Pedagogical linguistics

A view from L2 pragmatics

Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig
Indiana University

The positive effects of instruction on the acquisition of second-language pragmatics has been well documented by numerous recent published studies (81 in the 10 years between Rose, 2005, and Bardovi-Harlig, 2015), but we have yet to see a corresponding increase in the teaching of pragmatics in second and foreign language classrooms or language textbooks. This article explores some of the potential causes for the lack of implementation of pragmatics instruction in second and foreign language classrooms (Skyes, 2013) and suggests means of overcoming such challenges. Pedagogical linguistics, in the form of pedagogical pragmatics, offers insight into meeting the challenges of limited theoretical support for curricular development, lack of authentic input in teaching materials, lack of instructor knowledge, and lack of reference books and pedagogical resources for teachers. The final challenge for pedagogical linguistics and pragmatics researchers is conveying relevant research findings to teachers; means for accomplishing this are discussed in the final section of the article.

Keywords: pragmatics, second language acquisition, instructional pragmatics, authentic input, metapragmatics

1. Introduction

The invitation to contribute to the inaugural issue of *Pedagogical Linguistics* has given me the opportunity to reflect on how researchers in the field of second language pragmatics have addressed the goals of pedagogical linguistics and how we might go forward. In second language acquisition there is an undeniable pull to use the results of empirical studies to contribute to the knowledge of language learners. This may be heightened in an area where the use of an interlanguage form may not lead to a grammatical error but rather to bad feelings or a negative evaluation of the speaker as a person. In a ground-breaking *TESOL Quarterly* article which exemplified pedagogical linguistics, Thomas (1983) identified the risks

https://doi.org/10.1075/pl.19013.bar
Pedagogical Linguistics 1:1 (2020), pp. 44–65. issn 2665-9581 | e-issn 2665-959x

as pragmatic *failure*. For example, a request such as "give me X" or "I want you to do Y" or walking away without closing a conversation, or staying in the conversation, but not being able to close it, might all create what at best is an awkward situation. Although we now talk less about failure and more about satisfying a possible range of pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic expectations, the point is the same: Not understanding or not being able to engage in the pragmatics of a speech community in which one wishes to participate could lead to a negative outcome.

The following section first lays out the definition(s) of second language pragmatics and its relation to instructional pragmatics. The next sections consider challenges to implementing pragmatics instruction in second and foreign language classrooms and then propose means of meeting those challenges. The paper concludes by suggesting avenues by which we might deliver pedagogical linguistics, and more specifically, pedagogical pragmatics.

2. What is L2 pragmatics?

Pragmatics can be defined informally as knowing how to say what to whom when; the acquisition of L2 pragmatics would then be defined as learning how to say what to whom when in the second language and culture (Bardovi-Harlig, 2013). More formally, pragmatics involves speakers' intentions and hearers' perceptions. This is captured by Crystal's (1997) definition of pragmatics, which has been widely used in L2 pragmatics since it was adopted by Kasper and Rose (2002: 301): "the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication."

In second language (L2) research, pragmatics has included the study of the realization of speech acts, conversational structure, conversational implicature, address terms, conversation management (including turn-taking), discourse markers, and the use of pragmatic routines and conventional expressions (Bardovi-Harlig, 2010). Research in pragmatics often distinguishes between pragmalinguistics – the linguistic resources speakers use for pragmatic purposes – and sociopragmatics – the rules that guide use of language in society and in context.

What we now refer to as *second language pragmatics* has its roots in cross-cultural pragmatics, most notably represented by the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project whose eponymous volume (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989) reported empirical cross-linguistic comparisons of pragmatic performance. Interlanguage pragmatics, described as "referring to nonnative speakers' comprehension and production of speech acts, and how that L2-related knowledge is acquired" (Kasper & Dahl, 1991: 216), took up the comparison of native and nonnative speakers (generally advanced speakers, but who nevertheless showed interlanguage characteristics) and some acquisition studies. The volume *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993) exemplified the new discipline. An early review of research in second language acquisition of pragmatics (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996), followed by two reviews assessing the acquisitional content of pragmatics (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Kasper & Rose, 1999) helped usher in acquisitional pragmatics, and what we now call *second language pragmatics,* cemented by the monograph of the same name (Kasper & Rose, 2002). Early in the field, pragmatics researchers began engaging teachers and developing pedagogy as illustrated by Thomas's seminal *TESOL Quarterly* article in 1983, the inclusion of Olshtain and Cohen (1991) in a widely used volume on teaching methods, and the first edited volume of pragmatics and language teaching (Rose & Kasper, 2001).

The combination of second language acquisition researchers and language pedagogy leads unsurprisingly to instructed second language acquisition research, and the same is true in pragmatics. By 2010 Ishihara had begun to use the term *instructional pragmatics* to refer to "research conducted in the area of interlanguage pragmatics with a focus on its pedagogical component" (Ishihara, 2010: 938), our own brand of pedagogical linguistics.

The number of instructional effect studies in pragmatics reveals that interest in instructional pragmatics has grown steadily. At the time of Kasper and Schmidt's 1996 survey of research in interlanguage pragmatics, only six articles had been published; and only three of those were what we would now call instructional effect studies (Billmyer, 1990; Bouton, 1994; Wildner-Bassett, 1984). The other three were evaluations of pragmatic input available in language textbooks (Bardovi-Harlig et al., 1991; Kasper, 1982; Scotton & Bernsten, 1988). Rose (2005) reviewed 25 articles (from 1986 to just before 2005) which he called a "small, but growing body of research" (p. 386); Jeon and Kaya (2006) identified 34 studies (including unpublished studies) for their meta-analysis; and Takahashi (2010) reviewed 49 studies, double the number reviewed by Rose (2005) only five years before. Taguchi's (2015) review included 58 studies that met certain criteria, and Bardovi-Harlig's (2015) broader study of how conversation was operationalized in instructional effect studies from the same year reviewed 81 studies published between 2000 and mid-2013.

In spite of this level of research activity – and the demonstration that teaching pragmatics is beneficial – there continues to be a need for development of pedagogical linguistics of pragmatics and continued advocacy to do so. The education of language teachers (and linguists, for that matter) is ongoing and never completed. Many language teachers have yet to be exposed to pragmatics. Moreover, the teaching of pragmatics in second and foreign language classrooms has not yet been widely implemented.

Sykes (2013) suggests that teaching pragmatics faces eight challenges: (1) limited theoretical support for curricular development, (2) lack of authentic input in teaching materials, (3) lack of instructor knowledge, (4) a dominant focus on micro features of language in the foreign language context, (5) time limitations in the classroom, (6) individual student differences and learning subjectivity, (7) feedback and assessment challenges, and (8) dialectal variation (Sykes, 2013: 73). Bardovi-Harlig (2017) added one more challenge to the list: (9) the lack of reference books and resources.

3. Challenges for implementing pragmatics instruction in second-foreign language classrooms

Of the nine challenges to implementing pragmatics instruction in second and foreign language classrooms, four could be ameliorated by attention from pedagogical linguistics, and thus, I consider them here: limited theoretical support for curricular development, lack of authentic input in teaching materials, lack of instructor knowledge, and lack of reference books and pedagogical resources for teachers (challenges 1, 2, 3, and 9). Let us consider each one in turn.

3.1 Limited theoretical support for curricular development

In the aggregate, L2 pragmatics research provides the content for L2 pragmatics instruction, although it may be noted that there is still no complete pragmatics curriculum. However, neither the specification of the target, nor the development of language teaching pedagogy (for morphosyntax, for example) is sufficient to fully specify a pedagogy of pragmatics, and, as Kasper (2001: 51) observed "it is not always obvious how principles proposed for instruction in grammar might translate to pragmatics." Kasper illustrated this claim by considering FonF, focus on form. When inappropriate utterances arise exclusively from their pragmalinguistics, that is, from the use of an inappropriate form, "a wrong discourse marker, routine formula, or modal verb to index illocutionary force or mitigation, for instance – and [is] limited to short utterance segments" (2001: 51) it may be possible to provide a recast. However, when sociopragmatics is involved, the source of inappropriate utterances or a sequence of utterances can depend on the context, a speaker's interpretation of the situation or of another speaker's turn, or a culturally determined assessment of what speech act is required given the situation, among many others. The complexity of pragmatics may make it an uncomfortable fit for what might be thought of as brand name pedagogical approaches (see Kasper, 2001; Taguchi, 2015 for further discussion).

Research-based concerns, like the emphasis on authenticity in input and activities, has influenced the development of pragmatics pedagogy. Although researchers have made recommendations on what to teach, fewer proposals have been made on how to teach. Félix-Brasdefer and Cohen (2012) review a variety of models for teaching pragmatics, some of which specify content while others specify steps. Olshtain and Cohen (1991) laid out five steps: conducting diagnostic assessment, presenting model dialogues, evaluating the situation, providing role-play activities, and giving feedback and discussion. Martínez-Flor and Uso-Juan (2006) proposed six steps for teaching pragmatics: researching, reflecting, receiving, reasoning, rehearsing, and revising ("reviewing" in American English). Félix-Brasdefer (2006) suggested including three components focusing on content: communicative actions and cross-cultural awareness, conversational analysis in the classroom, and communication practice. Koike's (2008) three-principle pedagogical model emphasizes content: contextualizing L2 grammar of pragmatics in natural context, providing grammatical, pragmatic, and sociocultural knowledge, and developing knowledge of sociopragmatic variation. Félix-Brasdefer and Cohen (2012) conclude their review by proposing four sequential components to teaching pragmatics: raising awareness, providing pragmatic input, teaching grammar as a communicative resource, and facilitating producing or production practice.

3.2 Lack of authentic pragmatic input in teaching materials

The lack of authentic pragmatic input in commercially available second and foreign language textbooks has been well documented (Eisenchlas, 2011; Cohen & Ishihara, 2013; Vellenga, 2004). Reviews have shown that textbooks for both English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) present author-created conversations that do not reflect pragmatic usage by expert speakers (be they native or nonnative members of a speech community); the point here is that authentic conversations are absent from textbooks. The reviews have compared textbook presentations to natural or naturalistic conversations for a number of speech acts and pragmatic constructs, including, but not limited to conversation closings (Bardovi-Harlig et al., 1991), pragmatic routines for agreement, disagreement, and clarifications (Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2015a); the social use of complaints (Boxer & Pickering, 1995); the language of business meetings (Williams, 1988); repair sequences (Cheng & Cheng, 2010), and, more generally, politeness (Limberg, 2016). The general state of pragmatics in current commercially marketed materials has led Cohen and Ishihara (2013: 116) to observe that, “the actual dialogues may sound awkward or stilted, and are inauthentic in that they do not represent spontaneous pragmatic language as used in natural conversation.” Without the representation of pragmatics through authentic conversations in language textbooks, pragmatics will continue to be relegated to a supplemental rather than central status in the foreign- and second-language curriculum.

3.3 Lack of instructor knowledge

With respect to pragmatics, instructor knowledge involves knowing about pragmatics and knowing how to teach pragmatics. At the level of pragmatic knowledge, teachers may be familiar with the components of common speech acts as well as their functions, a range of conventional expressions, and regional pragmatic variation. But they may also be unaware of them or not have the means to discuss them explicitly. Knowledge of teaching of pragmatics entails knowledge of pragmatics, but knowledge of pragmatics does not guarantee knowledge of how to teach it, as demonstrated by the fact that pragmatics pedagogy is still developing. Kasper (1997) laid out the issues and benefits of educating teachers in pragmatics in “Pragmatics as a component of teacher education.” Ishihara and Cohen (2010/2014) provide a book-length guide to the teaching of pragmatics for both novice teachers and experienced instructors already teaching pragmatics.

One indication of the lack of teacher knowledge regarding pragmatics is found in instructional effect studies: Researchers either do their own teaching (researcher-as-language teacher) which jeopardizes the impartiality of the instruction or they have to train teachers to do it (Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2015b; Eslami & Liu, 2013; Koike & Pearson, 2005). The latter, in addition to strengthening the research design, also has the advantage of increasing teacher-knowledge, which may extend beyond the experimental teaching required for the study.

3.4 Lack of reference books and resources

There is a connection between lack of reference materials, lack of authentic examples of conversation in textbooks, and lack of teacher knowledge. Over the years, I have observed that graduate students are drawn to study requests as a topic for both research and pedagogical projects because there are more reports on the acquisition and use of requests by L2 speakers and learners than on any other speech act. This dominance is echoed in instructional effect studies, and requests are also the most likely speech act to be included in textbooks (often called “polite requests”). Years of observation suggest that the existence of resources encourages teaching in pragmatics; the lack of resources discourages it. Undertaking original pragmatics research for the sake of having accurate input for teaching is beyond the remit of most language teachers.

There is a growing list of resources that teachers can use to teach or prepare pragmatics materials, including a book-length treatment from New Zealand, *Workplace Talk in Action: An ESOL Resource* (Riddiford & Newton, 2010). Additional resources include lessons developed by teachers in Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor (2003), Tatsuki and Houck (2010), and Houck and Tatsuki (2011), and in Spanish, research-based website resources created by Félix-Brasdefer on the teaching of refusals <http://www.indiana.edu/~discprag/www_new/spch_refusals.html>. Instructional effect studies are an excellent source of models of teaching pragmatics – if teachers felt that such articles were accessible. However, even at their best, instructional effect articles have word limits and are often not able to give as many detailed details about instructional delivery as teachers (or other researchers) would like. In addition, because of experimental demands, instructional conditions in such studies are often rigidly defined to isolate specific variables, whereas classroom teachers may be inclined to combine the best features of different approaches in actual classroom teaching (see, for example, Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman, Rothgerber, Su, & Swanson, 2019 on combining teacher-developed corpus-based materials with teacher-guided student-conducted corpus searches, introduced as separate instructional conditions in Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2017). Moreover, the much-discussed research-practice divide and the accessibility of research may also play a role (Borg, 2010; Crookes, 1998). Whereas instructional effect studies may constitute a reasonable resource for teacher educators who wish to include pragmatics in their teacher education courses, these reports are not primarily addressed to language teachers and are unlikely to be read by them.

Fortunately, there are some sets of publications in which researchers report the research in one article and the instruction in the other. These include Riddiford (2007), Holmes and Riddiford (2010), and Riddiford and Joe (2010) for research on teaching workplace requests and sociopragmatics and Riddiford and Newton (2010) for teaching workplace requests and sociopragmatics, Nguyen (2013), Nguyen et al. (2013), and Nguyen et al. (2012) for research on teaching constructive criticism, and Nguyen and Basturkmen (2010) for teaching constructive criticism, and Bardovi-Harlig et al. (2015b) for research on teaching pragmatic routines of agreeing, disagreeing, and clarification for academic group work and Bardovi-Harlig et al. (2015a) for teaching the same pragmatic routines for academic group work.

Reference books on pragmatics would not only provide access to materials on which teachers could base lessons, but would also assure the accuracy of pragmatic information. Explicit instruction requires accurate metapragmatic information, which even native speakers do not possess without education (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010/2014; Wolfson, 1989), placing native and nonnative speaking teachers on the same footing (see Cohen, 2018). The closest thing to a reference work which has pragmatic information on multiple languages is the extensive pragmatics section of the CARLA website (Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition) hosted by the University of Minnesota <http://www.carla.umn.edu/> and created by Andrew Cohen and Noriko Ishihara. However, none of these resources compare to the hundreds of competing grammar reference works available from numerous publishers.

Given the state of affairs described by Sykes (2013), one straightforward path to the inclusion of pragmatics in foreign and second language curricula is to educate language teachers, strengthening their knowledge about both pragmatics and pragmatics instruction. If we work with language teachers, other attainable pedagogical goals may include the improvement of pragmatic representations in textbooks and reference works, and the subsequent integration of pragmatics into language teaching. A second path may be to target second and foreign language textbooks directly, acknowledging the influence that textbooks have on what gets taught in the classroom. It is also possible to work on both fronts at once.

4. Addressing the challenges

4.1 Authentic input in instructional pragmatics (and pragmatics instruction)

My particular approach to instructional pragmatics is to argue for the use of pragmatically authentic language as input to learners (Sykes's 2). (That is not to suggest that this approach is not shared by others – e.g., see Boxer & Pickering, 1995; Cohen & Ishihara, 2013; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010, 2014; Riddiford & Joe, 2010; Scotton & Bernsten, 1988; Vellenga, 2004; Williams, 1988, among others – but rather that I have approached instructional pragmatics with one central goal). In Bardovi-Harlig (2001) I referred to providing authentic input to language learners as "a fair fight." How can anyone know how to act or speak (or how to act through speech) in a second language if s/he has not seen or heard it done? Authentic pragmatic input may come from a variety of speakers in a variety of contexts from speech communities that are relevant to one's learners. The target language variety, as well as the setting, register, and pragmatic features to be focused on, will determine the potential sources of the input.

Preparing authentic input for learners is the most basic, and yet probably the most important, contribution pragmatics researchers can make to pedagogical linguistics. This would include data collection, transcription (for spoken data), and identification of recurrent patterns (or generalizations) that could be used in instruction. We can use the data we collect at multiple levels of pedagogical linguistics: to teach linguists, future and practicing language teacher-educators, and future and practicing language teachers about pragmatics, and we can convert it directly into input to learners. No one has ever posited an innate pragmatics device whereby acquisition is triggered only by key elements of pragmatic expression, thus input becomes much more important in pragmatics than in other areas for which an innate faculty has been hypothesized (and for non-nativist approaches, input would be equally important in pragmatics).

In a survey of 81 studies that investigated the effect of instruction on pragmatics since Rose (2005), Bardovi-Harlig (2015) investigated how studies operationalized conversation at three phases: input, practice, and assessment. Sixty-five studies reported their source of input; of those 38 studies (58%) reported the source as authentic, authentic scripted (movies and television created for a general audience), and elicited (such as videos of role plays by native speakers). The remaining 27 studies (42%) included scripted NS-NS performances, input from existing pedagogical audio-visual materials, textbooks, dialogues written for the study, and some materials from unspecified origins. The natural and naturalistic (authentic scripted and role play) input are divided between audio (or audio-visual) input and written input. Somewhat ironically, out of 12 studies that use conversation as input, only one uses audio, and four use transcripts with some re-recording, and the remaining 7 use written transcripts exclusively. The presentation of conversation exclusively in written form seems like a missed opportunity, but audio plus transcripts should help learners see what they might not otherwise hear. In contrast, authentic scripted and elicited input is predominately presented in audio or audio-visual format. Over half of the instructional effect studies model the use of authentically constructed input, and this is a definite departure from commercially available materials.

The problem in the early days of pedagogical pragmatics activism was how or where teachers would get authentic input. Our answers were not satisfactory. In the 1980s and early 1990s, we had fewer pragmatics studies, fewer examples of conversation from any source or tradition (whether speech act production or conversational research), and thus fewer resources. It appeared that teachers would have to collect their own data, depending on what they wanted to teach. Language learners were also envisioned as ethnographers, collecting their own data in host environments. The problem with the former is that teachers do not have the time or training to collect their own data and the problem with the latter is that learners do not know what to listen for when they are sent to listen to conversation (they have to have classroom input first to know what to listen for). I illustrate this claim with closings, a speech event that we have worked on in both research (Hartford & Bardovi-Harlig, 1992) and pedagogy (Bardovi-Harlig et al., 1991). What learners often miss, and thus what we would like to teach them, are the preclosing moves that indicate that an interlocutor is about to end the conversation. But if one sends learners "out" to collect closings (from either face-to-face conversations or telephone conversations – we learned that TV shows often do not show closings, but rather cut to another scene), the salient move is the final closing pair (*Goodbye-Goodbye; Goodbye-See you*). The pre-closing warrants (*OK, Well, All right*) are unlikely to be noticed, and yet that is what we would like to teach.

One potential resource for teachers (and for pedagogical pragmatics) are free, online, readily accessible corpora. Most importantly for pragmatics, the corpora offer very different types of spoken language interaction which cannot be interchanged; but even this variety can be turned into an asset. Most recently we have been focused on providing authentic input for the learning and teaching of pragmatic routines through corpora. Our research group was enlisted by ESL teachers in our intensive English program to create materials for the teaching of agreements and disagreements for academic group work. We also decided to add clarifications to the materials because we knew from conversational analysis that clarifications often occur before a disagreement is realized, and can avoid a disagreement altogether (Pomerantz, 1984). Pragmatic routines are one type of formulaic language; they tend to occur early in a turn, and they convey the illocutionary force of an utterance. Pragmatic routines for agreements include (*That's right, You're right, I agree*), disagreements (*I agree, but; Yeah, but; Okay, but*), self-clarifications (*What I mean is…*), and other-clarifications (*Do you mean…*). We worked with a regionally matched, academic corpus, MICASE (Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English; Simpson et al., 2002). We have developed both corpus-based materials and teacher-supported corpus searches, studying first whether access to input (with focused noticing) improved learners' production of speech acts and pragmatic routines (Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2015b), and later whether the type of engagement and presentation format had an effect on acquisition (Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2017, 2019; Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman, & Rothgerber et al., 2019). We also demonstrated the differences among corpora and types of discourse in the selection of authentic input for the teaching of requests (Bardovi-Harlig & Mossman, 2016) in the Santa Barbara Corpus (Du Bois et al., 2000–2005), Marlise-TV corpus (Cobb, 2014, <http;//www.lextutor.ca/TV-Marlise>), COCA (Davies, 2008), and MICASE. (These are North American resources, but there are resources for other varieties of English, most notably British English.) With training and practice for language teachers, the use of corpora as a source of input is a viable option, although selection of appropriate texts does take time.

For me, the use of authentic input has been the front line of pedagogical revolution in pragmatics. It seems to me that it is one clear area in which pragmatics researchers can do the most good and provide the most support to teachers. I had been content to focus on input and leave language-teaching methodology to language-teaching professionals. If my interest in promoting the use of authentic input allowed interested teachers more autonomy in working with it, focusing only on input also spared me from having to grapple with issues of delivery. However, once I wanted to demonstrate that the use of authentic input was a crucial factor in pragmatic development, I engaged TESOL experts to implement actual teaching in ways that we had not done before.

4.2 Metapragmatic information: Instruction and feedback

While I was conducting the review of how pragmatics instructional effect studies operationalized pragmatics (Bardovi-Harlig, 2015) and then again when I reviewed the literature on corrective feedback in pragmatics studies (Bardovi-Harlig & Yilmaz, in press), I became interested in metapragmatic information that instructional studies give to learners. Metapragmatic information is metalinguistic information concerning pragmatics. It may concern *social* knowledge, or *sociopragmatics,* the knowledge of what to say when and to whom, or *form*, that is *pragmalinguistics,* the linguistic devices used by speakers to realize sociopragmatic knowledge. If we know that leaving a professor's office requires that we express gratitude upon departure (sociopragmatic knowledge), then the means by which we express gratitude, i.e., thanking expressions constitute pragmalinguistic knowledge. Similarly, if our cultural norms say that leaving a professor's office is the appropriate context in which to apologize for taking the professor's time, the means by which we do so reflects our pragmalinguistic knowledge.

Presence or absence of metapragmatic information is an important design feature of an instructional study. What I noticed by doing the large-scale reviews is that metapragmatic information given prior to students producing language or undertaking an activity is often called "instruction," but (the same) metapragmatic information provided after production is often called "feedback." Although placement in instruction determines its label, metapragmatic information seems to be one phenomenon with at least two possible positions in the instructional sequence.

The challenge for pedagogical pragmatics would be to develop descriptively accurate statements (related to the authentic input to be presented) that are accessible to language teachers; the challenge for language teachers would be to transform those statements into information easily understood by language learners. The step in between would be for teacher educators to model metapragmatic statements addressed to learners. Kasper (2001) points out that one of the difficulties of correction is that a teacher must make an immediate assessment of what went wrong and provide corrective feedback. If we flip that around, we could say that the advantage of metapragmatic information as part of input is that teachers could formulate the statements in advance of instruction without the time pressure of correction. Once such statements were developed, they would potentially be available for use as corrective feedback.

Having descriptively adequate metapragmatic statements available for teaching would not entirely address the issue of giving corrective feedback, however. Kasper (2001) presents two arguments against correction in pragmatics: difficulty of implementing sociopragmatic correction and the lack of firmly established norms. The first speaks to the difficulty of locating a sociopragmatic error. If a learner chooses a politeness style that is inappropriate for a speech event, markers of that style are distributed throughout the discourse; there is no single location of an error. The misidentification of the status (or power and distance) of an interlocutor can be pervasive.

The second, the lack of firmly established norms, refers to pragmatics, not to our ability to identify norms. On one hand is variation, and on the other, is choice. In pragmatics, there is rarely one "correct" contribution to a communicative event, rather there are multiple possible means of realization. Instead, pragmatics is the arena of choice. A speaker uses one means of expression over another, and that choice itself (although not conscious unless the speech event has been rehearsed, as in anticipation of a difficult meeting or writing a consequential letter or email message) is informative (Bardovi-Harlig, 2017). Correction, in contrast, requires a single correct target, a specific pronunciation, a grammatical construction. Kasper (2001: 52) identifies the lack of firm sociopragmatic norms as the "most serious reservation against instant identification and repair of sociopragmatic problems." As she points out, casual conversation has a wide range of allowable and unpredictable contributions which are negotiated in the flow of communication: "Such preferences and the options and constraints emerging from the interaction itself elude instant repair; they can most adequately be addressed in metapragmatic discussion" (p. 52).

The disinclination to correct learner pragmatics is seen in the relatively few studies that have included feedback in pragmatics instruction. Taguchi's (2015) review of 58 instructed pragmatics studies found that only half used feedback. Similarly, fewer than half (34) of the 81 studies reviewed by Bardovi-Harlig (2015) reported some type of feedback, although *feedback* in instructional pragmatics is not restricted to *corrective* feedback, but rather is used to include a range of activities which provide, as Kasper suggested, metapragmatic information. These include peer feedback in telecollaboration, whole group discussions such as post-activity debriefings, as well as teacher-provided feedback to both production and interpretation.

Once descriptively adequate generalizations about pragmatics are identified for use in instruction, and are stated in teacher- and learner-accessible ways, then their use can be tested in instruction effect studies. Currently, metapragmatic information is treated as though it were all equally valuable. However, I suspect that it is not, but that it varies in quality (and quantity). This too is an empirical question, just as it is an empirical question as to whether metapragmatic information is a necessary or useful supplement to good input.

Because the prevailing interpretation of the instructional data at present is that metapragmatic information facilitates targetlike learner performance after instruction (in many, but not all studies; Taguchi, 2015), it seems that attention to metapragmatic information is warranted. This would be an area for additional work for pragmatics in pedagogical linguistics.

4.3 How do we deliver pedagogical linguistics?

Pedagogical linguistics is multi-layered

Researcher-teachers who practice pedagogical linguistics interact with students at three levels: (a) teaching linguistics to future researchers who may be potential teacher-educators; (b) teaching linguistics to future language teachers; and, (c) teaching language to second language learners. Thus, we can influence the teaching of language learners through the teaching of teachers, and we can also work with language learners directly, as in the case of instructional effect studies. We often think of working with language teachers in classrooms (which I will return to shortly), but we should also consider the practice of pedagogical linguistics as outreach.

Language-teacher education as outreach

Viewing the practice of pedagogical linguistics as outreach applies to other areas of pedagogical linguistics, as well as pragmatics, but I will continue to use pragmatics as an example. Journals like *Pedagogical Linguistics* are one step in the right direction, but not the only step that needs to be taken. Articles in such journals can help colleagues identify what should be included in teacher-education courses, but we also need to meet teachers in sites of professional development for teachers. We cannot expect teachers to come to us. Pragmatics researchers have been very successful in working with ESL/EFL teachers at the annual international TESOL conferences, and a variety of interest sections have sponsored pragmatics talks and workshops. Teachers seem to be quite interested in the topic as judged by both comments and audience sizes.

An inspiring model of researcher-teacher interaction is found in the "teacher-friendly" research, promoted by colleagues at Concordia University in Montreal. Teacher-friendly research presentations meet teachers at teacher meetings, and they use informed, but accessible language, and invite the teachers in, treating them as colleagues. Many teachers who attend the presentations have participated in or have students who have participated in the classroom-based research studies being presented; when I have attended such presentations I have noticed that teachers may bring colleagues with them.

Perhaps the most important part of outreach is to thank the institutions that host our research. Following Dörnyei's (2007) admonition to thank the institution may open additional opportunities for teaching. While a *thank-you* note could satisfy the social obligation, there are other means of thanking a teacher or program such as offering to teach an immediate follow-up lesson on whatever was researched so the learners know the answers to the questions on the assessment task. Another way is to tell the host language program how the learners did once the study is completed and discuss the results and *interpret* the results together. Discussing what the findings mean for their program, their students, and the teachers not only provides another opportunity for teacher education, it also enriches our own research with teacher perspectives.

A recent volume entitled *Doing SLA research with implications for the classroom: Reconciling methodological demands and pedagogical applicability* (DeKeyser & Botana, 2019) challenged the contributing classroom researchers to think about whether instructed SLA research was relevant for classroom implementation and if so, how it fits in. This is the final stage of pedagogical linguistics: to not only educate language teachers, but to educate language teachers in different areas of linguistics with the expressed purpose of affecting language teaching. Swaying individual teachers may ultimately not be sufficient. In the long game, pedagogical linguistics may also need to help teachers formulate student-learning outcomes and corresponding assessment activities for the content that we advocating be incorporated into the curriculum.

Educating linguists to do pedagogical linguistics

My final point of advocacy has to do with teaching the next generation of linguists to do pedagogical linguistics. The next generation of SLA researchers will not engage in pedagogical linguistics unless we teach them how. While we can model engagement, I find that an approach that requires that they write for teachers to work well. I have the privilege of teaching a full-year SLA seminar for advanced PhD students, which gives us the luxury of time. In the second semester after the

PhD students have established their research, they are required to write a teacher-audience paper based on their own work. We use paired models (such as the research-teaching pairs I mentioned earlier), so they can see the difference in language and approach in the two types of papers; we also review submission information from relevant pedagogically-focused, research-informed journals, so they become familiar with journal expectations for pedagogical venues. This is harder for some students than others: Some are naturals, and some find greater challenges in explaining basic concepts simply. The process requires one or more revision and is enhanced by peer review among classmates. Overall it is a worthwhile undertaking.

Whatever one's personal approach to pedagogical linguistics, explicitly modeling it and asking future linguists to engage in it, not only assures the future of pedagogical linguistics, it prepares PhD students for job interviews. Applicants for positions in SLA or applied linguistics are likely to be asked what pedagogical application their dissertations have for language teaching. It is to the candidate's advantage to be able to answer that question with some forethought.

A final way to promote pedagogical linguistics is to challenge ourselves to write one teacher-audience paper per research project, whether theoretical, acquisitional, or instructed SLA. With a journal devoted to pedagogical linguistics and other venues that welcome research-informed pedagogy, the placement of such work is no longer problematic.

One of the steps in securing the future of pedagogical linguistics as realized in pragmatics is to have students (and in-service teachers) engage in actual pedagogical projects that either collect primary data or make use of someone else's data. To that end, I conclude with 10 suggestions for projects that teachers, teacher-trainers, and pre-service teachers can undertake.

Pedagogical linguistics projects for teachers and teacher-educators in training:

1. Go through instructional effect studies (even in a single journal or divide journals among students) and collect input texts or video, making sure to document the sources. (I am biased toward the authentic, authentic scripted, and role-played performances of proficient speakers). The resulting collection then forms a resource for input for future instruction. (A more ambitious project is to assemble the input, activities, and assessment, if reported, for future teaching.)
2. Become familiar with a corpus that has relevant data for the area that you teach. (This may be an assignment on its own. It is at least a separate step to have students explain why the corpus they have selected is appropriate before proceeding to the next step). Identify and extract useful pedagogical examples. Decide how long the excerpts should be to establish context. Determine presentational format (see Bardovi-Harlig & Mossman, 2016, for

requests; Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2015a, for agreements, disagreements, and clarifications).

3. Become familiar with a corpus that has relevant data for the area that you teach. Identify useful pedagogical examples and design corpus-searches for your target student population. (Reppen, 2010, provides the basics of teaching with corpora; Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2017; Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman, & Rothgerber et al., 2019, provide some examples of working with pragmatic routines and speech acts.)
4. Propose a lesson or a unit of lessons that teaches choice (not correct or incorrect use). All the options in the lessons should be appropriate, but vary by a definable variable, such as, strength of commitment to a proposition, status of interlocutor, or directness of an individual.
5. Use primary research (published or your own data) as a source of input to create metalinguistic statements that are informative, accurate, and comprehensible to language learners. Avoid statements that relate how to do the task (e.g. "mark 4 or 5 because it's polite"), focus on the pragmatics of the situation. (See studies by Alcón Soler and colleagues for insightful examples; e.g., Alcón Soler, 2007; Alcón Soler & Guzmán Pitarch, 2010).
6. Empirically establish a list of candidate pragmatic routines in use in your community or institution that have pedagogical value for your language learners. Verify their frequency using a relevant corpus (follow Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2015a).
7. Conduct your own evaluation of pragmatic input in the textbooks used in your language program(s). (To do this, students will need a description of a speech act either from the literature or from their own data collection.) Choose an appropriate level of investigation. One might first ask whether a particular speech act is represented in textbooks. If so, go on to whether its realization (head act, semantic formulas, content, or form) is appropriate.
8. For future or in-service ESL/EFL teachers, identify multiple examples of "polite requests" from ESL/EFL textbooks. (These are requests that almost invariably use *will*.) From conversation, equivalent corpora, or role plays, collect examples from highly competent speakers in situations analogous to those used by the textbooks and compare them. Either provide a pragmatic interpretation for the textbook "polite requests" or re-write the textbook unit using the requests that you collected.
9. Identify a speech act and context of your choice, and compare the characteristics and quality of data available from the authentic side of the pedagogical input scale (Bardovi-Harlig, 2015): conversation, authentic-scripted (movies, films), and role plays. Collect enough tokens of each to be able to make your

comparison, then determine which best serves what pedagogical purpose. Does your decision change if all input is either audio or audio-visual?
10. Replicate the comparison of DCT (discourse completion task) data and corpus-data reported by Schauer and Adolphs (2006) for thanking expressions. Choose a speech act and an appropriate corpus, and then construct (or find) a DCT. Advanced students might try creating an oral DCT based on the contexts in the corpus.

The outcome of such class projects could be archived for use of the creators and classmates. Ideally, they should be tested in the classroom as a second step. Once tested, materials can be uploaded to a pragmatics teaching archive, such as the wiki *wlpragmatics* sponsored by Andrew Cohen (see also Cohen, 2016).

5. Concluding remarks

I hope to have shown that researchers in the field of second language pragmatics have been actively engaged in the undertakings of pedagogical linguistics and that there is still more to be done. Above all, I hope to have shown that this is an area of rewarding intellectual pursuit, and that it can be a venue in which researchers, methodologists, materials developers, and language teachers can collaborate to the ultimate benefit of second and foreign language learners.

References

Alcón Soler, E. (2007). Fostering EFL learners' awareness of requesting through explicit and implicit consciousness-raising tasks. In M. del Pilar Garcia Mayo (Ed.), *Investigating tasks in formal language learning* (pp. 221–241). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Alcón Soler, E., & Guzmán Pitarch, J. (2010). The effect of instruction on learners' pragmatic awareness: A focus on refusals. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10, 65–80. https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/1/113981

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning*, 49, 677–713.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524797.005

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2010). Pragmatics and second language acquisition. In R. Kaplan (Ed.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 232–243). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2013). Developing L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning*, 63(Suppl.1), 68–86. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00738.x

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2015). Operationalizing conversation in studies of instructional effects in L2 pragmatics. *System*, 48, 21–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.002

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2017). Acquisition of pragmatics. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *Handbook of instructed SLA* (pp. 224–245). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Hartford, B.A.S., Mahan-Taylor, R., Morgan, M.J., & Reynolds, D.W. (1991). Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversation. *ELT Journal*, 45, 4–15. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/45.1.4

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching pragmatics*. Washington, DC: United States Department of State. <http://americanenglish.state.gov/search/solr/pragmatics>

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mossman, S. (2016). Corpus-based materials development for teaching and learning pragmatic routines. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.) *SLA research and materials development for language learning*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Su, Y. (2017). The effect of corpus-based instruction on pragmatic routines. *Language Learning & Technology*, 21, 76-103.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., Rothgerber, J., & Su, Y., & Swanson, K. (2019). Revisiting clarifications: Self- and other-clarifications in corpus-based pragmatics instruction. In M. Sato & S. Loewen (Eds.), *Evidence-based second language pedagogy: A collection of instructed second language acquisition studies* (pp. 52–80). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Su, Y. (2019). Integrating instructed second language acquisition research, pragmatics, and corpus-based instruction in an intensive English program. In R.M. DeKeyser & G.P. Botana (Eds). *Doing SLA research with implications for the classroom: Reconciling methodological demands and pedagogical applicability* (pp. 55–81). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Vellenga, H.E. (2015a). Developing corpus-based materials to teach pragmatic routines. *TESOL Journal*, 6, 499–526. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.177

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Vellenga, H.E. (2015b). The effect of instruction on pragmatic routines in academic discussion. *Language Teaching Research*, 19, 324–350. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541739

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Yilmaz, Y. (in press). Corrective feedback in instructional pragmatics. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in language learning and teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Billmyer, K. (1990). "I really like your lifestyle": ESL learners learning how to compliment. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 6, 31–48.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Borg, S. (2010). Language teacher research engagement. *Language Teaching*, 43, 391–429. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000170

Bouton, L.F. (1994). Can NNS skill in interpreting implicatures in American English be improved through explicit instruction? A pilot study. In L.F. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol 5, pp. 88–109). Urbana-Champaign, IL: Division of English as an International Language, University of Illinois.

Boxer, D., & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: The case of complaints. *ELT Journal*, 49, 44–58. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.1.44

Cheng, W., & Cheng, P. (2010). Correcting others and self-correcting in business and professional discourse and textbooks. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (Vol. 7 of Handbooks of pragmatics, pp. 443–466). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cobb, T. (n.d.). *Corpus Concordance English* [computer program]. <http://www.lextutor.ca/conc/eng> (16 November, 2014).
Cohen, A.D. (2016). The design and construction of websites to promote L2 pragmatics. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & J.C. Félix-Brasdefer (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 14, pp. 341–356). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
Cohen, A.D. (2018). *Learning pragmatics from native and nonnative language teachers*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/COHEN9924
Cohen, A.D., & Ishihara, N. (2013). Pragmatics. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Applied linguistics and materials development* (pp. 113–126). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
Crookes, G. (1998). On the relationship between second and foreign language teachers and research. *TESOL Journal* 7, 6–11.
Crystal, D. (Ed.). (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
Davies, M. (2008–). *The Corpus of Contemporary American English: 450 million words, 1990-present*. <http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>
DeKeyser, & Botana, G.P. (Eds). (2019). *Doing SLA research with implications for the classroom: Reconciling methodological demands and pedagogical applicability*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.52
Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Du Bois, J.W., Chafe, W.L., Meyer, C., Thompson, S.A., Englebretson, R., & Martey, N. (2000–2005). *Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English (Parts 1–4)*. Philadelphia PA: Linguistic Data Consortium. <http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/research/santa-barbara-corpus> (1 November, 2019).
Eisenchlas, S.A. (2011). On-line interactions as a resource to raise pragmatic awareness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 51–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.08.013
Eslami, Z., & Liu, C. (2013). Learning pragmatics through computer-mediated communication in Taiwan. *Iranian Journal of Science, Culture and Language*, 1, 52–73.
Félix-Brasdefer, J.C. (2006). Teaching the negotiation of multi-turn speech acts: Using conversation-analytic tools to teach pragmatics in the classroom. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, C. Félix-Brasdefer, & A.S. Omar (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 11, pp. 165–197). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
Félix-Brasdefer, J.C., & Cohen, A.D. (2012). Teaching pragmatics in the foreign language classroom: Grammar as a communicative resource. *Hispania*, 95, 650–669. https://doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2012.0124
Hartford, B.S., & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1992). Closing the conversation: Evidence from the academic advising session. *Discourse Processes*, 15, 93–116. https://doi.org/10.1080/01638539209544803
Holmes, J., & Riddiford, N. (2010). From classroom to workplace: Tracking socio-pragmatic development. *ELT Journal*, 65, 376–386. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq071
Houck, N.R., & Tatsuki, D.H. (Eds.). (2011). *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation*. New York, NY: TESOL.
Ishihara, N. (2010). Instructional pragmatics: Bridging teaching, research, and teacher education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4, 938–953. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2010.00242.x

Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A.D. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. London: Longman.
Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A.D. (2014). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. New York, NY: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833842
Jeon, E.H., & Kaya, T. (2006). Effects of L2 instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development: A meta-analysis. In J.M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 165–211). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.13.10jeo
Kasper, G. (1982). Teaching-induced aspects of interlanguage discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 4, 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100004368
Kasper, G. (1997). The role of pragmatics in language teacher education. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, & B.S. Hartford (Eds.), *Beyond methods: Components of language teacher education* (pp. 113–136). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 33–60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524797.006
Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 215–247. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100009955
Kasper, G., & Rose, K.R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 81–104.
Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 149–169. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100014868
Koike, D. (2008). A grammar of L2 pragmatics: Issues in learning and teaching. In S. Katz & J. Watzinger-Tharp (Eds.), *Conceptions of L2 grammar: Theoretical approaches and their application in the L2 classroom* (pp. 35–52). Boston, MA: Heinle.
Koike, D., & Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in the development of pragmatic competence. *System*, 33, 481–501. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.06.008
Limberg, H. (2016). "Always remember to say *please* and *thank you*": Teaching politeness with German EFL textbooks. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & C. Félix-Brasdefer (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 14, pp. 265–292). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
Martínez-Flor, A., & Usó-Juan, E. (2006). A comprehensive pedagogical framework to develop pragmatics in the foreign language classroom: The 6Rs approach. *Applied Language Learning*, 16, 39–64.
Nguyen, T.T.M. (2013). Instructional effects on the acquisition of modifiers in constructive criticism by EFL learners. *Language Awareness*, 22, 76–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2012.658810
Nguyen, T.T.M., & Basturkmen, H. (2010). Teaching constructive critical feedback. In D.H. Tatsuki & N.R. Houck (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching speech acts* (pp. 125–140). New York, NY: TESOL.

Nguyen, T.T.M., Pham, M.T., & Cao, T.H. (2013). The effects of explicit metapragmatic instruction on EFL learners' performance of constructive criticism in an academic setting. In T. Greer, D. Tatsuki, & C. Roever (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 13, pp. 213–244). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Nguyen, T.T.M., Pham, T.H., & Pham, M.T. (2012). The relative effects of explicit and implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 416–434. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.01.003

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A.D. (1991). Teaching speech act behavior to nonnative speakers. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 154–165). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reppen, R. (2010). *Using corpora in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riddiford, N. (2007). Making requests appropriately in a second language: Does instruction help to develop pragmatic proficiency? *TESOLANZ Journal*, 15, 88–102.

Riddiford, N., & Joe, A. (2010). Tracking the devlopment of sociopragmatic skills. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44, 195–205. https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2010.215252

Riddiford, N., & Newton, J. (2010). *Workplace talk in action: An ESOL resource*. Wellington: School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.

Rose, K.R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System*, 33, 385–399. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.06.003

Rose, K., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524797

Schauer, G.A., & Adolphs, S. (2006). Expressions of gratitude in corpus and DCT data: Vocabulary, formulaic sequences, and pedagogy. *System*, 34, 119–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.09.003

Scotton, C.M., & Bernsten, J. (1988). Natural conversations as a model for textbook dialogue. *Applied Linguistics*, 9, 372–384. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/9.4.372

Simpson, R.C., Briggs, S.L., Ovens, J., & Swales, J.M. (2002). *The Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English*. Ann Arbor, MI: The Regents of the University of Michigan. <quod.lib.umich.edu/m/micase/> (1 November, 2019).

Sykes, J.M. (2013). Multiuser virtual environments: Learner apologies in Spanish. In N. Taguchi & J.M. Sykes (Eds.), *Technology in interlanguage pragmatics research and teaching* (pp. 71–100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.36.05syk

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

Takahashi, S. (2010). Assessing learnability in second language pragmatics. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (Handbooks of Pragmatics, Vol. 7, pp. 391–421). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tatsuki, D.H., & Houck, N.R. (Eds.). (2010). *Pragmatics: Teaching speech acts* (pp. 163–180). New York, NY: TESOL.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 91–111. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.91
Vellenga, H. E. (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL and EFL Textbooks: How likely? *TESL-EJ*, 8 (2).
Wildner-Bassett, M. E. (1984). *Improving pragmatic aspects of learners' interlanguage*. Tübingen: Narr.
Williams, M. (1988). Language taught for meetings and language used in meetings: Is there anything in common? *Applied Linguistics*, 9, 45–58. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/9.1.45
Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Address for correspondence

Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig
Department of Second Language Studies
Indiana University
Ballantine Hall
Bloomington, IN 47405
USA
bardovi@indiana.edu