that an important goal of second language learning is the ability to communicate effectively with speakers from different speech communities, it appears essential for teachers to understand how the target language is actually used for communication. As suggested in this report, using a pedagogical approach focused on usage helps second language learners understand cross-cultural differences and gives them the tools to unpack the dynamics of a languaculture.

In Chapter 3, the need to focus on language use in L2 pedagogy was stressed. The principles of Critical Language Awareness (CLA) were argued to be an effective framework for raising learners' pragmatic awareness. Additionally, the importance of pedagogical intervention in the acquisition of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of a target language was emphasized. Several instructional techniques for teaching pragmatics were reviewed based on the work of SLA scholars. It was suggested that these techniques be used in conjunction with metapragmatic discussion. In chapter 4, based on a review of the relevant literature, four key conditions for leading effective metapragmatic discussion were suggested:

(a) narrowing the focus of the pragmatic feature being taught;
(b) fostering a highly motivating, low-risk environment;
(c) keeping the MPD embedded in a PCR- activity, and;
(d) capitalizing on peer collaboration

It is hoped that these recommendations will provide helpful guidance for instructors who wish to use metapragmatic discussion to its fullest potential.

There is a need for further research on the effectiveness of metapragmatic discussion. As noted, most of the published work on MPD has explored its effectiveness when paired with other instructional tasks. Most studies have suggested that MPD-enhanced tasks contribute to the development of pragmatic competence. As established by research, implementing MPD-enhanced tasks in the L2 classroom can help the L2 learners to become more successful in the use of appropriate language use and in the interpretation of interactions within the target languaculture. Future investigation of the pedagogical effectiveness of metapragmatic discussion should focus on three factors: 1) its value as a stand-alone task; 2) its effect when combined with other instructional techniques; and 3) learners' attitudes towards metapragmatic discussion as an instructional tool.

Works Cited

Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock. understanding the culture of conversation*. New York: William Morrow

Agar, M. (2006). Culture: Can you take it anywhere? *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 5*(2), 2. Retrieved March 15, 2012, from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/5_2/pdf/agar.pdf

Alcón-Soler, E. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System 33*(3), 417–435.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2006). Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century: Including Arabic, Chinese, classical languages, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish. In *National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (U.S.)*. Yonkers, NY: National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2013). *Program standards for the preparation of foreign language teacher*s. Retrieved from: http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/ACTFL-Standards20Aug2013.pdf

Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representation and attentional control in pragmatic competence. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 43-59.

Chen, J. H. (1995). Metapragmatic judgment on refusals: Its reliability and consistency. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (29th, Anaheim, CA, November 1995).

Chen, Y. (2009). Learner perceptions of instruction in L2 Pragmatics. *English Language Teaching*, *2*(4), 154.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf and G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. 33–56 Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Doughty, C. & J. Williams. (1998). *Focus on Form in classroom second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Critical language awareness*. London: Longman.

Fernández Amaya, L. (2008). Teaching culture: is it possible to avoid pragmatic failure?. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 21, 11-24.

Friedrich, P. (1989). Language, ideology, and political economy. *American Anthropologist, 91*(2), 307.

Fukuya, Y. & Clark, M. K. (2001). A comparison of input enhancement and explicit instruction of mitigators. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning*. Urbana, Ill: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. 111-130.

Fukuya, Y., Reeve, M., Gisi, J., & Christianson, M. (1998). *Does focus on form work for teaching sociopragmatics*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learn. Retrieved from: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED452736.pdf

Fukuya, Y. & Y. Zhang (2002). Effects of recasts on EFL learners' acquisition of pragmalinguistic conventions of request. *Second Language Studies 21*, 1–47.

Fukuya, Y. & Y. Zhang. (2006). The effects of recasting on the production of pragmalinguistic conventions of request by chinese learners of English. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 15(1). Retrieved from: http://escholarship.org/uc/item /77m4d8tj

Horwitz, E.K. (2008). *Becoming a language teacher: A practical guide to second language learning and teaching.* Boston: Pearson Education.

Isaacs, E. & H. Clark. (1990). Ostensible invitations. *Language in Society, 19*(4) 496.

Ishihara, N. & A. D. Cohen. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Harlow, UK : Pearson Longman.

Jakobson, R. (1985). Crucial questions of linguistic theory. In Jakobson, R., & Rudy, S. (eds.), *Selected Writings 7*. Walter de Gruyter, p.117

Kasper, G. & K. Rose (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 19*, 81-104

Kondo, S. (2001). Instructional effects on pragmatic development: Refusals by Japanese EFL learners. *Publications of Akenohoshi Women's Junior College 19*(3), 32-51.

Kondo, S. (2008). Effects on pragmatic development through awareness-raising instruction: refusals by Japanese EFL learners. In Alcón, E. and A. Martìnez-Flor (eds.) *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 153-157.

Kubota, M. (1995). Teachability of conversational implicature to Japanese EFL learners. *The Institute for Research in Language Teaching Bulletin, 9*, 35-67.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Liddicoat, A. J., & C. Crozet. (2001). Acquiring French interactional norms through instruction. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie, & T. Bhatia. *Handbook of second language acquisition* (eds.). New York, CA: Academic Press. 413-468.

Lyster, R., (1998a), Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning, 48*(2), 183–218.

Morrow, K. C. (1995). *The pragmatic effects of instruction on ESL learners' production of complaint and refusal speech acts*. (Doctoral Dissertation), State University of New York at Buffalo.

Mwinyelle, J. (2005). *The acquisition of pragmatics competence in an L2 classroom: giving advice in Spanish*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis). The University of Texas at Austin. Retrieved from: https://www.lib.utexas.edu/etd/d/2005/mwinyellej65109/ mwinyellej65109.pdf

Narita, R. (2012). The effects of pragmatic consciousness-raising activity on the development of pragmatic awareness and use of hearsay evidential markers for learners of Japanese as a foreign language. *Journal of Pragmatics 44*, 1–29.

Pearson, L. (2001). *Pragmatics in foreign language teaching: the effects of instruction on*

L2 learners' acquisition of Spanish expressions of gratitude, apologies, and directives. (Unpublished PhD Thesis).University of Texas at Austin. Retrieved from: http://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/11342

Risager, K. (2005). Languaculture as a key concept in language and culture teaching. In H. Bent Preisler, S. Kjaerbeck, & K. Risager (Eds.), *The consequences of mobility,* pp. 185-196. Roskilde: Roskilde University Press.

Rose, K. R. (1994). Pragmatic consciousness-raising in an EFL context. In L.F. Bouton & Kachru, Y. (Eds.). *Pragmatics and language learning*, 5, p.52-63. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Rose, K.R. & C.K. Ng. (2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses. In K.R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 145-170

Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System 33*(3), 385–399.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 129-158.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R. (2010). *Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning.* In W. M. Chan, S. Chi, K. N. Cin, J. Istanto, M. Nagami, J. W. Sew, T. Suthiwan, & I. Walker, Proceedings of CLaSIC 2010, Singapore, December 2-4 (pp. 721-737). Singapore: National University of Singapore, Centre for Language Studies.

Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). Peer–peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 171–85.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2002). Talking it through: Two French immersion learners' response to reformulation. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37*, 285–304.

Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced language proficiency. In H. Byrnes, ed., *Advanced Language Learning: The Contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky*, 95-108. London: Continuum.

Swain, M. and Y. Watanabe. 2013. Collaborative dialogue as a source of learning. In C. Chapelle (ed.): *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics.* doi: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0664.

Sykes, J., Oskoz, A., & Thorne, S.L. (2008). Web 2.0, Immersive Environments, and the Future of Language Education. *CALICO Journal, 25*(3), 528-546.

Takimoto, M. (2012b). Metapragmatic discussion in interlanguage pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics 44*,1240–1253.

Taguchi, N. (Eds.). (2009). *Pragmatic competence in Japanese as a second language*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Taguchi, N. (2012). *Context, individual differences, and pragmatic competence.* New York/Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Taguchi, N.(2014). "Contextually" speaking: A survey of pragmatic learning abroad, in class, and online. *System, 48*, 3-20. doi:10.1016/j.system.2014.09.001

Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching, 48* (1), 1-50. doi:10.1017/S0261444814000263

Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takahashi, S. (2005). Pragmatic awareness: Is it related to motivation and proficiency? *Applied Linguistics, 26*, 90-120.

Takahashi, S. (2014). The effects of learner profiles on pragmalinguistic aawareness and learning. *System, 48*, 48-61. doi:10.1016/j.system.2014.09.004

Takahashi, S. (2010a). Assessing learnability in second language pragmatics. In A. Trosborg (ed.), *Handbook of pragmatics,(vol 7)*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 391–421.

Takahashi, S. (2010b). The effect of pragmatic instruction on speech act performance. In Martìnez-Flor, A. & E. Usò-Juan (eds.), *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 127–144.

Tateyama, Y. & al. (1997). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines. In: Bouton, L. (Ed.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning*. University of Illinois, 163-178.

Tateyama, Y. (2001). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatics routines: Japanese sumimasen. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics 4* (2), 91-112.

van Compernolle, R. A. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and L2 instructional pragmatics*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 64-90

Verschueren, J. (2000). Notes on the role of metapragmatic awareness in language use. *Pragmatics 10*(4), 439.

Watanabe, Y., & Swain, M. (2007). Effects of proficiency differences and patterns of pair interaction on second language learning: Collaborative dialogue between adult ESL learners. *Language Teaching Research, 11*, 121–42.