

1 **Approaches to pragmatic knowledge mediation**

2 Seyed Vahid MERGHATI KHOEI, University of Limerick, Irland

3 As Bardovi-Harlig and Griffen (2005) and Salmani Nodoushan and
4 Daftarifard (2011) argue, classroom activities can raise L2 pragmatic
5 awareness and provide learners with the information they need to
6 become competent users of the target language. Yet, for these activities
7 to be successful, teachers should select appropriate instructional goals,
8 approaches, and materials (Allan & Salmani Nodoushan, 2015; Salmani
9 Nodoushan, 2003; 2006a,b; 2007a; 2008a,b; 2009; 2010; 2011; 2013a;
10 2014a; Salmani Nodoushan & Pashapour, 2016). The present study is
11 divided into five sections grounded in teaching pragmatic knowledge.
12 Section one addresses the teachability of pragmatic features, Section
13 two reviews literature on explicit versus implicit approaches to
14 teaching pragmatics. Sections three and four discuss focus on form
15 versus focus on forms approaches, and traditional versus experiential
16 approaches to teaching pragmatics. Finally, section five examines
17 textbook driven versus online driven approaches. The findings support
18 for a combination of focus on form and focus on forms in pragmatic
19 awareness instruction . Websites that supply learners with authentic
20 language in action, have been shown to work as successful alternatives
21 when combined with traditional classroom instruction. The role of
22 technology depends on the genre of pragmatics you aim to teach.
23 Backchannel signals and reactive expressions have been taught
24 successfully through telecollaboration. Finally, for speech act requests,
25 the best technological instrument at this time is the CARLA website,
26 Dancing with Words: Strategies for Learning Pragmatics in Spanish as
27 supported by Cohen (2008).

28 **Keywords:** Pragmatic Competence; Pragmatic Teachability; Pragmatic
29 Knowledge Mediation

30 **1. Introduction**

31 PLEASE PROVIDE AN INTRODUCTION HERE

32 **2. Are Pragmatic Features Teachable?**

1 After reviewing multiple studies investigating the effects of pragmatic
2 instruction, Rose (2005) comes to the conclusion that research conducted
3 thus far provides ample evidence in support of the teachability of pragmatic
4 features. He draws the following conclusions: (a) learners who receive
5 instruction in pragmatics consistently outperform those who do not, (b)
6 pragmatic instruction appears to outpace exposure alone, and (c) without
7 instruction, in an environment that presents learners with ample opportunity
8 for meaningful use of and exposure to the L2, learners can acquire some, if
9 not many, pragmatic features. Diving into research addressing the debate on
10 explicit vs. implicit pragmatic instruction, he finds that there is considerable
11 support for explicit instruction and thereby the noticing hypothesis. Rose
12 does not dispel the idea of learning pragmatics implicitly. He purely
13 summarizes findings in the literature that confirm the facilitative role of
14 pedagogical interventions. Finally, he concludes that:

15 . . . there is considerable evidence indicating that a range of features of
16 second language pragmatics are teachable. These include a variety of
17 discursal, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic targets of instruction, such as
18 discourse markers and strategies, pragmatic routines, speech acts,
19 overall discourse characteristics, and pragmatic comprehension.

20 (Rose, 2005, p. 397)

21 Thus, on the basis of the empirical evidence reviewed by Rose, we can
22 conclude that pragmatics is teachable, and that learners that receive explicit
23 instruction tend to outperform their non-explicitly instructed counterparts.

24 **3. Explicit vs. Implicit Approaches**

25 To elucidate Rose's (2005) findings further, a few research studies involving
26 the role of explicit and implicit instruction in pragmatic awareness teaching
27 are reviewed in brief detail. Koike and Pearson's (2005) study involving 99
28 third-semester second language learners of Spanish from two U.S. public
29 universities (The University of Texas at Austin, and Bowling Green State
30 University) revealed that explicit instruction and feedback are effective in
31 helping learners understand pragmatic elements. Participants were divided
32 into 5 groups: (a) explicit pre-instruction with explicit feedback (EPEF), (b)
33 explicit pre-instruction with implicit feedback (EPIF), (c) implicit pre-
34 instruction with explicit feedback (IPEF), (d) implicit pre-instruction with
35 implicit feedback, and (e) no pre-instruction and no feedback. The treatment
36 parameters exercised were modified from those set by Rosa and Leow (2004)
37 to include explicit, implicit or no instructor feedback because Koike notes that
38 some form of feedback is expected by learners. As can be inferred by the
39 division of participant groups, the experimental procedure included both
40 explicit or implicit pre-instruction, and either explicit or implicit feedback by

1 instructors; excluding the control group which received neither pre-
2 instruction nor feedback on the suggestion task. Both the EPEF and the EPIF
3 groups received a list of ways to express Spanish suggestions and to respond
4 to them.

5 All experimental groups saw Spanish suggestions demonstrated in multi-turn
6 dialogues across three lessons. The dialogues reflected conversations
7 between two friends where one had a problem, and the other suggested
8 solutions. The friend with the problem was not easily accepting of the
9 suggestions offered, so conversation followed. The experimental tasks
10 included the completion of both a multiple choice and an identification task.
11 Learners used common suggestion forms, but were also allowed to indicate
12 the types of suggestions they themselves would use to communicate the
13 suggestions. Finally, pre-, post- and delayed post-tests were administered. All
14 tests were formatted the same. The pretest and the delayed posttest were
15 identical, but the posttest differed in content. The results of their study
16 suggest that implicit instruction and feedback in the form of recasts (i.e., a
17 correct rephrase of the language that the learner stated by the instructor or
18 other more advanced speaker of that language) might be helpful in the
19 production of appropriate pragmatic utterances by learners.

20 Ifantidou (2010) examined whether genre-specific conventions can be
21 acquired through explicit instruction, if pragmatic competence and language
22 knowledge are positively correlated, and if pragmatic competence can
23 develop by explicit instruction using genre-based applications. Her objective
24 was to observe learners' performance in two courses in order to investigate
25 correlations between language tasks (e.g., between synthesis and summary)
26 and pragmatic tasks (e.g., between metapragmatic analysis and genre
27 conversion). She assessed the correlations and looked for strengthening
28 effects of one aptitude on the other. The study results indicated that (a) it is
29 possible to teach genre-specific competences and have improved candidates'
30 performance be the outcome of similar description-of-data tasks, (b)
31 linguistic proficiency is positively correlated with genre-specific
32 competences, (c) language knowledge is positively correlated with pragmatic
33 competence, and (d) for low proficiency learners, performance in pragmatic
34 competence tasks does not improve when accompanied by explicit pragmatic
35 instruction. Ifantidou's argument does not discourage explicit instruction for
36 intermediate or high-proficiency language learners, simply low proficiency
37 ones.

38 Fukuya and Martinez-Flor (2008) investigated whether different types of
39 instruction (explicit and implicit) affected learners' use of pragmatically
40 appropriate and linguistically accurate suggestions differently depending on
41 the tasks they performed. Participants were 49 native speakers of Spanish

1 who had learned English as a foreign language in Spain. They were randomly
2 divided into two groups according to type of instruction: implicit and explicit.
3 On average the implicit group had studied English for roughly one year longer
4 than the explicit group. Background data was gathered via a questionnaire. A
5 placement test indicated both groups had an intermediate proficiency level,
6 with the implicit group testing slightly higher than the explicit group. Both
7 groups completed two tasks (e-mail and phone messages) in DCT form two
8 weeks prior to instruction and one week after instruction. E-mail and phone
9 were chosen instead of traditional DCT fill-in the space tasks because the
10 researchers argued that DCTs by phone and e-mail were less limiting, more
11 open ended, and psychologically real; participants expressed their own
12 intentions. The pragmatic competences taught and measured were
13 suggestions and downgraders. Instruction took place during six 2-hour long
14 sessions. The explicit group received instruction which moved the learner
15 from awareness-raising to production. Seven videos of native speakers
16 performing suggestions and downgraders were utilized over the course of the
17 sessions. After their awareness was raised, a table of target forms was
18 presented to the learners. Finally, to review, they completed a multiple choice
19 test and acted out role-plays. The implicit group watched the same videos as
20 the explicit group, but the implicit group's videos were enhanced by captions
21 and preliminary descriptions of the social situations. They also partook in
22 listening and reading tasks and role-plays; however, the transcripts for their
23 role-plays had the suggestions and downgraders bolded. When learners used
24 the wrong pragmalinguistic form for the situation, the teacher, one of the
25 researchers, used a recast system created by Fukuya and Zhang (2002).
26 Answers to the pre- and posttests were assessed based on pragmatic
27 appropriateness and linguistic accuracy. This study provided further evidence
28 that learners receiving explicit instruction slightly outperform their implicitly
29 instructed counterparts on posttest assessment. In this particular study,
30 performance on the phone task was higher for the explicit group, while
31 participants' performance in the e-mail task was on par. The researchers
32 argue for urging teachers to use a variety of assessment tasks to rate
33 pragmatic performance because performance in one form of assessment
34 might cause inappropriate evaluation of the learners' knowledge.

35 **4. Focus on Form vs. Focus on Forms Approaches**

36 The debate on instruction includes the roles of focus on form versus focus on
37 forms in the classroom (Long, 1991). When teaching pragmatics, focus on
38 forms instruction is the traditional way to assist students in the reproduction
39 of explicitly taught conventional phrases, while focus on form instruction
40 teaches the meaning behind those conventional phrases implicitly. Both Koike
41 and Pearson (2005) and Soler (2005) favor Schmidt's (1990) noticing

1 hypothesis, which states that learners notice specific target language features
2 as a result of instruction which, in turn, promotes learning. As was inferred
3 earlier in chapter 2 section 2: Why is Pragmatic Competence So Important,
4 noticing is particularly essential for pragmatic learning because the
5 pragmatics of a language are specific to each dialect, as well as culture and
6 sub-culture of a language. Thus, as language teachers we should continue to
7 be encouraged to include explicit, implicit, focus on form, and focus on forms
8 instruction in our classrooms in order to help our learners notice the
9 differences and similarities between pragmatics across languages. But, now
10 the question is, what is the best venue for teaching this

11 **5. Traditional vs. Experiential Approaches**

12 Different genres of pragmatics have been taught in classrooms in the past but,
13 have they been taught in a meaningful and comparable manner which at least
14 attempts to provide learners with pragmatically, level-appropriate language?
15 Gilmore (2004) investigated discourse features of seven dialogues published
16 in textbooks between 1981 and 1997; then, compared them to authentic
17 interactions. He found that the language differed considerably—not in favor of
18 textbooks. His research questions were:

- 19 (a) how artificial have dialogues in the average textbook been, and what is
20 it exactly that makes them less real?, and
21 (b) would inclusion of any missing features make materials less effective,
22 as suggested by Widdowson (1998), or does it depend on the individual
23 characteristics of each one?

24 To limit the research to one genre of pragmatics, service encounter dialogues
25 were selected from the textbooks surveyed. Also, service encounters were
26 easily replicable outside the classroom, which aided in the collection of
27 similar, meaningful, and comparable authentic data. Transcripts from the
28 aforementioned textbooks were reviewed. The information receiver's
29 (listener) questions were noted, reformulated, and exercised in authentic
30 encounters outside the classroom. In the end, the results clearly showed that
31 textbooks from 1981-1995 lacked in comparable authentic dialogue.
32 However, new-at-the-time textbooks—New Headway Intermediate (1996),
33 Getting Ahead (1999), and Cutting Edge (2001)—rated higher on the eight
34 discourse features measured in the earlier textbooks (1981 - 1997), even
35 though they were still lacking considerably in comparison to their authentic
36 data counterparts. Reasons suggested by Gilmore as an educated explanation
37 for these differences were:

- 38 1. Materials writers have started to include discourse features in their
39 dialogues.

- 1 2. Materials writers traditionally tended to use dialogues as a medium to
- 2 reinforce grammar or present vocabulary and functional language.
- 3 3. Materials writers have had structural/functional pedagogic aims.
- 4 4. Materials writers may have deliberately chosen not to include authentic-
- 5 like dialogs, although it is more likely that they had just not considered
- 6 doing so in the past.

7 While Gilmore does not answer his research questions directly, he does infer
8 that dialogues in the average textbook have been substantially limited
9 compared with those expected in authentic language, and (b) inclusion of
10 missing pragmatic features, at least for service encounters, would not make
11 the materials less effective, rather it would enrich the text.

12 If enriching the text by including missing pragmatic features would not make
13 the materials less effective in a traditional classroom (i.e., a classroom where
14 the teacher teaches from a chosen textbook), then one could make the
15 argument that student participation in a study abroad program would either
16 render the non-enriched materials less effective, or prove the enriched
17 materials helpful. Shively (2011) used enriched materials by including a
18 speech act intervention, and a non-traditional textbook: *Maximizing Study*
19 *Abroad: A Student's Guide to Strategies for Language and Culture Learning*
20 *and Use* (Paige, Cohen, Kappler, Chi, & Lassegard, 2006). While it is difficult to
21 argue whether or not these enriched materials proved helpful, results of the
22 study reveal that participants adopted some pragmatic norms of the Toledo
23 speech community. As already noted, the most prevalent change in speech
24 was a shift from speaker-to-hearer-oriented verbs in requests. However, this
25 change did not have an impact on interactional consequences perhaps
26 because Toledenses are used to interacting with foreigners. Even though
27 students' adoption of pragmatic norms did not have a great impact on
28 interactional consequences, in the discussion, Shively notes that the simple
29 instruction and reflection on these differences made them aware that there
30 are differences in the meaning behind language in context.

31 **6. Textbook-Driven vs. Online-Driven Approaches**

32 If instruction on pragmatics surfaces in textbooks, it generally appears in
33 short little blurbs, grouped together with "culture" at the end of the chapter
34 as we observed with Gilmore (2004). Wintergerst and McVeigh (2011) agree
35 that teaching about the target culture, including a focus on intercultural
36 communication instead of focusing on the sound system, grammar, and
37 vocabulary is a "relatively recent development in language teaching" (p. 119).
38 They emphatically encourage language teachers to break out of the
39 traditional way of teaching culture, of which pragmatic awareness is a major
40 component, and bring a general awareness about it into FL classrooms. One

1 suggestion of theirs is to get students involved through contact assignments
2 and experiential learning. In areas where the target language is spoken, these
3 types of assignments are more easily implemented. As long as students are
4 carefully prepared for the assignment or task, the opportunity to experience
5 intercultural communication in their own backyards can have an especially
6 positive effect on students' confidence levels (Wintergerst & McVeigh, 2010).

7 However, if learners do not have access to authentic pragmatics acquisition
8 opportunities through textbooks or in their own backyard, then the Internet
9 is an alternative outlet to find good resources. Of course technology is ever
10 changing and very soon the statements made in the next chapter will become
11 out of date. It is advised that teachers continually educate themselves on
12 available technology resources.

13 **7. The Role of Technology in Pragmatic Instruction**

14 In her state-of-the-art review, Belz (2007) derived three basic observations of
15 computer mediation (CM) and computer-mediated communication (CMC) in
16 L2 pragmatics instruction and research:

- 17 1. L2 pragmatic development is facilitated by the delivery and connections
18 afforded to language learners through CM, which increases access to
19 genuine materials and opportunities to participate in meaningful
20 interactions. These materials and opportunities may take many forms:
21 self-directed websites housing project- based interactions with NS
22 keypals (aka: telecollaboration), or multimodal NS pragmatic
23 performance examples accompanied by explicit discussions of
24 pragmatic knowledge.
- 25 2. Corpora can be constructed from CM interactions between NS and NNS,
26 or NNS and NNS. These corpora can then be tapped to track L2 learners'
27 pragmatic competence development over time.
- 28 3. CM provides a context of authenticity where L2 learners' may be made
29 aware of their emerging L2 pragmatic competence through carefully
30 designed and executed pedagogical interventions which direct learners'
31 attention to NSs' operationalization of focal pragmatic features. (p. 63).

32 **8. Video Conferencing and CMC Tools**

33 Video conferencing use for teaching pragmatics has been researched by
34 Sardegna and Molle (2010). Even though their participants were neither
35 second language learners of Spanish, nor learning speech act requests,
36 teachers can still glean some insights from this study into the effectiveness of
37 using video conferencing as a tool for teaching pragmatics. The participants
38 were Japanese English as a foreign language (EFL) students (5 active, 30
39 observers). The pragmatic knowledge taught through a two- hour

1 videoconference, and later analyzed by the researchers, were verbal
2 backchannel signals and reactive expressions. Besides finding evidence in
3 favor of the effectiveness of teaching pragmatics through videoconferencing,
4 the researchers also noted some problems they faced as a result of the
5 medium: (a) the videoconferencing technology interfered at times with the
6 nature of communication in the form of lags or muffled dialogue interchange,
7 and (b) the U.S. instructors found it very difficult to establish eye contact with
8 participants and observers. From this study we gain an important
9 understanding of the challenges that teachers may be up against when using
10 video- conferencing as a tool to promote pragmatic awareness. Economidou-
11 Kogetsidis (2011) reports on pragmatically inappropriate email requests by
12 EFL learners and the affects they have on faculty. She investigated the
13 following research questions:

- 14 (a) What is the degree of directness and amount of lexical/phrasal and
15 external modification employed in the English e-requests of Greek
16 Cypriot university students?
- 17 (b) What forms of address do Greek Cypriot students (NNSs of English)
18 employ in their e-mails to faculty?
- 19 (c) To what extent to British native speaker lecturers perceive unmodified
20 and direct e-mails from students as abrupt and inappropriate?

21 Participants in her study were 24 lecturers (11 female and 13 male), all from
22 various universities in the UK with ages ranging from late 20s to over 50.
23 Lecturers took a perception questionnaire on-line that consisted of six e-mail
24 messages where they were asked to judge each e-mail's appropriateness on a
25 5-point Likert scale as if it were from one of their university-aged students
26 with whom they were not close to, but were familiar with. The Likert scale
27 rated the messages on politeness and abruptness.

28 Lecturers quantitatively explained the linguistic features from the messages
29 that affected their perceptions of the e-mails. E-mails judged were authentic,
30 selected from a bank of 200 that were sent to 11 faculty members over the
31 course of 18 months and written by NNSs of English studying at a major,
32 private, English-medium university in Cyprus. Economidou-Kogetsidis found
33 that direct strategies employed by the NNSs can spur pragmatic infelicities by
34 appearing to give the faculty no choice in request compliance. The following
35 contribute to the former statement: the omission of greetings and closings,
36 underuse of lexical/phrasal downgraders, and notable variation of address
37 forms. While this study does not report on how to teach pragmatic awareness
38 through instruction on e-mail, it is one of the few, along with Fukuya and
39 Martinez-Flor (2008) that suggest NNSs could benefit from explicit e-mail
40 instruction not only supplied by ESL/EFL teachers, but from the
41 incorporation of such instruction in curricula and textbooks.

1 From the perspective of speech act theory, Sykes (2005) studied the influence
2 of synchronous CMC (SCMC) on pragmatic development. Specifically, she
3 studied the application of head acts (HAs) and supporting moves (SMs) in
4 invitation refusals. Participants were 27 third-semester L2 learners of
5 Spanish. The effects of three types of synchronous discussions were
6 investigated: (a) face-to-face (F2F), (b) oral chat (Wimba), and (c) written
7 chat (local program). The treatment consisted of participants first being
8 video-taped in F2F oral role-plays (pretest). Then, they received F2F
9 classroom instruction. Next, in a computer lab, students took part in a 20-
10 minute self-directed online instructional component which incorporated
11 videotaped model dialogues. After that, the learners were assigned to
12 synchronous discussion groups: F2F, oral chat, or written chat. Within their
13 groups, they employed their respective communicative mode to practice
14 refusal dialogues together and discuss questions pertaining to invitation
15 refusal.

16 Finally, learners again participated in videotaped F2F oral role-plays
17 (posttest). Sykes's findings showed that the group that used the most complex
18 HAs and largest variety of SMs was the written chat group. Sykes proposes
19 that this finding may be explained by the simple fact that when writing, more
20 time is afforded for both construction of responses and reflection and that
21 this group was the only one that received multimodal processing (oral
22 practice/instruction and written practice/discussion). Belz (2007)
23 commenting on this study states, "This is an important finding for the design
24 of classroom tasks that speaks to the advantages of blending, that is, the
25 alternation of CM with more traditional forms of instruction" (p. 53).

26 As reported by Belz (2007), Cohen and Sykes's (2007) presentation on
27 Strategies, CMC, and learning pragmatics at the 17th international conference
28 on pragmatics and language learning in Honolulu, HI, on March 26-28 brought
29 the prospective value of video games for the development of pragmatic
30 competence in L2 Spanish to the discussion table. The idea is that learners
31 would use the manmade, virtual, 3-D, immersive environments to develop
32 pragmatic competence by engaging in a variety of speech acts through
33 different modes of communication: written, oral, gestural, and environmental.
34 The advantages of these kinds of interactions are many: individually- paced
35 instruction, adoption of various participant roles, multimodal processing
36 opportunities, and possible high emotional payoffs for low risk interactions
37 (p. 53). The advantages of using other forms of CMC, like e-mail, text chat, oral
38 chat, or video chat, besides video-conferencing are that the learner is usually
39 having a more intimate conversation or experience with the data either
40 synchronously or asynchronously, and that "communication is language
41 based to an even greater extent than before" (Egbert & Hanson-Smith, 2007,
42 p. 68). However, when using these other forms of CMC learners' are still

1 slightly removed from the context of the situation and they might miss key
2 body language, which helps convey a speaker's message. As Egbert and
3 Hanson-Smith state: The language of e-mail, for instance, is less formal than
4 other written language because it is written with greater speed and less
5 attention to detail (e.g., spelling mistakes are tolerated) and because it is
6 generally private rather than intended for large audiences; yet because it is
7 written rather than spoken and because of the distance between sender and
8 receiver, e-mail retains some qualities of written language. This intermediate
9 language also presents new challenges to language learners already
10 struggling with variation in genre and style in the target language (p. 68).
11 Basically, learners easily fall into the eavesdropper role even though they
12 have the ability to transcend that status (p. 69).

13 **9. Corpus Data**

14 With Corpus data, L2 learners may easily fall into the role of eavesdropper as
15 well. Without instruction that scaffolds their learning, learners could easily
16 read the corpus data, notice the differences between native speakers'
17 language and their own, but not adapt any of the noticed nuances. Besides,
18 there are many different types of corpora that may include one or more of
19 these data sources as Native speaker data, learner data ,Data from a select
20 group of native speakers/L2 learners, Data from a select time frame,
21 Longitudinal data, Data from different contexts, Data created from class
22 projects. Belz and Vyatkina (2005) essentially created their own corpus of
23 data from a classroom telecollaboration among L2 learners. Their
24 productions were simultaneously entered into a corpus as they were
25 composed. This process enabled researchers to access learner output on a
26 day-to-day basis. Not only did the researchers create their own sub-corpus of
27 data, but over the course of the telecollaboration, their learners' interactions
28 were added to the existing Telecollaborative Learner Corpus of English and
29 German (Telekorp) which had existed for 5 years at the time of their article's
30 publication. The strength in Belz and Vyatkina use of the Telekorp is that they
31 included not one but multiple pedagogical interventions, which "included
32 focused instruction (FI) in semantics, syntax, and pragmatics of the target
33 MPs [modal particals]" (p. 25). Modal particals are "non-declinable 'small
34 words,'...that are of vital importance to the accurate interpretation of
35 interaction in German because they index the speaker's attitude towards
36 particular utterances and interlocutors . . ." (p. 18). Basically, Belz and
37 Vyatkina's study was highly effective in exhibiting the successful use of
38 corpora with focused instruction in aiding learners in the adoption of modal
39 particals over the course of a one-semester telecollaboration project. Their
40 study may not be generalized to other pragmatic awareness instruction
41 efforts, but it is worth noting that, because the telecollaboration project was

1 long-term and project-based, it enabled the performance of typically
2 examined speech acts: apologies, refusals, expressions of modality, and
3 refusals. Mainly, Belz and Vyatkina emphasize that, “Telecollaboration
4 facilitates the compilation of learner corpora because the electronic nature of
5 the process data obviates both digitization and transcription” (p. 41). Most
6 corpora are not used or created in this way. Therefore, there are many other
7 weaknesses associated with using corpora to teach pragmatic awareness that
8 were not mentioned in the Belz and Vyatkina’s article. If language teachers
9 use a corpus that was not developed through a telecollaboration in their
10 classroom, then the students would most likely not be familiar with the
11 context or the principal speakers. Most corpora, like Telekorp, have data from
12 different learners at different points in time, with different learning
13 environments. All of these factors can result in a great deal of authentic data
14 that is hard for learners to navigate through without the aid of an instructor.

15 **10. Websites**

16 A website, on the other hand, has the capability for students to learn the
17 context of the data (written, oral, and visual) from the written text provided
18 on the website as well as through audio and visuals. In the near-future, I do
19 not doubt that we will see video-based corpora, but for now websites that
20 incorporate audio and visual examples of authentic interactions will help
21 learners understand the material a great deal more than if the information is
22 only presented explicitly in class. Websites like Dancing with Words, set up by
23 the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA)¹,
24 incorporate learner awareness through speaking, listening, reading, and
25 writing. In comparison, websites like Discourse Pragmatics² developed in
26 2007 by César Félix-Brasdefer at Indiana University offer limited aid to
27 learners: definitions and examples of different speech acts without audio or
28 video. On the website, it appears that there is a listening function, but upon
29 multiple visits to the site, I found the sound option not available.

30 **11. Conclusion**

31 Language is not only used to say things, but also to do things (Austin, 1962;
32 Capone & Salmani Nodoushan, 2014; Salmani Nodoushan, 1995; 2006c,d;
33 2007b,c,d; 2008c,d; 2012; 2013c; 2014b,c; 2015a,b; 2016a,b,c,d; 2017;
34 Salmani Nodoushan & Allami, 2011). Social cooperation and order in
35 linguistic interaction are determined by a speaker’s language used and the

¹ http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/sp_pragmatics/home.html

² <http://www.indiana.edu/~discprag/index.html>

1 meaning of the language interpreted by the listener (Wintergerst and
2 McVeigh, 2010).

3 Authentic examples of the meaning of language in context have not always
4 been incorporated in second language learning textbooks (Gilmore, 2004). In
5 study abroad research, explicit instruction has been shown to have more
6 positive effects than implicit instruction (Fukuya and Martinez-Flor, 2008;
7 Koike and Pearson, 2005). Subsequently, Koike and Pearson (2005) and Soler
8 (2005) have shown support for a combination of focus on form and focus on
9 forms in pragmatic awareness instruction. However, Infantidou (2010)
10 recommends reserving explicit pragmatic instruction for intermediate or
11 high-proficiency language learners. Now, for language learners without
12 access to real-world encounters, websites that supply learners with authentic
13 language in action (specifically, speech act requests), like Dancing with
14 Words, have been shown to work as successful alternatives when combined
15 with traditional classroom instruction (Cohen, 2008).

16 The role of technology depends on the genre of pragmatics you aim to teach.
17 Backchannel signals and reactive expressions have been taught successfully
18 through telecollaboration. Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011) suggests that e-
19 mail request instruction be added to textbooks and supplied by ESL/EFL
20 teachers. Invitation refusals were learned best by L2 Spanish students whom
21 were exposed to both CMC through written chat and traditional classroom
22 instruction (Sykes, 2005). Modal partials were adopted by L2 learners of
23 German when they were exposed to a combination of a personally created
24 corpus and traditional classroom instruction (Belz & Vyatkina, 2005). Finally,
25 for speech act requests, the best technological instrument at this time is the
26 CARLA website, Dancing with Words: Strategies for Learning Pragmatics in
27 Spanish (Cohen, 2008). Therefore, the role of technology in pragmatic
28 awareness instruction, specifically speech act requests, at this time, is to
29 support and blend with traditional instruction approaches by supplying more
30 authentic examples of language in context than is currently/will ever be
31 found in a paperback textbook.

32 **The Author**

33 Seyed Vahid Merghati Khoei (Email: sv.merghat@icloud.com) is . . . **PLEASE**
34 **PROVIDE YOUR VITA HERE (150-200 WORDS)**

35 **References**

- 1 Allan, K., & Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2015). Pragmatics: The state of the art
2 (An online interview with Keith Allan). *International Journal of*
3 *Language Studies*, 9(3), 147-154.
- 4 Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge : Harvard
5 University Press.
- 6 Altstaedter, L. L., & Jones, B. (2009). Motivating students' foreign language
7 and culture acquisition through web-based inquiry. *Foreign Language*
8 *Annals*, 42(4), 640-562.
- 9 Bardovi-Harlig, K. 2009. Conventional expressions as a pragmalinguistic
10 resource: Recognition and production of conventional expressions in L2
11 pragmatics. *Language Learning*, 59, 755-795.
- 12 Bardovi-Harlig, K., Dornyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize
13 pragmatic violations. Pragmatic vs. grammatical awareness in
14 instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 233-259.
- 15 Bardovi-Harlig, K., Griffen, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from
16 the ESL classroom. *System*, 33, 401-415.
- 17 Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). Teaching pragmatics. United
18 States Department of State. Available at
19 <http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/onlineca.htm>.
- 20 Barnes-Karol, G., & Broner, M. A. (2010). Using images as springboards to
21 teach cultural perspectives in light of the ideals of the MLA Report.
22 *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(3), 422-445.
- 23 Bataller, R., (2010). Making a request for a service in Spanish: pragmatic
24 development in the study abroad setting. *Foreign Language Annals*,
25 43(1), 159- 174.
- 26 Belz, J. (2007). The role of computer mediation in the instruction and
27 development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Annual Review of Applied*
28 *Linguistics*, 27, 45-75.
- 29 Belz, J., & Vyatkina, N. (2005). Learner Corpus Analysis and the Development
30 of L2 Pragmatic Competence in Networked Intercultural Language
31 Study: The Case of German Modal Particals. *The Canadian Modern*
32 *Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 62(1), 17-
33 48.
- 34 Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representation and attentional control in
35 pragmatic competence. In G. Kasper and S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.),

- 1 *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, (pp. 4357). New York: Oxford University
2 Press.
- 3 Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
4 Press.
- 5 Bueno, K. A. (2009). Got film? Is it a readily accessible window to the target
6 language and culture for your students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(2),
7 318-339.
- 8 TechSmith Corp. (1995). Camtasia Studio. Retrieved from
9 www.techsmith.com/camtasia.asp.
- 10 Capone, A., & Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2014). On indirect reports and
11 language games: Evidence from Persian. *Rivista Italiana di Filosofia del*
12 *Linguaggio*, 8(2), 26-42.
- 13 CARLA, (2010). Dancing with Words: Strategies for Learning Pragmatics in
14 Spanish. Retrieved from
15 [http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/sp_pragmatics/Service%20Enc](http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/sp_pragmatics/Service%20Encounters/home_service_enc.html)
16 [ounters/home_service_enc.html](http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/sp_pragmatics/Service%20Encounters/home_service_enc.html).
- 17 Cohen, A. D. (2005). Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts.
18 *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2, 275–301.
- 19 Cohen, A. (2008). Teaching and assessing L2 pragmatics: What can we expect
20 from learners? *Language Teaching*, 41(2): 215-237.
- 21 Cohen, A. D., Shively, R. L. (2007). Acquisition of requests and apologies in
22 Spanish and French: impact of study abroad and strategy building
23 intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(2), 189–212.
- 24 Cohen, A. D., & Sykes, J. M. (2007). Strategies, CMC, and learning pragmatics.
25 *17th International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning*,
26 Honolulu, HI, March 26–28, 2007.
- 27 Cunningham, S., & Moor, P. (2001). *Cutting Edge (Pre-Intermediate)*. Harlow,
28 Essex: Longman.
- 29 Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2010). Cross-cultural and situational variation in
30 requesting behaviour: Perceptions of social situations and strategic
31 usage of request patterns. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(8), 2262-2281.
- 32 Egbert, J., & Hanson-Smith, E. (2007). *CALL environments: Research, practice*
33 *and critical issues* (2nd ed.). Alexandria: TESOL, Inc.

- 1 Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2007). Discourse Pragmatics. Retrieved from
2 <http://www.indiana.edu/~discprag/index.html>.
- 3 Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2007). Natural speech vs. elicited data: A comparison of
4 natural and role play request in Mexican Spanish. *Spanish in Context*,
5 4(2): 1159-185.
- 6 Fukuya, Y., Martinez-Flor, A. (2008). The Interactive Effects of Pragmatic-
7 Eliciting Tasks and Pragmatic Instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*,
8 41(3), 478-500.
- 9 Fukuya, Y.J., Zhang, Y. (2002). The effects of recasts on EFL learners
10 acquisition of pragmalinguistic conventions of request. *Second*
11 *Language Studies* 21(1), 1-47. Available at
12 http://www.hawaii.edu/sls/uhwpsl/on-line_cat.html.
- 13 Gilmore, A. (2004) A comparison of textbooks and authentic interactions. *ELT*
14 *Journal*, 58, 362-374.
- 15 Haugh, M. (2007). The co-constitution of politeness implicature in
16 conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 84-110.
- 17 Herron, C., Cole, S. P., Corrie, C., & Dubreil, S. (1999). The effectiveness of a
18 video-based curriculum in teaching culture. *The Modern Language*
19 *Journal*, 83, 518- 533.
- 20 Huang, Y.(2007). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 21 Ifantidou, E.(2010). Genres and pragmatic competence. *Journal of Pragmatics*,
22 43, 327- 346.
- 23 Jones-Macziola, S. and White, G. (1999). *Getting Ahead*. Cambridge: Cambridge
24 University Press.
- 25 Jourdain, S. (1998). Building connections to culture: A student centered
26 approach. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31(4), 439-450.
- 27 Kasper, G. (2001). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied*
28 *Linguistics*, 22(4), 502-530.
- 29 Koike, D., (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts
30 and interlanguage. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(3), 279-289.
- 31 Koike, D., & Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in the
32 development of pragmatic competence. *System*, 33(3), 481-501.

- 1 Levy, M. (2007). Culture, culture learning and new technologies: Towards a
2 pedagogical framework. *Language Learning & Technology*, 11(2), 104-
3 127.
- 4 Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching
5 methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign*
6 *language research in cross-cultural perspective*, (pp. 39-52).
7 Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 8 Lorenzo-dus, N. (2001). Compliment responses among British and Spanish
9 university students: A contrastive study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 107-
10 127.
- 11 Knorre, M., Dorwick, T., Pérez-Gironés, A., Glass, W. and Villarreal, H. (2009).
12 *Puntos de Partida: An Invitation to Spanish* (8th edition). McGraw-Hill.
- 13 Paige, R. M., Cohen, A. D., Kappler, B., Chi, J. C., & Lassegard, J. P. (2002).
14 *Maximizing study abroad: A students' guide to strategies for language*
15 *and culture learning and use*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced
16 Research on Language Acquisition.
- 17 Pinto, D. (2005). The acquisition of requests by second language learners of
18 Spanish. *Spanish in Context*, 2, 1 – 27.
- 19 Pinto, D., & Raschio, R. (2007). A comparative study of requests in heritage
20 speaker Spanish, L1 Spanish, and L1 English. *International Journal of*
21 *Bilingualism*, 11(2), 135-155.
- 22 Placencia, M. E. (2008). (Non)Compliance with directives among family and
23 friends: Responding to social pressure and individual wants.
24 *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 5(3), 315-344.
- 25 Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language
26 pragmatics. *System*, 33(3), 385-399.
- 27 Rosa, E., & Leow, R. (2004). Computerized task-based exposure, explicitness,
28 type of feedback, and Spanish L2 development. *The Modern Language*
29 *Journal*, 88, 192- 216.
- 30 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (1995). *A sociopragmatic comparative study of*
31 *ostensible invitations in English and Farsi*. Unpublished master's thesis,
32 University of Isfahan, Iran.
- 33 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2003). Text-familiarity, reading tasks and ESP test
34 performance: A study on Iranian LEP and Non-LEP university students.
35 *The Reading Matrix*, 3(1), online.

- 1 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2006a). Language teaching: State of the art. *Asian*
2 *EFL Journal*, 8(1), 169-193.
- 3 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2006b). Research in the language classroom: State
4 of the art. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 3(2), 63-72.
- 5 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2006c). Greetings forms in English and Persian: A
6 sociopragmatic perspective. *International Journal of Language, Culture,*
7 *and Society*, 17. online.
- 8 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2006d). A sociopragmatic comparative study of
9 ostensible invitations in English and Farsi. *Speech Communication*,
10 48(8), 903-912.
- 11 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2007a). Are task type and text familiarity
12 predictors of performance on tests of English for specific purposes?
13 *Asian ESP Journal*, 3(1), 67-96.
- 14 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2007b). Iranian complainers' use of
15 conversational strategies: A politeness study. *Iranian Journal of*
16 *Language Studies*, 1(1), 29-56.
- 17 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2007c). Politeness markers in Persian requestives.
18 *The Linguistics Journal*, 2(1), 43-68.
- 19 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2007d). Conversational Strategies in Farsi
20 Complaints: The Case of Iranian Complainers. *PhiN: Philologie Netz*, 39,
21 20-37.
- 22 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2008a). A Framework for Task-Oriented Language
23 Instruction. *Journal on School Educational Technology*, 3(3), 5-16.
- 24 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2008b). The role of metacognition in the language
25 teaching profession. *Journal on Educational Psychology*, 2(1), 1-9.
- 26 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2008c). Conversational Strategies in Farsi
27 Complaints: The Case of Iranian Complainers. *International Journal of*
28 *Language Studies*, 2(2), 187-214.
- 29 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2008d). Persian requests: Redress of face through
30 indirectness. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 2(3), 257-280.
- 31 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2009). Improving learning and teaching through
32 action research. *The Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(4), 211-
33 222.

- 1 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2010). The Interface between interim assessment
2 and feedback: An opinion paper. *Journal on Educational Psychology*,
3 4(3), 1-8.
- 4 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2011). Reflective teaching in English as a Foreign
5 Language (EFL) classes: An overview. *Journal on School Educational*
6 *Technology*, 6(3), 1-6.
- 7 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2012). Rethinking face and politeness.
8 *International Journal of Language Studies*, 6(4), 119-140.
- 9 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2013a). The bilingual self or selves? *Annals*
10 *Universitatis Apulensis - Series Philologica*, 14(2), 503-510.
- 11 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2013b). Review of Philosophical perspectives for
12 pragmatics. *Linguistik Online*, 58(1), 119-126.
- 13 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2013c). The social semiotics of funerary rites in
14 Iran. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 7(1), 79-102.
- 15 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2014a). Review of Perspectives on linguistic
16 pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 11(4), 645-649. (DOI: 10.1515/ip-
17 2014-0028)
- 18 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2014b). Review of Perspectives on pragmatics and
19 philosophy. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 11(2), 301-306. (DOI: DOI
20 10.1515/ip-2014-0013)
- 21 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2014c). Speech acts or language micro- and
22 macro-games? *International Journal of Language Studies*, 8(4), 1-28.
23 (DOI: 10.13140/2.1.3699.2648)
- 24 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2015a). Review of Intercultural pragmatics.
25 *Pragmatics & Society*, 6(1), 152-156. doi 10.1075/ps.6.1.08nod
- 26 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2015b). The secret life of slurs from the
27 perspective of reported speech. *Rivista Italiana di Filosofia del*
28 *Linguaggio*, 9(2), 92-112.
- 29 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2016a). *An encyclopedic dictionary of research*.
30 Tehran: Iranian Institute for Encyclopedia Research.
- 31 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2016b). Rituals of death as staged communicative
32 acts and pragmemes. In A. Capone & J. L. Mey (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary*
33 *Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society*, (pp. 925-959). Heidelberg:
34 Springer.

- 1 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2016c). Persian speakers' use of refusal strategies
2 across politeness systems. *PhiN: Philologie Netz*, 76, 61-77.
- 3 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2016d). On the functions of swearing in Persian.
4 *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, 4(2), in press.
- 5 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2017). Which view of indirect reports do Persian
6 data corroborate? *International Review of Pragmatics*, 9(1), in press.
- 7 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A., & Allami, H. (2011). Supportive discourse moves in
8 Persian requests. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 5(2), 65-94.
- 9 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A., & Daftarifard, P. (2011). Globalized classroom,
10 emancipatory competence, and critical pedagogy: A paradigm shift. In
11 R. V. Nata (Ed.), *Progress in Education*, (pp. 147-162). New York: Nova
12 Science Publishers, Inc.
- 13 Salmani Nodoushan, M. A., & Pashapour, A. (2016). Critical pedagogy, rituals
14 of distinction, and true professionalism. *Journal of Educational
15 Technology*, 13(1), 29-43.
- 16 Sardegna, V. G., & Molle, D. (2010). Videoconferencing with strangers:
17 Teaching Japanese ESL students verbal backchannel signals and
18 reactive expressions. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 7(2), 279-310.
- 19 Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning.
20 *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 17-46.
- 21 Shively, R. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad. A longitudinal
22 study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6): 1818-
23 1835.
- 24 Soler, A. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL
25 context? *System*, 33(3), 417-435.
- 26 Soars, L., & Soars, J. (1996). *New Headway English Course (Intermediate)*.
27 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 28 Sykes, J. M. (2005). Synchronous CMC and pragmatic development: Effects of
29 oral and written chat. *CALICO*, 22(3), 399-432.
- 30 Taft, M., Kacanas, D., Huen, W., & Chan, R. (2011). An empirical demonstration
31 of contrastive rhetoric: Preference for rhetorical structure depends on
32 one's first language. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 8(4), 503-516.
- 33 Weigand, E. (2010). Language as dialogue. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 7(3), 505-
34 515.

- 1 Widdowson, H. G. (1998). 'Context, community, and authentic language'.
2 *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 705-716.
- 3 Wintergerst, A. C., & McVeigh, J. (2011). *Tips for teaching culture: Practical*
4 *Approaches to Intercultural Communication*. NY: Pearson Longman.
- 5 Williams, J. (2004). *Teaching writing in second and foreign language*
6 *classrooms*. McGraw Hill.

UNCORRECTED PROOF