Spoken Pragmatic Competence Acquisition and L2 Learners

Benjamin Sanchez Murillo

Temple University

Japan Campus

Tokyo Center

TESL 5618: Second Language Development

Dr. David Beglar

April 12, 2022

Spoken Pragmatic Competence Acquisition and L2 Learners

The learning context for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners in countries like Japan presents learners with limited opportunities to interact with speakers of the target language outside of the classroom. Learners in foreign language contexts are typically focused on building foundational language skills that they can use to receive a satisfactory score in language proficiency exams like the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) that will permit the learners to study abroad. Learners in these foreign language contexts tend to eventually learn the target language to travel overseas as degree-seeking students or further their English proficiency at universities in English-speaking countries like the United States, the United Kingdom, or New Zealand.

At some point, though, some of these students will eventually experience paralinguistic or sociopragmatic failures (Thomas, 1983) and will fail to understand what the speaker intended to say. While these types of paralinguistic or sociopragmatic failures experienced in a school setting while studying abroad might cause embarrassment or missed opportunities if the intention of the speaker is not interpreted accurately, these types of failures could also be important to the learner who intends to work in the target language country (Louw et al., 2010; Riddiford and Joe, 2010)

Although students are eventually exposed to pragmatic features in the target language country, they often have difficulties developing effective cross-cultural communication when interacting with native speakers of English. These features might not be necessarily salient enough for the learner, so these difficulties often stem from inadequate attention to pragmatic awareness in the foreign language context (Matsumura, 2001; Matsumura, 2003; Takahashi, 2005; Rafieyan, 2014). According to Schmidt (1990), awareness is at the level of noticing and awareness at understanding. Therefore, to improve learners the noticing of pragmatic features,

learners could benefit from exposure to different pragmatic features before traveling abroad in the forms of either explicit or implicit pragmatic instructions (Alcón Soler, 2005; Rafieyan, 2014; Halenko & Jones, 2015; Eslami et al., 2015).

Fortunately, teachers in EFL settings have at their disposal various forms of materials they can use in the form of books and videos (Alcón Soler, 2005; Louw et al., 2010; Rafieyan et al., 2014), computer-mediated communication (Eslami et al., 2015). Should these materials not be enough, teachers can always create dialogues (Takimoto, 2008) or use role-play transcripts (Takahashi, 2005). The combination of pragmatic instruction with suitable teaching material can increase pragmatic awareness among students before they travel abroad. However, before expanding further, it is essential to have some background knowledge of the concept of pragmatics.

Birner (2013) defined pragmatics as "the study of language use in context – as compared with semantics which is the study of literal meaning independent of context" (p. 2) and differentiated between competence and performance. Canale and Swain (1980) included the knowledge of the pragmatic conventions and knowledge of the sociolinguistic conventions as necessary to appropriately perform language functions in a particular context, while Birner (2013) referred to the "knowledge of the rules of our own dialect" (p. 2) as competence and performance as what we do in the language "including all of our hem and haws, false starts, interrupted sentences, and speech errors" (p. 2).

Birner (2013) included an overview of different concepts to understand pragmatics. These included implicatures, reference, presuppositions, speech acts, information structure, and inferential relations. These concepts can be subdivided into more detailed properties that help support the central idea. However, the focus of this literature review will be limited to the

concept of speech acts. Birner (2013) explained that a speech act was simply the act of speaking. However, an interlocutor needs to use contextual meaning to understand the illocutionary force, in other words, the speaker's intention in producing an utterance. For example, the utterance of "I'm cold" can imply different things depending on the context. It can simply be stating that the person feels cold; it could be interpreted as an invitation to come over and snuggle, as a request to have someone close the window, or ask someone to change the temperature.

Pragmatic Failure

Thomas (1983) defined pragmatic failure as "the inability to understand what is meant by what is said" (p. 91). These pragmatic failures can either be paralinguistic failures or sociopragmatic failures. Thomas (1983) further expands on these types of failures. She states that paralinguistic failures occur when the utterances emitted by a speaker are different from those of most uttered by native speakers, and sociopragmatic utterances refer to social conditions that are encountered in language use.

Pragmatic Awareness

One of the problems EFL learners face is the lack of exposure to the target language to bring about pragmatic awareness of different types of speech acts like requests. Researchers have found that learners living abroad positively impact their abilities to develop pragmatic awareness (Matsumura, 2001), that the amount of exposure to the target language has a more significant impact on pragmatic development (Matsumura, 2003) and that motivation played more of an essential role in pragmalinguistic awareness than language proficiency (Takahashi, 2005). Alcón Soler and Safont Jorda (2008) defined pragmatic awareness as "the conscious, reflective, explicit knowledge about pragmatics" and that it "involves knowledge of those rules and conventions

underlying appropriate language use in particular communicative situations and on the part of members of specific speech communities" (p. 193).

Current studies have focused on the nature of retaining pragmatic awareness and developing pragmatic awareness and how individual differences could be a factor in pragmatic awareness. Matsumura (2003), for example, aimed to examine the development of pragmatic awareness among 187 university-level Japanese students studying in Canada. Matsumura (2003) implemented a multiple-choice questionnaire designed to examine learners' preferences when offering advice and implemented a self-report questionnaire to obtain the amount of exposure to English. Matsumura (2003) found that amount of language exposure can account more for pragmatic development competence than levels of language proficiency.

However, while exposure to the target language in natural settings, such as when students interact with native speakers of the target country, is ideal, it is better if learners are exposed to samples of these linguistic features before traveling abroad. These exposures entail instructional approaches (i.e., explicit/implicit instructions and deductive/inductive instructions). Hence, learners know what they need to expect when encountering pragmatic elements such as requests while in the target language setting.

Matsumura (2001) examined Japanese students' perception of social status change in the perception of the advice offered to a person with higher status, equal status, or to a lower status person. The study involved three groups of university students One group of 97 Japanese students who studied in Canada for eight months (Vancouver students), the second group of 102 Japanese students who continued to learn at a Japanese university (Kyoto students), and a group of 111 native speakers of English in a Canadian university (native speaker students). Matsumura administered a questionnaire on personal information and a multiple-choice questionnaire to

assess perceptions of social status. The results of native speakers were used as a reference point to compare the results with those of the Vancouver and Kyoto students. Matsumura (2001) found that although the Vancouver students initially performed lower in pragmatic performance than the Kyoto students, the Vancouver students eventually surpassed the Kyoto students indicating that socialization in the speech community enabled the development of pragmatic competence. The data collection in Matsumura (2001) occurred only once. Hence, it lacked a more detailed description while learners were in their home countries. Also, the study ended in Canada, so it is difficult to tell how much learners were able to retain after returning to Japan.

Takahashi (2005) aimed to determine assigned 49 Japanese EFL college students to two instructional groups a form-comparison condition (FC) group (n = 25) and a form-search (FS) group (n = 24). In the FC group, learners use their requests and compare them against those elicited by native English speakers. In contrast, the participants in the FS group simply identify native-like usage in input. These results suggested that individual differences influence learners' attention to target forms. So, a particular instruction type can't be equally beneficial to all learners. Takashi (2005) found that motivation significantly affected paralinguistic awareness more than language proficiency.

Instructional Approaches

Explicit and Implicit Instructions

Some of the implications of not understanding requestive speech acts can affect learners when encountering target language speakers. These repercussions sometimes result in adverse reactions from interlocutors (Halenko & Jones, 2011; Eslami et al., 2015). However, studies focusing on developing EFL student's pragmatic competence have compared the benefits between explicit instruction and implicit instruction (Alcón Soler, 2005; Rafieyan, 2014;

Halenko & Jones, 2015; Eslami et al., 2015) and have found explicit instruction as more beneficial than implicit instruction regarding requests.

Halenko and Jones (2011) aimed to find to what extent does explicit instruction of requests enhance and retains pragmatic competence knowledge over time, as well as to see if the learning of pragmatic awareness helps Chinese English for Academic Purposes (EAP) learners enhance their productive and receptive skills when making requests in the UK. The study involved 16 Business Communication students at a university in the UK. The students were divided between an explicit instruction group and a control group. The explicit instruction group received instructions on request strategies in an EAP context, while the control group did not receive such instructions. The sessions were divided into three phases: a sociopragmatic phase for topic instruction and awareness-raising, a paralinguistic phase used for explicit instruction, and a sociopragmatic phase for learners to practice discussing such requests. Halenko and Jones (2011) found that direct instruction was instrumental in learners' pragmatic development in this study; however, they also found that this knowledge was not sustained over time. The researchers subsequently suggested regular explicit instruction in requests as an EAP program.

Eslami et al. (2015) investigated the effectiveness of requests in English among Iranian EFL learners that received either explicit or implicit form-focused instruction using computer-mediated instruction (CMC). The participants in this study were 74 university students in Iran randomly assigned to a control ($n = 27$), explicit ($n = 23$), and implicit ($n = 24$) group and 18 native English speakers at a university in the USA (telecollaborative tutors) enrolled in an ESL Methodology course. They read papers on pragmatic instruction and assessment as part of their instruction.

The study by Eslami et al. (2015) used a Discourse Comprehension Task (DCT) and emails to collect elicited and naturalistic request performances. The request performances in the DCT were scored using an analytical assessment measuring sociopragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy. The emails in the study were used to extract requestive speech acts and were later coded into different types of request strategies and modifiers. The emails of the study were obtained from various exchanges between the EFL learners in Iran and the telecollaborative tutors. These email exchanges contained lesson plans the USA university students sent the Iranian students on requestive speech acts and examples of inappropriate forms. The telecollaborative tutors also discussed distance, power/social status, and imposition to the explicit group and used the implicit group's input enhancement techniques (i.e., highlighted text). Learners in the control group were limited to traditional in-class instructions focusing on the four skills, grammar, and vocabulary.

Eslami et al. (2015) found that computer technology and CMC can be used for consciousness-raising activities and to mediate the development of L2 pragmatic competence. The researchers also found that while both treatment groups benefited from the intervention, the explicit group benefited the most because this group received metapragmatic information and explanations. Eslami et al. (2015) further emphasized the effectiveness of explicit instructions on pragmatic competence development.

Alcón Soler (2005) explored whether explicit and implicit instructions make a difference in learners' pragmatic requests production. In this study, the researcher divided 132 participants into an explicit, implicit, and control group of 44 students and presented them with excerpts from different TV series episodes. The explicit group received a focus on forms instructions on requests and received metapragmatic feedback. The implicit group also received a focus on form

instruction using input enhancement and used implicit awareness-raising tasks. The control group did not receive instructions on requests. The three groups received 15 self-study lessons.

Students watched an entire episode and read the corresponding episode's script in the first lesson. The goal of watching the episodes was to identify direct requests, conventionally indirect, and non-conventionally indirect requests appearing in the videos to raise their metapragmatic awareness. Subsequently, learners were directed to produce a dialogue of someone making requests, considering the interlocutor's social distance and the type of favor asked.

In the following 13 lessons, the explicit group explained the different types of requests (i.e., imperatives, status, type of task, indirect) with the corresponding excerpt from the movie as examples and the opportunity to use the explanations to writhe their requests. On the other hand, the implicit group received the same extracts as the explicit group. However, the request strategies of this group appeared in bold. Participants in the implicit group also received different examples of requests and an opportunity to make a request. The difference was that the implicit group did not receive metapragmatic explanations like the explicit group. In the last lesson, all three groups were provided with the same dialogues as the pre-test and asked to identify the request and type of language used.

Alcón Soler (2005) found that although both explicit and implicit instructions were beneficial in raising awareness of requests, it was the explicit group that benefited the most ($M =$ 7.864) than the implicit ($M = 7.591$) and control ($M = 2.318$) groups concerning their post-test awareness results. Alcón Soler (2005) suggested that learners in foreign language contexts can benefit from the exposure to authentic audiovisual input and opportunities to use requests and receive feedback from such requests. She further acknowledged that using awareness-raising

tasks or input enhancing techniques could challenge learners to acquire pragmatic competence. So different approaches should be tailored according to the context.

Rafieyan (2015) conducted a study to find to what extent pragmatic instruction affects the development and sustainability of pragmatic awareness. Participants in the study consisted of 60 undergraduate Iranian learners of English at a university in Iran. This study adopted a multiple-choice test from Matsumura (2001) to determine learners' pragmatic awareness and created cultural awareness using instructional materials (i.e., books and videos) that emphasized various cultural rules such as politeness, greetings, and taboos, etc. Participants received a pre-test the first week into participant's academic year, a post-test the week following the pre-test, and a follow-up test two months following the final intervention sessions. Although participants' scores improved on the post-test ($M = 37.58$) as compared to the pre-test ($M = 27.50$), the follow-up scores ($M= 32.50$) were lower than the post-test results. This finding led the researcher to conclude that learners experienced pragmatic awareness development because the development was not sustained after the instructional intervention. Rafieyan (2015) suggested teachers continually expose learners to target pragmatic features.

Past studies have not been exclusive to educational settings. Studies have investigated the effects of pragmatic instruction in the workplace and have found learners in these contexts can similarly benefit as learners who travel abroad for educational purposes. A couple of studies focused on pragmatic instruction in work-related contexts are Riddiford and Joe (2010) and Louw et al. (2010). Riddiford and Joe (2010) conducted a study in a Skilled Migrant Program in New Zealand that tracked the development of 11 underemployed migrants from China, Taiwan, Russia, and the Philippines with difficulties in negotiating culturally appropriate requests. Riddiford and Joe (2010) administered Discourse Completion Tasks, role-plays, retrospective

interviews, and workplace recordings to collect data on sociopragmatic aspects of requests. The researchers found that learners who received opportunities to receive explicit pragmatic instruction and feedback, access to authentic workplace interactions, and time to develop pragmatic awareness can enhance their sociopragmatic competence and performance.

Louw et al. (2010) used various data sources (job interviewers, expert ESL instructors, engineering job candidates) and used the data to develop materials for pedagogical purposes. The purpose of the videos was to show learners (prospective job candidates) appropriate examples of miscommunications among individuals of different backgrounds (cultural and linguistic). The videos were essential teaching materials that helped enhance learners' pragmatic understanding of a job interview. The three participants in this study receiving the pragmatic instruction were non-native speakers (NNS) of English. They were full-time ESL students from China living in Canada for two, three, and five years. The instructors used a five-point Likert-type scale to assess participants' skills. Post-interview impressions from each candidate were audio-recorded following the first interviews to identify pragmatic problems. Researchers found that L2 learners can develop pragmatic skills with the help of explicit instruction. Additionally, researchers found that the NNS rated as the most pragmatically skilled was chosen as the job candidate. This finding, in turn, indicated the importance of pragmatic competence for L2 English learners, especially those looking for work opportunities.

Deductive and inductive instructions

Another instructional approach used to develop pragmatic competence among EFL learners is deductive and inductive instruction. Takimoto (2008) stated that in his study, "inductive and deductive refer to processing strategies in learning and instruction" (p. 370) and that in actual deduction, participants receive explicit statements of grammatic rules or patterns. On conscious induction, participants are led to discover and formulate a grammatical rule.

Takimoto (2008) investigated the development of language learners' pragmatic competence and the effects of deductive and inductive instruction. The study consisted of 60 Japanese EFL learners subdivided into four different groups. A deductive Instruction ($n = 15$) group, an inductive instruction with Problem Solving Tasks ($n = 15$) group, an Inductive Instruction with Structured Input Tasks ($n = 15$) group and a control ($n = 15$) group. In this study, Takimoto (2008) some of the internal modifiers used in the study were syntactic downgraders (e.g., I *am wondering* if you could lend me a book) and lexical /phrasal downgraders (e.g., I *wonder* if you could come here). Takimoto (2008) used actual deduction and conscious induction as the modalities used in the study and found an advantage of using inductive instruction in combination with problem-solving tasks to be an effective way for learners to process pragmalinguistic sociopragmatic forms.

Takimoto (2008) gave three reasons why these tasks were affected. He pointed to the fact that the problem-solving and input-based tasks did not conform to mechanical habit formation tasks like in the case of drills. Takimoto (2008) further posited that developing habit formation does not necessarily equate to learning. A second reason he raised was that participants in the inductive instruction with problem-solving tasks (IP) group were more involved in their tasks. Participants in this group needed to interact with the dialogues by copying them and comparing

them with the request in another dialogue. Then, they needed to produce the rules about the target structures. Participants in the inducive instruction with structured input tasks (IS) group also were involved in these activities. They chose request forms that were more appropriate and had to rate the level of appropriateness. The third reason Takimoto (2008) explained why the two types of tasks were effective stemmed from the processing of deriving pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic meanings. Takimoto (2008) suggested that material developers emphasize designing tasks that enable learners to process pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic resources as much as possible.

Data Collection Instruments

Different types of instruments can be used for data collection purposes. Some of the instruments used in the studies were multiple-choice tests (Rafieyan et al., 2014), a motivational questionnaire, an awareness retrospective questionnaire, and a language proficiency test (Takahashi, 2005). However, the commonly used instruments were Discourse Completion Tasks (Riddiford & Joe, 2010; Eslami et al., 2015; Halenko & Jones, 2015) and Discourse Completion Tests (Takahashi, 2005; Takimoto, 2008). The Discourse Completion Task in the Halenko and Jones (2015) study is composed of six scenarios and an opportunity for the person to respond to a "what would you do" type of question (See Appendix A). This type of DCT could provide a model for future teachers considering eliciting pragmatic responses from their students.

According to Riddiford & Joe (2010), Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs) are used to elicit data, and they are "research instruments used to analyze sociopragmatic features" (p. 196). Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs) are also used for the same purposes. DCTs give a person a scenario in a short paragraph intended to elicit pragmatic responses triggered by a prompting question related to the scenario. The learner taking the DCTs can generate an answer, and the

generated answer is analyzed for samples of pragmatic features. When the pragmatic feature

being assessed are requests. These pragmatic features can be efficiently elicited from the prompt.

DCTs would offer the researcher or teacher a way to determine the level of pragmatic feature

understanding if they were to implement them in the classroom.

Instructional Materials

The selection of instructional materials used to teach pragmatic features available for the

EFL teacher varies, so they are not limited to classroom instruction. Examples of materials used

in the studies in this literature review varied, examples of material types were books and videos

(Rafieyan et al., 2014), videos (Alcón Soler, 2005; Louw et al., 2010;), computer-mediated

communication (Eslami et al., 2015), dialogues (Takimoto, 2008), role-play transcripts

(Takahashi, 2005).

Books and Videos

Rafieyan et al. (2014) used books and videos from books and television video programs

targeting English learners. These materials exposed learners to authentic language features

represented in acts of politeness, greetings, and other culturally appropriate contexts. The videos

he used in his study also contain situational comedy episodes that relate to the contents in the

books, visually re-enforcing content that was previously studied in written form. Other

researchers (Alcón Soler, 2005; Louw et al., 2010) have adapted videos in their pragmatic

instruction activities.

Alcón Soler (2005) used scenes and transcripts from the science fiction series *Stargate* to

expose learners to direct requests, conventionally indirect requests, and non-conventionally

indirect requests. After watching the whole episode, students were required to identify the

requests in the episodes using a script the researcher provided to the students. The objective was

for students to identify the type of request used in the video, and this activity, in turn, raised students' pragmatic awareness of requests.

Louw et al. (2010) took a different approach to the videos used in their research. They recorded videos of native speakers and non-native speakers in simulated job interviews. Transcripts were extracted from the videos, and both videos and transcripts were used to compare participants' pragmatic skills. Researchers attributed participants' improvement in pragmatic skill development to their participation in the study. Louw et al. (2010) recognized the limited time language instructors have at creating these types of realistic materials and offered alternatives (television clips, YouTube, movies) as other sources of teaching materials to consider.

The books and videos used in these studies all have positive and negative attributes that should be brought to teachers' awareness. Books and videos developed for instructional purposes like those used in the study by Rafieyan et al. (2014) are often very rehearsed and lack naturally occurring conversations. On the other hand, this material is readily available and organized for language learners. Movies filmed under realistic conditions like the video recordings in Louw et al. (2010) can be time-consuming for practical purposes in a teaching context. Teachers must generally invest their time creating these movies and creating the scripts with the recorded movies. Watching movies like the science fiction movies used in Alcón Soler (2005) can be more practical as the scripts are often made available online, so there is less time the teacher can dedicate to material preparation. The problem with these movies is that they are not designed for language learners. Although they might become exposed to this material in a classroom setting or at home, the pragmatic features could be easily missed if students' language proficiency is

insufficient to permit understanding. Therefore, teachers should know their learners'

backgrounds to select appropriate materials for pragmatic development purposes.

Computer-mediated communication

Another type of material that can expose learners to different pragmatic features such as

requests is using computer-mediated communication. Eslami et al. (2015) classified computer-

mediated communication (CMC) as synchronous CMC (SCMC) and asynchronous CMC

(ACM). SCMC are types of communications that happen in real-time, and some examples are

voice chats and text-based chat rooms. ACMC are modes of communication such as email,

Skype, Facebook, and written/oral chats. These technologies can be used to communicate with

speakers of the target language and receive feedback on the accuracy of the pragmatic feature in

focus. One of the problems with this type of technology is that it can be very limiting to the type

of target language the language learner wishes to learn due to different time zones in target

countries. Japanese learners who wish to interact with native speakers of the United States or the

United Kingdom would be very flexible or lucky to coordinate a mutually convenient time and

date for these communication exchanges. On the other hand, if students are motivated, it can be a

great tool as now most students have access to their smartphones and can continue with their

studies outside of the classroom setting. Learners would also have to receive appropriate

guidance as to how to notice pragmatic feature requests outside of the classroom, as learners

could be confused if they encounter a feature that was not reviewed in class.

Dialogues

The use of situations and dialogues in a classroom setting like the ones used in Takimoto (2008) presents learners with opportunities to read an excerpt about a fictional situation that provides a background to a dialogue where users can mark the appropriateness level for a particular underlined request, or they can write the actual proposal from the dialogues themselves and learners can also comment on the differences between the two types of requests. One of the advantages of the dialogues used in Takimoto (2008) is that they are easy to administer once they have been created. The disadvantage of these dialogues is that teachers would need to spend time to make them if they do not have them readily available.

Conclusion

Overall, learners gaining spoken pragmatic competence in EFL settings can benefit from the different instructional approaches and materials that can be adapted to help learners create pragmatic awareness. Teachers have different instructional approaches (e.g., explicit/implicit instruction; deductive/inductive instruction). At the same time, explicit instruction is more effective than implicit instruction (e.g., Rafieyan, 2014; Eslami et al., 2015), and inductive instruction effective when "combined with problem-solving tasks" (Takimoto, 2008; p. 381) in research settings.

DCTs are one of the many instruments available to researchers used to elicit learners' responses. The term can either mean Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs) (Riddiford & Joe, 2010; Eslami et al., 2015; Halenko & Jones, 2015) or Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs) (Takahashi, 2005; Takimoto, 2008). However, they share the same acronym they can be used for the same purpose.

Teachers also have different instructional materials that they can use (e.g., books, videos, computer-mediated communication, dialogues). All these materials will work differently depending on the teacher's resources at their disposal. Some of the materials can be easily implemented, as is the case of language-related materials (Rafieyan et al., 2014) but are limited in naturally occurring pragmatic features, while other materials not intended for educational purposes can be easily adapted for an EFL classroom setting, as in the case of fiction movies in Alcón Soler (2005), the language used in these movies do not have the language learner in mind. So, these movies may contain pragmatic features that might be difficult for learners to understand if they are unfamiliar with the particular video that the teacher might decide to present.

Teachers can also implement technology in the classroom, for example, emails, text chats, or voice chats like it was implemented in the Eslami et al. (2015) study. Although these tools are ubiquitous nowadays, the teacher should ensure learners have access to them before implementing them in a classroom setting. However, the teacher should keep in mind time zone differences if these types of communications and students' accessibility to these tools.

The use of dialogues, like in Takimoto (2008), is another source that teachers can create if they are not readily found in books. These dialogues offer a student the ability to read a speech act. The student can answer questions regarding the dialogue to let the teacher know whether the learner could understand the pragmatic feature.

Therefore, it is possible to increase pragmatic competence while students are learning in the EFL context. The teacher can implement various types of teaching materials to create pragmatic awareness. However, one of the limitations of raising pragmatic competence among students living in an EFL context is the lack of exposure to the spoken target language. The

classroom is one of the only sources of consistent practice. Therefore, this lack of naturalistically occurring spoken samples has limitations, and instructional approaches should be used with this limitation in mind; for example, teachers should be aware of the potential that features of pragmatic features are often not sustained over time (Halenko and Jones, 2011; Rafieyan, 2015). Lack of exposure and a focus that schools place on improving TOEFL scores for study abroad students also limit how much class time a teacher can allocate to pragmatic instructions. However, it is still possible to work around those limitations if teachers can adapt their instructional approaches to fit the limits of their teaching context.

References

Alcón Soler, E. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System, 33*(3), 417–435. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.06.005

Alcón Soler, E., & Safont Jorda, M.P. (2008). Pragmatic Awareness in Second Language Acquisition. In J. Cenoz & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education Vol. 6: Knowledge about Language* (pp. 193-204). Berlin: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_149

Birner, B.J. (2013). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1–47.

Eslami, Z.R., Mirzaei, A., & Shadi, D. (2015). The role of asynchronous computer mediated communication in the instruction and development of EFL learners' pragmatic competence. *System*, *48*, 99–111. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.008

Halenko, N. & Jones, C. (2011). Teaching pragmatic awareness of spoken requests to Chinese EAP learners in the UK: Is explicit instruction effective? *System, 39*(2), 240–250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.05.003

Louw, K. J., Derwing, T. M., & Abbott, M. L. (2010). Teaching pragmatics to L2 learners for the workplace: the job interview. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *66*(5), 739–758. http://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.66.5.739

Matsumura, S. (2001). Learning the rules for offering advice: A quantitative approach to second language socialization. *Language Learning*, *51*(4), 635–679. https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00170

Matsumura, S. (2003). Modelling the relationship among interlanguage pragmatic development, L2 proficiency, and exposure to L2. *Applied Linguistics*, *24*(4), 465–491. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/24.4.465

Rafieyan, V., Sharafi-Nejad, M., & Siew-Eng, L. (2014). Effect of pragmatic instruction on sustainable development of pragmatic awareness. *Journal of Studies in Education*, *4*(1), 206–218. https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v4i1.5088

Riddiford, N., & Joe, A. (2010). Tracking the development of sociopragmatic skills. *TESOL Quarterly*, *44*(1), 195–205.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129–158. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129

Takahashi, S. (2005). Noticing in task performance and learning outcomes: A qualitative analysis of instructional effects in interlanguage pragmatics. *System*, *33*(3), 437–461. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.06.006

Takimoto, M. (2008). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the development of language learners' pragmatic competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*(3), 369–386. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00752.x

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

Appendix A
Halenko & Jones (2011)

1. **At the 'I' (Student Information Services)** You are having problems with your accommodation. You ask an
older and experienced member of staff at the 'I' to help you. You want the staff member to help you find a new
place to live. What would you ask them?
You:

2. **In the study centre** You are working with your classmates preparing a group presentation. You are deciding who
will take responsibility for which part of the presentation. Your friend is very good with computers. You want to
ask him to design the powerpoint slides. What would you ask him?
You:

3. **At the tutor's office** You have just received an essay back and want to discuss it with your tutor. S/he is very
busy. You go to your tutor's office after the class. You want to make an appointment to see her/him as soon as
possible. What would you ask?
You:

4. **At your university accommodation** Your new roommate at university, who is three years younger than you and
also a university student, keeps playing loud music late at night and you are having trouble sleeping. You want
your roommate to play the music more quietly. What would you ask?
You:

5. **At the International Society** You are president of the International Society at the university. You are interviewing other international students to become part of the team which organises social events. You meet the next candidate but then get called away to an urgent appointment. You want to delay the interview for 30 min. What
would you ask?
You:

6. **On campus** You have a lecture in Marsh Building but don't know where the building is. You stop another
student (who you don't know) on campus. You want directions to the building. What would you ask?
You: