Exploring the Potential of a Formula-Enhanced Approach
for Speech Act Teaching in Language Instruction for
Newcomers to Canada

by

Alisa Zavialova

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral
Affairs in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Applied Linguistics and Discourse Studies

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

© 2020, Alisa Zavialova

Abstract

Pragmatic formulas can augment both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of second language (L2) pragmatic competence and serve as linguistic building blocks necessary for successful speech act performance (Bardovi-Harlig, 2012). Major approaches to speech act teaching (e.g., Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006) encourage explicit meta-pragmatic explanations aimed at drawing learners' attention to degrees of power, distance, and imposition; however, these approaches make vague references to pragmatic formulas despite their pragmalinguistic value, promoting an unbalanced view of pragmatics instruction. In addition, there is an urgent need for classroom-based studies targeting L2 pragmatics in community-based language programs, such as Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) since the majority of existing teaching intervention studies in this area have been conducted in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) settings (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012).

To address these gaps, an approach to teaching L2 pragmatics that goes beyond awareness-raising and consists of a carefully planned instructional sequence enhanced by an explicit focus on pragmatic formulas was developed for this study; this approach was contrasted with the more widely recommended awareness-raising approach. A two-cycle qualitative utterance analysis was conducted to determine how pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities of the students in both treatment groups evolved after the intervention. In addition, three trained expert judges evaluated students' pragmatic performance to complement the findings of the qualitative utterance analysis. To determine which pedagogical features of the formula-enhanced approach make it more

effective, eight instructional treatment sessions were observed, and the recorded classroom episodes were qualitatively analyzed.

The results showed that formula-enhanced pragmatics instruction can help L2 learners achieve higher levels of both pragmatic and grammatical proficiency by contributing to lexical richness and nativelikeness of expression and preventing negative transfer from the first language or overreliance on the same formula when producing various speech acts. The findings of the classroom observation analysis revealed that the main pedagogical advantage of the formula-enhanced approach is that it provides L2 learners with multiple opportunities to build appropriate form-function-context connections which can facilitate higher levels of cognitive processing of input leading to bottom-up discovery of the target pragmatic conventions and long-term retention of nativelike pragmatic formulas.

Acknowledgements

As my time as a graduate student at Carleton University is coming to an end, I feel a little sad but, at the same time, excited to begin a new chapter. I have finally reached the end of this long journey, which, no matter how challenging, was no doubt worth embarking on. Many phenomenal people accompanied me on this journey and made it possible for me to arrive at a place I find myself today.

First and foremost, I would like to express deepest gratitude to my one-of-a-kind supervisor, Dr. David Wood, who has been supporting me since the very beginning of this journey. When I moved to Canada from Ukraine back in 2013 to pursue graduate studies in applied linguistics, Dr. Wood was one of the first professors at the School of Linguistics and Language Studies (SLALS) who welcomed me with open arms and inspired me to become a language educator. Since then, I have learnt many valuable academic, professional, as well as life lessons from Dr. Wood, who will continue to be my role-model in years to come. The completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without you, David. I thank you from the bottom of my heart for everything you have done for me.

I must also thank my PhD committee members, Dr. Leila Ranta and Dr. Michael Rodgers, for their critical contributions to this project and for sharing their expertise and wisdom with me. A huge thanks to Dr. Ranta who was always available for much-needed Skype consultations, despite her busy schedule and a time difference. You essentially acted as my co-supervisor, and your pivotal role in my academic and professional development cannot be overestimated. I must also thank Dr. Rodgers for his words of encouragement and for all the insightful comments he made on earlier versions of this

dissertation. I am also very grateful to SLALS professors Dr. Eva Kartchava and Dr. Janna Fox, who have always seen potential in me and supported me in all ways possible throughout my graduate studies at Carleton. It has been both a privilege and a pleasure to be your student and your research assistant.

I am also extremely grateful to the two teachers from Language Instruction to Newcomers to Canada program here in Ottawa, who volunteered to participate in this study and allowed me to work with their students. I have always believed that researchers can only make a difference if they work in close collaboration with practitioners in the field. By participating in my project, you have helped to narrow the gap between research and practice. I must also thank all wonderful staff members at the Ottawa Chinese Community Service Centre, and especially Ms. Snezana Minic, for always treating me with so much respect and kindness and for her unwavering support throughout various stages of this project. I would also like to extend my warmest wishes to Don Myles of Carleton University, Dmitri Priven of Algonquin College, and Vanessa Reyes of UNAM-Canadá and thank them for being such wonderful and supportive colleagues. Most importantly, I wish to thank all those second language students whom I have had a privilege to teach throughout these years, and who remain my main source of motivation giving me energy to keep moving forward.

The person who deserves my most sincere gratitude is my lifetime partner and beloved husband Anton Burinkov, who has always been there for me during both ups and downs and whose love and endless support have kept me grounded. I am indeed blessed to have a partner like you, and I feel confident that together we can move mountains.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction	16
1.1. Background.....	16
1.2. Gaps in Research and Pedagogy.....	18
1.2.1. <i>Pragmatic Formulas in Formulaic Language Pedagogy</i>	18
1.2.2. <i>Pragmatic Formulas in Speech Act Teaching Models</i>	20
1.2.3. <i>Classroom-based Research</i>	21
1.3. The Present Study.....	23
1.3.1. <i>Research Context</i>	23
1.3.2. <i>Research Design</i>	25
1.3.3. <i>Organization of the Dissertation</i>	25
Chapter 2: Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks.....	27
1.1. Pragmatics	27
1.1.1. <i>Major Theoretical Frameworks</i>	29
1.1.2. <i>Defining Pragmatic Competence</i>	34
1.1.3. <i>Cross-cultural and Interlanguage Pragmatics</i>	37
1.2. Formulas in Pragmatics	39
1.2.1. <i>Terminological Variety</i>	40
1.2.2. <i>Formula Identification and Elicitation Tools</i>	44
1.3. SLA Theoretical Frameworks	48
1.3.1. <i>Noticing, Comprehension, and Processing of Input</i>	50

1.3.2.	<i>Focus on Form in Pragmatics</i>	53
1.3.3.	<i>Mental Processing and Acquisition of Formulas</i>	57
Chapter 3: Review of Classroom-Based Research		61
3.1.	Pragmatics in the L2 Classroom.....	61
3.1.1.	<i>Development of L2 Pragmatic Ability in the Language Classroom</i>	62
3.1.2.	<i>Approaches to Speech Act Teaching</i>	68
3.2.	Formulaic Language in the L2 Classroom	73
3.2.1.	<i>Pedagogical Techniques Used in Formulaic Language Teaching</i>	73
3.2.2.	<i>Selection and Teachability of Formulas</i>	77
3.3.	Formulaic Language and Spoken Language Proficiency	80
3.3.1.	<i>Fluency Development</i>	81
3.3.2.	<i>Pragmatic Competence Enhancement</i>	82
3.4.	Conclusion.....	87
3.4.1.	<i>Research Questions</i>	89
Chapter 4: Method		91
4.1.	Pre-Intervention Phase.....	92
4.1.1.	<i>Emerging Formula-Enhanced Approach in the Pilot Study</i>	92
4.1.2.	<i>Refined Formula-Enhanced Approach in the Main Study</i>	96
4.2.	Teaching Intervention Phase	107
4.2.1.	<i>Participants</i>	107
4.2.2.	<i>Data Collection</i>	111
4.2.3.	<i>Data Analysis</i>	113
Chapter 5: Results and Discussion of the Qualitative Utterance Analysis		126
5.1.	First Cycle of Analysis: Major Patterns of Interlanguage Formula Development	126
5.2.	Second Cycle of Analysis: Pragmalinguistic and Sociopragmatic Violations	132

5.2.1.	<i>Invitations</i>	133
5.2.2.	<i>Appointments</i>	140
5.2.3.	<i>Resolving Issues</i>	144
5.2.4.	<i>Responding to Requests</i>	149
5.2.5.	<i>Summary of Results</i>	155
5.3.	<i>Discussion</i>	156
5.3.1.	<i>The Nature of Pragmalinguistic Violations in Both Treatment Groups</i>	158
5.3.2.	<i>The Nature of Sociopragmatic Violations in Both Treatment Groups</i>	163
Chapter 6: Results and Discussion of the Expert Judgements		168
6.1.	First cycle of analysis: Group Mean Scores	168
6.1.1.	<i>FE Group</i>	168
6.1.2.	<i>AR Group</i>	174
6.2.	Second Cycle of Analysis: Prominent Individual Cases	179
6.2.1.	<i>Invitations</i>	180
6.2.2.	<i>Appointments</i>	187
6.2.3.	<i>Resolving Issues</i>	195
6.2.4.	<i>Responding to Requests</i>	200
6.3.	<i>Discussion</i>	207
6.3.1.	<i>The Role of Formulas in the Development of Students' Pragmalinguistic Ability.</i>	208
6.3.2.	<i>The Role of Formulas in the Development of Students' Sociopragmatic Ability...</i>	215
Chapter 7: Results and Discussion of Analysis of Classroom Episodes.....		221
7.1.	Trends Recorded during the FE Instructional Treatment	222
7.1.1.	<i>Noticing Pragmatic Formulas in the Input</i>	222
7.1.2.	<i>Discovering Form-Function-Context Relationship</i>	227
7.1.3.	<i>Discovering the Target Notions of Directness, Politeness, and Appropriateness</i> .	232

7.2.	Trends Recorded during the AR Instructional Treatment	236
7.2.1.	<i>Noticing Pragmatic Formulas in the Input</i>	236
7.2.2.	<i>Discovering the Target Notions of Directness, Politeness, and Appropriateness</i> .	242
7.3.	Discussion.....	247
7.3.1.	<i>Signs of Deep Cognitive Engagement during the FE Instructional Treatment</i>	249
7.3.2.	<i>Signs of Superficial Cognitive Engagement during the AR Instructional Treatment</i>	
	253	
Chapter 8:	Conclusions, Implications, and Future Directions	258
8.1.	Major Findings: Research Questions 1 and 2	258
8.2.	Major Findings: Research Questions 3 and 4	261
8.3.	Theoretical and Practical Implications	264
8.3.1.	<i>Interlanguage and Instructional Pragmatics</i>	264
8.3.2.	<i>L2 Teaching, Curricular Development, Assessment, and Teacher Professional Development</i>	265
8.4.	Limitations of the Study	269
8.5.	Future Research Directions	271
References		275
Appendices		299
Appendix A:	Native Speaker Corpus (NSC)	299
Appendix B:	Target Pragmatic Formulas Selected for the Teaching Intervention.....	308
Appendix C:	Ethics Clearance.....	309
Appendix D:	Scenarios Used in Four Open-Ended Oral Discourse Completion Role-Plays..	310
Appendix E:	Formula-Enhanced Lesson Booklets.....	312
Appendix F:	Awareness-Raising Lesson Booklets.....	351
Appendix G:	Lesson Plan Notes for Teachers.....	379

Appendix H: Corpus of Students' Utterances Based on the First Cycle of Coding in the FE Group	383
Appendix I: Corpus of Students' Utterances Based on the First Cycle of Coding in the AR Group	389
Appendix J: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the FE Group	395
Appendix K: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the AR Group	396
Appendix L: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the FE Group	398
Appendix M: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the AR Group	400
Appendix N: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the FE Group	401
Appendix O: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the AR Group	402
Appendix P: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the FE Group	404
Appendix Q: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the AR Group	406

List of Tables

Table 1.	Major approaches to speech act teaching.....	72
Table 2.	Distribution of codes in the 1 st cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis....	130
Table 3.	Invitations FE group: Pragmalinguistic component.....	168
Table 4.	Invitations FE group: Sociopragmatic component.....	168
Table 5.	Appointments FE: Pragmalinguistic component.....	169
Table 6.	Appointments FE: Sociopragmatic component.....	169
Table 7.	Resolving issues FE: Pragmalinguistic component.....	170
Table 8.	Resolving issues FE: Sociopragmatic component.....	170
Table 9.	Responding to requests FE: Pragmalinguistic component.....	172
Table 10.	Responding to requests FE: Sociopragmatic component.....	172
Table 11.	Invitations AR group: Pragmalinguistic component.....	173
Table 12.	Invitations AR group: Sociopragmatic component.....	173
Table 13.	Appointments AR: Pragmalinguistic component.....	174
Table 14.	Appointments AR: Sociopragmatic component.....	175
Table 15.	Resolving issues AR group: Pragmalinguistic component.....	176
Table 16.	Resolving issues AR group: Sociopragmatic component.....	176
Table 17.	Responding to requests AR group: Pragmalinguistic component.....	177

Table 18.	Responding to requests AR group: Sociopragmatic component.....	177
Table 19.	Individual scores in the FE group: Invitations.....	179
Table 20.	Verbal responses in the FE group: Invitations.....	181
Table 21.	Individual scores in the AR group: Invitations.....	183
Table 22.	Verbal responses in the AR group: Invitations.....	185
Table 23.	Individual scores in the FE group: Appointments.....	187
Table 24.	Verbal responses in the FE group: Appointments.....	190
Table 25.	Individual scores in the AR group: Appointments.....	191
Table 26.	Verbal responses in the AR group: Appointments.....	193
Table 27.	Individual scores in the FE group: Resolving issues.....	194
Table 28.	Verbal responses in the FE group: Resolving issues.....	196
Table 29.	Individual scores in the AR group: Resolving issues.....	197
Table 30.	Verbal responses in the AR group: Resolving issues.....	199
Table 31.	Individual scores in the FE group: Responding to requests.....	200
Table 32.	Verbal responses in the FE group: Responding to requests.....	203
Table 33.	Individual scores in the AR group: Responding to requests.....	204
Table 34.	Verbal responses in the AR group: Responding to requests.....	205

List of Figures

<i>Figure 1.</i> Pragmatic competence in major models of communicative competence.....	35
<i>Figure 2.</i> Formulas in pragmatics.....	41
<i>Figure 3.</i> An example of a written DCT.....	48
<i>Figure 4.</i> Phases of data collection.....	89
<i>Figure 5.</i> A 6-hour course in the pilot study intervention.....	93
<i>Figure 6.</i> Diagnostic criteria for justifying intuitive judgements about formulaicity.....	99
<i>Figure 7.</i> Methodological triangulation of data analysis methods.....	111
<i>Figure 8.</i> First and second cycle coding categories in the qualitative utterance analysis..	116
<i>Figure 9.</i> Pragmalinguistic component of the diagnostic rubric.....	119
<i>Figure 10.</i> Sociopragmatic component of the diagnostic rubric.....	120
<i>Figure 11.</i> Patterns of interlanguage formula development observed in the FE group...	125
<i>Figure 12.</i> Patterns of interlanguage formula development observed in the AR group...	129
<i>Figure 13.</i> An excerpt from the ‘Deep Cognitive Engagement’ phase in the FE approach.....	228

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Native Speaker Corpus (NSC).....	298
Appendix B: Target Pragmatic Formulas Selected for the Teaching Intervention.....	307
Appendix C: Ethics Clearance.....	308
Appendix D: Scenarios Used in Four Open-Ended Oral Discourse Completion Role-Plays	309
Appendix E: Formula-Enhanced Lesson Booklets.....	311
Appendix F: Awareness-Raising Lesson Booklets.....	350
Appendix G: Lesson Plan Notes for Teachers.....	378
Appendix H: Corpus of Students' Utterances Based on the First Cycle of Coding in the FE Group.....	382
Appendix I: Corpus of Students' Utterances Based on the First Cycle of Coding in the AR Group.....	388
Appendix J: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the FE Group.....	394
Appendix K: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the AR Group....	395
Appendix L: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the FE Group....	397
Appendix M: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the AR Group....	399
Appendix N: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the FE Group....	400
Appendix O: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the AR Group....	401
Appendix P: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the FE Group.....	403
Appendix Q: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the AR Group....	405

List of Abbreviations

AR	Awareness-Raising
CLB	Canadian Language Benchmarks
DCT	Discourse Completion Task
EAP	English for Academic Purposes
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ESL	English as a Second Language
FE	Formula-Enhanced
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
LINC	Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada
NSC	Native Speaker Corpus
DCRP	Discourse Completion Role-play
SLA	Second Language Acquisition

Chapter 1: Introduction

This introductory chapter provides a brief overview of the research problem, followed by a quick presentation of the three major research gaps identified as a result of an analysis of the research literature; next, the motivation for the present study is explained followed by an overview of the research questions and the overall organization of this dissertation.

1.1. Background

Pragmatics can be defined as the study of contextual meaning or meaning expressed by speakers in interaction (Yule, 1996; Thomas, 1995). Pragmatics has had a major impact on applied linguistics and has shaped the approaches to second language (L2) instruction. The Communicative Approach to language teaching, which currently dominates L2 pedagogy around the world, maintains that it is insufficient to simply learn how to compose grammatically correct sentences to successfully acquire a second language (Savignon, 1975, 1976). In addition to the knowledge of linguistic forms, L2 language learners also need to develop an ability to use grammatical forms appropriately in a given context to successfully achieve communicative purposes (Widdowson, 1978). This understanding has led to the emergence of the concept of *pragmatic competence* as an integral component of overall communicative language ability in L2, in addition to grammatical and lexical competences (Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Celce-Murcia, 2007). Pragmatic competence implies a good command of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge. *Pragmalinguistic knowledge* can be defined as the knowledge of language resources used by speakers for achieving pragmatic purposes, while *sociopragmatic*

knowledge can be defined as the knowledge of rules and other conventions that guide contextual use of language in society (Bardovi-Harlig, 2017).

Acquiring pragmatic competence can be a time-consuming process and even after many years in a target language environment, certain pragmatic features remain non-native-like (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986). Experts believe that it may take up to fifteen years to acquire nativelike pragmatic ability that is indistinguishable from that of the native speakers in the given speech community (Cohen & Weaver, 2006). Nevertheless, research suggests that it is possible to enhance L2 learners' pragmatic competence through pedagogical intervention and that explicit instruction of pragmatics seems to be more effective than implicit instruction (Taguchi, 2015). One way to enhance L2 pragmatic competence is to place formulaic sequences known as *routine formulae* or *pragmatic formulas* at the center of L2 pragmatics instruction. Such formulaic sequences play a valuable role in augmenting both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of L2 pragmatic competence since they provide verbal means for mastering various social situations and are closely associated with performance of speech acts (Bardovi-Harlig, Rose, & Nickels, 2008). Pragmatic formulas serve as linguistic devices for performing various speech acts like apologizing, making requests, and many others (e.g., *I am sorry to hear about* + [*any meaningful completion of the phrase*] to express regret) (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992). Therefore, acquiring such sequences can be particularly beneficial for developing pragmatic competence because of their capacity to serve as a pragmalinguistic resource in L2 learners' speech (Bardovi-Harlig, 2009, 2012).

The study presented in this doctoral dissertation is an attempt to consolidate knowledge from the theoretical domains of formulaic language, pragmatics, and second language acquisition

(SLA) theories in order to suggest practical implications for L2 pedagogy. In particular, the study aims at bridging the gap between research and practice by developing a more refined approach to speech act teaching that goes beyond awareness-raising and consists of a carefully planned instructional sequence enhanced by an explicit focus on pragmatic formulas. In this dissertation, an innovative formula-enhanced approach, which was specifically designed for the purpose of the present study, is contrasted with a traditional awareness-raising approach to speech act teaching; the efficacy of both teaching approaches is compared in terms of enhancing both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities of L2 learners.

1.2. Gaps in Research and Pedagogy

1.2.1. Pragmatic Formulas in Formulaic Language Pedagogy

Communicative ability in L2 largely depends on formulaic sequences of different kinds, length and complexity, especially if we consider that formulaic language may comprise up to sixty percent of spoken discourse (Altenberg, 1998, as cited in Wood, 2015). This important role of formulaic language in SLA has also been acknowledged in multiple communicative competence frameworks. For example, an ability to use formulaic expressions at different stages of language proficiency is mentioned in Canadian Language Benchmarks (CLB) (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2012) as one of the main criteria for successful oral and written performance. Other recent models of communicative competence (e.g., Celce-Murcia, 2007) also recognize the importance of formulaic language for the development of overall communicative language ability. Various studies have reported on the role of formulaic language in fluency improvement (Wood, 2010); vocabulary acquisition (Webb & Kagimoto, 2010); pragmatic competence enhancement (Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005); and teaching academic writing skills (AlHassan & Wood, 2015), to name just a few.

Despite the wide recognition of the importance of formulaic language for successful second language comprehension and production, Wood (2015) notes that “*surprisingly little effort* has been put into investigating how to teach it, particularly to second language learners” (p. 139, emphasis added). In formulaic language pedagogy, awareness-raising teaching methods such as the Lexical Approach (Lewis, 1997, 2008), which are primarily based on the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), are most frequently reported in the literature (e.g., Boers et al., 2006; Webb & Kagimoto, 2010; Peters, 2012). While such methods are believed to be effective for raising L2 students’ awareness about the phraseological aspect of the target language and directing their attention to certain kinds of lexical items, vocabulary and formulaic language specialists agree that in order to form durable mental representations of lexical items in learners’ long-term memory, the instruction should include activities which involve *deep cognitive processing* or *cognitive engagement* with the both meaning and form of the target items (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009; Eyckmans, Boers, & Lindstromberg, 2016; Wood, 2015). Deep cognitive processing is based on the notion of elaboration which requires the learner “to engage in a cognitive activity with regard to a particular lexical item that goes beyond this item merely being noticed” (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009, p. 22). The two main types of deep cognitive processing are *semantic elaboration* and *structural elaboration*. Semantic elaboration may include activities exploiting images, identifying the source of the target expression, or grouping phrasal verbs according to the theme of an underlying conceptual metaphor. Structural elaboration involves designing activities featuring such phonological features as alliteration and assonance in the target formulaic expressions (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). The deep cognitive engagement approach is probably more effective for acquisition and long-term retention of formulaic

language items. Thus far, there have been very few attempts to put it to the test, and studies have shown mixed findings (e.g., Eyckmans, Boers & Lindstromberg, 2016).

It is also worth noting that the majority of the published studies that used the deep cognitive engagement approach have focused on teaching collocations and idioms. Unlike collocations (e.g., *garage sale*) or idioms (e.g., *make both ends meet*, *kick the bucket*), which are not always related to any particular social situation and can occur at any point in a conversation, the use of pragmatic formulas is determined by a particular social interaction context (e.g., *Hold the line, please*; *You have to sign your name here*; *I wish I could help, but*; *Thanks for your understanding*). Moreover, unlike collocations or idioms, pragmatic formulas have a sentence-like grammatical structure (Pawley, 2007). This particular feature of pragmatic formulas, which, after Wray's (2002) definition, corresponds to the continuous (fixed) or discontinuous (semi-fixed) nature of formulaic sequences, may make the process of their acquisition and mental processing more difficult for L2 learners. Even though formulaic sequences are believed to be holistically stored in and retrieved from the mental lexicon at the time of communicative need without analysis of each of the constituent parts (Wray, 2002, 2008), the mental processing of pragmatic formulas should be investigated more closely due to their complicated syntactic structures.

1.2.2. Pragmatic Formulas in Speech Act Teaching Models

Major approaches to speech act teaching (e.g., Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006; Cohen, 2005) do not seem to pay enough attention to pragmatic formulas and make rather vague references to these formulaic sequences despite their pragmalinguistic value and promote an unbalanced approach to L2 pragmatic competence instruction by placing the main emphasis on the sociopragmatic component and neglecting the pragmalinguistic one. On the other hand,

pragmatic formulas have gained significant attention from sociolinguistically-oriented studies as well as in research on cross-cultural pragmatics (e.g., Olshtain & Cohen, 1990; Cohen & Olshtain, 1993; Cohen, Olshtain, Rosenstein, 1986; Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986; Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1990). However, little research has been done to investigate pragmatic formulas from the perspective of interlanguage pragmatics. In particular, few studies have explicitly focused on how L2 speakers produce pragmatic formulas in various speech acts (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig, Rose, & Nickels, 2008; Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012). Researchers agree that more longitudinal studies, as opposed to cross-sectional ones, are needed to uncover interlanguage development patterns in learners' acquisition of pragmatic competence and track the emergence of target formulas in L2 speech (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig, 2006; 2009).

1.2.3. Classroom-based Research

Apart from apparent research gaps in pedagogy and interlanguage development of pragmatic formulas, research in applied linguistics in general, and in formulaic language and pragmatics in particular, has not seen many process-oriented classroom-based studies. There exists a distinction between pure *product* and pure *process* research studies. In pure 'product' studies researchers are usually concerned with controlling various factors in order to replicate lab conditions, and experimental or quasi-experimental research design is common for this type of study (Allwright & Bailey, 1991). On the other hand, in pure 'process' studies researchers analyse interaction-based data collected during classroom activities, but do not document any learning outcomes. The research designs common for this type of study include observation, case study, protocols, stories, and diaries. Finally, research studies that belong to the third category are known as *process-product* studies. In this type of studies researchers try to "specifically

describe the classroom process and relate them to the documented learning outcomes” (Allwright & Bailey, 1991, p. 44). According to R. Ellis (2012), there are two main traditions in L2 classroom research: *confirmatory research* and *descriptive research*. Depending on the research tradition chosen, the research design and data collection methods will differ. Confirmatory research is usually theory-driven and employs either a true experimental or a quasi-experimental cross-sectional design. Descriptive research, on the other hand, aims at “understanding a specific aspect of teaching or learning and also at providing information that can ultimately be used to shape a theory” (Ellis, R., 2012, p. 25). Research of this type usually follows an ethnographic or interactional research approach, and longitudinal studies are more common for this research tradition.

Nevertheless, it is still common in classroom-based research to interpret the efficacy of a pedagogical treatment by using a cross-sectional design and calculating pre-test and post-test scores, without observing and documenting processes that occur in the classroom during the intervention. As R. Ellis (2012) observes, there are still few longitudinal studies of the L2 classroom. For example, Martynychiev (2010) in his doctoral dissertation, reviewed research studies published in the leading applied linguistics journals during a seven-year period (2002-2008) and found that the majority of the studies (64 %) used quantitative research methodology. However, only 28 % of the studies used qualitative design, and only 8 % had mixed methods research design. Therefore, more process-focused qualitative research that uses various observational procedures and documents processes involved in implementing pedagogical treatment is both important and timely (Allwright & Bailey, 1991).

1.3. The Present Study

I started to develop a special interest in the role of formulas in pragmatics research specifically in the context of Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) program since my time as a Master student. My keen interest in explicit instruction of pragmatic formulas for augmenting L2 pragmatic competence was generated by several seminal publications in this area (e.g., Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993; House, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig, 2012), as well as by my own practical experience working as a LINC teacher and observing the realities of this program first-hand. I was also inspired by my thesis supervisor, a recognized expert in formulaic language research and pedagogy, Dr. David Wood, who believes that more intervention studies linking knowledge of formulaic language with well-established methods like task-based teaching and focus on form are urgently needed (Wood, 2015). My Master's study (Zavialova, 2015) eventually grew into a doctoral project that is presented in this dissertation and aims at developing a more refined, formula-enhanced¹ approach to teaching L2 pragmatics in the LINC context.

1.3.1. Research Context

LINC program was established by the government of Canada in 1992 as one of the settlement programs run by the department of Citizenship and Immigration². The main mandate of LINC is to support the settlement and integration of adult permanent residents and provide basic language training in one of Canada's official languages as well as promote Canadian citizenship (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2010). According to the recent LINC

¹ The researcher owes thanks to Dr. Leila Ranta for coining this term.

² Recently renamed into Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada.

evaluation report published by the government of Canada (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2010), as of 2008, approximately 86% of Canada's permanent residents had a mother tongue other than English or French. According to statistical data published by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (Dempsey et al., 2009), the majority of LINC students across provinces were born in China, and Chinese speakers account for 25-30% of clients; Spanish and Arabic speakers represent the second largest language group accounting for approximately 10% of the student population. Skilled workers account for the largest number of LINC students annually, followed by family class immigrants, refugees, and other economic immigrants. At the same time, LINC student population is overall dominated by female students with low levels of previous education (Dempsey et al., 2009).

Logically, language proficiency is the main barrier newcomers face when looking for employment in Canada. Students with higher education tend to have better proficiency in English and, as a rule, graduate from LINC relatively quickly and continue to further their language education by enrolling into more advanced programs. In order to ensure smooth social, cultural, and economic integration into a Canadian society, newcomers should develop an ability to use linguistically accurate target language structures in a pragmatically appropriate manner to successfully achieve their communicative goals when engaging in spontaneous interaction with native or proficient speakers of the target language. Therefore, it is vital to continuously improve the quality of the language training provided by LINC since this program is of crucial importance for Canadian L2 education and society at large. Nevertheless, this community-based language program has not yet received proper attention from applied linguistics studies and, in particular, from the perspective of instructional pragmatics.

1.3.2. Research Design

The present study can be described as a process-oriented exploratory study with a quasi-experimental design involving a teaching intervention and pre-, post- and delayed post-test measures. As Mackey and Gass (2005) put it, “the purpose of such studies is to obtain a rich, detailed, participant-oriented pictures of the phenomena under study” (p. 167). The collected data were qualitative in nature and underwent an interpretative analysis (Grotjahn, 1987). In addition, for the purposes of credibility and transferability of the qualitative data analysis, the researcher used a combination of thick description methods and quantification of qualitative data to illustrate emerging trends when reporting the results. The thick description methods include particular description (i.e., representative examples from the data); general description (i.e., information about the patterns in the data); and interpretive commentary (i.e., explanation of the phenomena researched and interpretation of the meaning of the findings with respect to previous research) (Davis, 1995, as cited in Mackey & Gass, 2005).

1.3.3. Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is comprised of eight chapters. Chapter Two provides an in-depth discussion of theoretical and conceptual frameworks used to design the present study, while Chapter Three contains a literature review of some key classroom-based studies in the areas of instructional pragmatics and formulaic language. Chapter Four presents a comprehensive review of the methodological processes used to answer the guiding research questions of the study as well as explains the processes involved in data collection and analysis, which include qualitative utterance analysis, expert judgment, and analysis of classroom episodes.

The results of the study are presented in three separate chapters; each chapter has its own discussion section. Chapter Five reports on the results of the first and second cycles of the qualitative utterance analysis, followed by a discussion on the role of pragmatic formulas in the acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence. Chapter Six chapter reports on the results of the expert judgements which were performed in order to complement the qualitative utterance analysis; the chapter concludes with a discussion on the role of pragmatic formulas in the development of L2 pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities. Chapter Seven reports on the results of the qualitative content analysis of the classroom episodes recorded during eight observed sessions; the chapter concludes with a discussion on the comparison of the efficacy of these two teaching approaches by drawing on the evidence from the classroom. Finally, Chapter Eight concludes this dissertation by providing a recap of major research findings, commenting on this study's theoretical and practical implications, acknowledging the study's limitations, and outlining potential directions for future research.

Chapter 2: Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

This chapter outlines theoretical and conceptual frameworks on which the current study is built. The first section provides a brief overview of the fundamentals of pragmatics theory followed by an overview of existing models of communicative competence and a subsection that focuses on the notion of pragmatic competence and its possible definitions. The second section addresses the issue of terminological variety in the literature on formulaic language in pragmatics and reviews common research tools used for eliciting pragmatic formulas from input. The third section is dedicated to SLA theoretical and conceptual frameworks that have shaped instructional pragmatics; finally, instructed SLA theories which have informed the instructional sequence of the innovative formula-enhanced approach used in this study are reviewed.

1.1. Pragmatics

Until the early 1960s, the word *pragmatics* had mainly been associated with realms of logic and philosophy. Leech and Thomas (1990) note that pragmatics was born out of the abstraction of philosophy of language and described it as “a messy, unformalisable element- the attitudes, behaviour and beliefs of symbol-users” (p. 94). Until about the 1970s, generative grammar was a predominant paradigm in linguistic theory. In this model, syntax had a central role, while semantics occupied a peripheral position; pragmatics was not part of that model at all (Leech, 1983). One of the most influential proponents of generative grammar, Noam Chomsky, argued that languages follow rules that operate according to certain pre-determined conventions (Chomsky, 2006). However, as Leech (1983) argued, such model presents a rather limited scope of linguistic theory since it focuses on competence, but not on performance. Unsurprisingly, Chomsky’s paradigm has been strongly undermined by approaches like sociolinguistics or

discourse analysis that stressed the social dimension of language and shifted the emphasis within linguistics from competence towards performance.

The American sociolinguist D. Hymes was one of the first scholars to challenge Chomsky's views. Unlike Chomsky, who viewed language as a set of abstract syntactic rules, Hymes (1974) advocated that language should be investigated in the context of a given situation. In his analysis, Hymes (1974) used an approach which he called 'ethnography of communication' which can be described as "a science that would approach language neither as abstract form nor as an abstract correlate of a community, but as situated in the flux and pattern of communicative event" (p. 5). It is important to note, however, that Chomsky did not deny that there are rules of language use in addition to the rules of grammar. Whereas Chomsky (1965, as cited in Hymes, 1972) was mainly interested in linguistic theory that involves an ideal speaker-listener in a homogeneous speech community, Hymes was concerned with language used by real interlocutors in real life circumstances (Widdowson, 1989).

At present, pragmatics is an important field of research in linguistics along with syntax and semantics in traditional distinctions in language analysis (Leech & Thomas, 1990). Pragmatics investigates how contextual meaning is being expressed and negotiated using available linguistic resources (Yule, 1996) and is defined as the study of communicative action in the sociocultural context (Rose & Kasper, 2001). However, pragmatics is currently not a particularly coherent field of study and may overlap with such areas of linguistic inquiry as discourse analysis and sociolinguistics (Crystal, 1997). While sociolinguistics is an area of study that investigates how relatively fixed social variables such as sex, origin, or ethnicity impact the way an individual speaks, pragmatics deals with relatively changeable features of an individual,

such as relative status, social role, and the way in which speakers exploit their linguistic repertoires in order to achieve their communicative goals (Thomas, 1995).

1.1.1. Major Theoretical Frameworks

1.1.1.1. Speech Act Theory

In pragmatics theory, it is important to differentiate between the notion of *utterance* and the notion of *sentence*. While the latter is the unit of analysis in linguistics, the former is the unit of analysis in pragmatics (Huth, 2013). Sentence is an abstract entity “divorced from nonlinguistic context” (Kecskes, 2014, p. 9), whereas an utterance “is a concrete instantiation of a speech act in a specific situational context” (Kecskes, 2014, p. 9). Therefore, one utterance can serve more than one communicative function, and very often there is no direct match between the literal meaning of the utterance and the speech act performed by this utterance in context. For example, the sentence ‘I am hungry’ can have various meanings depending on speakers’ true intentions (Blum-Kulka, 1980).

The British philosopher of language J. L. Austin was one of the first scholars to point out that utterances can express people’s communicative intentions (Austin, 1962). This observation laid a foundation for the Speech Act theory, which is one of the milestones in the contemporary theory of pragmatics. According to Austin (1962), the action performed when an utterance is provided constitutes a basic unit of communication called a *speech act*. Every speech act can be analysed on three levels:

- the words themselves (locution/locutionary act)
- what speakers do with their words: asserting, requesting, apologising, etc. (illocution/illocutionary act)

- the result of the words (perlocution; perlocutionary act/effect)

In his Performative Hypothesis, Austin claimed that people do not only use language to make statements, but also use language to perform social actions.

A few years later, a student of his, J. R. Searle, further developed Austin's hypothesis and introduced what is now known as classical Speech Act theory. Searle proposed a taxonomy comprising of five different types of illocutionary acts: *assertives*, *directives*, *commissives*, *expressives*, and *declaratives/declarations* (Searle, 1969, 2002). Searle (2002) describes assertives as speech acts in which "the speaker commits himself in varying degrees to the truth of the expressed proposition" (p. 5) (e.g., statements, explanations); directives are speech acts in which "the speaker attempts to get the hearer to do something" (p. 5) (e.g., orders, requests); in commissives "the speaker commits himself to doing something, to some future course of action" (p.5.) (e.g., promising, vows, threats, pledges, contracts); in expressives "the speaker expresses his feelings and attitudes about some states of affairs specified by propositional content" (p. 5) (e.g., apologies, thanks, congratulations); finally, in declarations "the speaker brings about changes in the world through his utterances" (p.5.) (e.g., declaring war, adjourning a meeting). Another important contribution of Searle to the theory of pragmatics is that he introduced the term *indirect speech act* (Searle, 1975). He argued that very often a speaker may utter a sentence and mean more than what has been uttered. An example may be a request produced in a form of a statement (e.g., *I want you to do it*), or a request produced in an interrogative form (e.g., *Can you reach the salt?*).

1.1.1.2. Pragmatics and Culture

Pragmatics is also generally understood as a research field devoted to interpreting how language use reflects the culture of a given speech community (Huth, 2013). Major theoretical frameworks linking pragmatics to culture include politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987) and theory of conversational implicature, which includes maxims of cooperation and politeness (Grice, 1975). As opposed to Austin, who made a distinction between what speakers say and what they mean, Grice (1975) in his theory tried to explain how a hearer proceeds from the level of expressed meaning to the level of implied meaning (Thomas, 1995). Grice (1975) believed that there are general conditions that apply to conversations, regardless of the subject matter. He coined the term *implicature*, which is another central theoretical notion in pragmatics. However, one should distinguish between implicature and inference; while implicature is generated by the speaker, and may or may not be understood by the hearer/listener, *inference* is drawn by the listener based on linguistic or non-linguistic evidence (Thomas, 1995). Moreover, Grice (1975) distinguished between conventional and conversational implicature. For pragmatics, *conversational implicature* is more important than the conventional one since the former deals with implied meaning of an utterance within a given context, whereas in the case of *conventional implicature* what is said is what is meant despite the context.

In the English language, indirect speech acts are generally associated with greater politeness than direct speech acts (Yule, 1996). However, this classification may not work for languages other than English due to different sociocultural norms and different interpretations of the concept of politeness. Trosborg (1995) points out that: “different pragmatic norms reflect *different hierarchies of values* characteristic of different cultures” (p. 40, emphasis added). This implies that the notions of politeness and directness and/or indirectness are culture-dependant. In

the Anglophone cultures, there is a preference for indirectness in communication since it is believed that higher level of indirectness implies higher level of politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Leech, 1983; Trosborg, 1995). At the same time, Wierzbicka (2003) observes that the classic distinction between direct and indirect speech acts, which is mainly linked to the difference between imperatives and the so-called whimperatives (i.e., ‘Close the door’ versus ‘Could you close the door/Would you mind closing the door?’), can not always be applied to other languages and, therefore, only holds true for the English language pragmatics. Therefore, Wierzbicka (2003) argues that “the whole distinction between ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ speech acts should be abandoned, at least until some clear definitions of these terms is provided” (p. 88).

1.1.1.3. Meaning and Context in Pragmatics

To better understand pragmatics, one may want to compare and contrast this area of language study with syntax and semantics. While syntax is mainly concerned with the relationships between linguistic forms and how they are arranged in sequence, and semantics studies how verbal descriptions of words connect to objects in the real world, pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms (Yule, 1996). The concept of *meaning* in pragmatics is not to be confused with meaning in semantics. Leech and Thomas (1990) note that the simplest way to distinguish semantics from pragmatics is to say that semantics deals with meaning as a dyadic relationship between a form of an utterance and its meaning (i.e., X means Y), whereas pragmatics has to do with meaning as a triadic relationship between speaker, meaning, and form of an utterance (i.e., S means Y by X). In other words, whereas in semantics meaning is viewed as an abstract notion unrelated to any context, pragmatics deals with meaning which is communicated as a consequence of the interaction between what was said and the context in which it was said. Therefore, meaning in pragmatics is

not intrinsic to the linguistic expression carrying it, but results from the interaction of an utterance with the context in which it is used (Trask, 1999). Scholars who follow a social approach to the discipline equate pragmatics with the ‘speaker meaning’ and focus their attention on the producer of the message. On the other hand, scholars who favour a cognitive approach tend to focus mostly on the interpretation of an utterance from the point of view of the hearer or receiver of the message Thomas (1995). Regardless of theoretical perspective, *meaning* and *context* are the two key theoretical constructs in pragmatics theory.

According to Thomas (1995), speaker meaning consists of two inseparable components: *contextual/ utterance meaning* (what the speaker actually does mean by these words on this particular occasion) and *utterance force* (speaker’s communicative intention). By and large, the main distinguishing feature of pragmatic meaning is that it is concerned with the meaning in relation to the speech event, which includes the addresser and addressee of a message, context, communicative goals, illocutionary acts, and time and place of the utterance (Leech, 1983). Thomas’s (1995) definition of meaning in pragmatics seems most appealing: “Pragmatics is not about meaning; it is about *making meaning*, about meaning potential, showing how people negotiate *meaning in interaction*” (p.23, emphasis added). As one can infer from this definition, pragmatic meaning is constantly being negotiated by interlocutors and emerges in the context of a particular speech event.

While meaning is at the heart of both semantics and pragmatics, *context* is exclusive to pragmatics (Fetzer, 2004). Since pragmatics is mainly concerned with meaning communicated through utterances, the term ‘context’ may refer to linguistic and non-linguistic surroundings of utterances. Therefore, the meaning in pragmatics is contextually bound, and contextual

information helps interlocutors to interpret each other's communicative intentions, especially if both interlocutors have shared background knowledge (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000).

According to Fetzer (2004), context can be divided into three subtypes: *linguistic* (everything that precedes and follows an utterance in a speech situation), *social* (involves co-participants, their physical and psychological dispositions, communicative intentions and goals, general background knowledge, and social relationship of the people involved in communication); *sociocultural* (social context as interpreted through the lens of cultural constraints and requirements).

1.1.2. Defining Pragmatic Competence

Applied linguists recognize an important theoretical distinction between language *competence* and language *performance*. While the former is concerned with the L2 learner's tacit knowledge about the language that enables them to analyse the target structures, the latter is defined as the ability of the learner to demonstrate this knowledge by controlling these structures during an act of communication (Canale & Swain, 1980; Bialystok, 1994). According to Canale (1983), both knowledge and skill (i.e., ability to perform knowledge in actual situations) are important components for successful performance in L2. As opposed to grammatical/linguistic competence, which refers to the knowledge of the rules of morphology, syntax, and phonology, *pragmatic competence* is quite an ambiguous phenomenon. Taguchi (2012) notes that one of the most complex aspects of pragmatic competence is its sociocultural nature. This can be explained by the fact that both linguistic and non-linguistic means to perform pragmatic functions vary across cultures (Taguchi, 2012). Therefore, the constituting components of pragmatic competence vary from model to model, and in many models sociolinguistic/sociocultural and

discourse competences overlap with pragmatic competence. A chronological overview of the evolution of the pragmatic competence construct is illustrated in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1. Pragmatic competence in major models of communicative competence.

Pragmatic competence as a term first appeared in Bachman's (1990) model of communicative competence. In this model, pragmatic competence included two components: the

knowledge of the pragmatic conventions for performing language functions and the knowledge of sociolinguistic conventions for performing language functions appropriately in a given context. As illustrated in Figure 1, this division into linguistic and sociolinguistic knowledge in pragmatic competence is true for all recent models of communicative competence. Leech (1983) was the first to highlight this distinction. He distinguished between *pragmalinguistics* (i.e., linguistic resources available to perform language functions) and *sociopragmatics* (i.e., language user's assessment of the context in which linguistic resources are implemented). Taguchi (2011) observes that the most widely used definition of pragmatic competence can be found in the relationship between pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. According to her, "pragmatic development entails acquisition of both of these knowledge bases, as well as efficient control of them in real-time communication" (Taguchi, 2011, pp. 289-290).

Pragmatic competence involves the ability to co-construct, negotiate and interpret meanings during the course of interaction within a particular sociocultural context (Laughlin et al., 2015). Remarkably, in her latest model of communicative competence, Celce-Murcia (2007) put forth the term 'interactional competence' (see Figure 1), which seems to be an elaboration of the concept of pragmatic competence presented in the earlier models. Drawing on the combination of both early and recent models of communicative competence, Taguchi (2016) proposed a synthesized definition of pragmatic competence, which seems to be the most comprehensive conceptualization of this construct to date. Based on Taguchi's (2016) definition, pragmatic competence is a socially co-constructed phenomenon which consists of three main components:

- knowledge of linguistic forms and their functional meanings

- sociocultural knowledge
- and the ability to use this knowledge to create a communicative act in interaction.

1.1.3. Cross-cultural and Interlanguage Pragmatics

Research on pragmatics in L2 teaching and learning can be divided into two major disciplines: *cross-cultural pragmatics* and *interlanguage pragmatics*.

1.1.3.1. Cross-cultural Pragmatics

Cross-cultural pragmatics studies differences in speech act production by native and non-native speakers. Previous research in this area has established that speech acts are realized differently in different cultures which may lead to *pragmatic failures*. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986) note that pragmatic failures occur when two interlocutors fail to understand each other's communicative intentions; notably, such misunderstandings can occur between any two interlocutors, regardless of whether or not they share the same linguistic and cultural background. However, Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986) observe that pragmatic failures are more likely to occur between speakers from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Research has established that pragmatic failures can be caused by inaccurate usage of target language lexico-grammatical structures in certain speech contexts that result in cross-cultural misunderstandings ranging from less to more harmful (Gass, 1996).

Furthermore, there is evidence that native speakers have different speech act realization patterns as opposed to non-native speakers (e.g., Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Cohen & Olshtain, 1993). This can be explained by the fact that native speakers within a given speech community usually share sociocultural knowledge, whereas non-native speakers do not always have this knowledge (Cohen, 2005). As a result, L2 learners' communicative performance and

interpretation of target languages implicatures may suffer due to the negative transfer from first language (L1). The negative transfer can happen on both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic levels which are interrelated (Kasper, 1992). Overall, researchers agree that the ability of L2 learners to achieve nativelike pragmatic proficiency depends on such factors as availability of authentic language input, level of language proficiency, length of exposure to or stay in the target language community, the amount of negative transfer of learners' L1 patterns of speech act realization, the context of L2 acquisition, and individual differences (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Kasper, 2001; Kasper & Roever, 2005; Roever & Al-Gahtani, 2015).

1.1.3.2. Interlanguage Pragmatics

Interlanguage pragmatics is an interdisciplinary area of inquiry that lies at the intersection between theoretical pragmatic and the study of SLA (Felix-Brasdefer, 2013). Interlanguage pragmatics focuses on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a target language and is concerned with L2 acquisition and the processes of L2 development (Roever, 2015). According to Felix-Brasdefer (2013), L2 pragmatic development has been examined by researchers in three areas: in naturalistic settings; in study-abroad contexts; and as a result of formal classroom instruction. The growing recognition of the importance of teaching pragmatics to L2 learners has led to the development of the subfield of interlanguage pragmatics known as *instructional pragmatics*, which is defined as “L2 teaching applications related to fostering pragmatic competence in language learners” (Vasquez & Sharpless, 2009, p. 17). However, instructional pragmatics is a relatively new area of inquiry compared to other aspects of language such as grammar, vocabulary or pronunciation instruction (Bardovi-Harlig, 2017). Instructional pragmatics is mainly concerned with various classroom applications of the ways of raising pragmatic awareness *for augmenting L2 pragmatic competence*. Studies in this research tradition

investigate the impact of formal classroom instruction on learners' ability to acquire various aspects of pragmatic competence (Takahashi, 2013). The study presented in this dissertation falls under the category of instructional pragmatics.

1.2. Formulas in Pragmatics

In their seminal article, Pawley and Syder (1983) argued that native speakers of English possess, what they called, 'nativelike selection of speech'. Nativelike selection is the ability of native speakers to use expressions that are not only grammatically accurate but also natural and idiomatic. This suggests that, in order to produce nativelike utterances, L2 learners should know the "conventional ways of talking about particular subject matter" (Pawley, 1986, p. 62) in the target language. Such ability may be achieved by means of acquiring a sufficient stock of various fixed multi-word sequences (e.g., proverbs, idioms, collocations, lexical bundles, etc.) grouped under an umbrella term *formulaic language* (Weinert, 2010). One of the earliest definitions of a *formulaic sequence* was provided by Pawley (1986). He defines it as "a conventional pairing of a particular formal construction with a particular conventional idea" (p. 62). Overall, there are more than forty labels used in the literature to refer to various kinds formulaic sequences; yet, it can be a very challenging task to provide a single, one-size-fits-all definition of a formulaic sequence due to the multi-faceted nature of formulaic language (Wray & Perkins, 2000). The vast range of existing formulaic units presents a challenge to present-day researchers in terms of defining boundaries and establishing fixed terminology of formulaic language (Granger & Paquot, 2008). Nevertheless, specialists seem to agree that, in order for a sequence to be considered formulaic, it has to contain two or more words, have a single meaning or perform a single pragmatic function, and, ideally, be uttered in a phonologically coherent manner (Wray, 2002; Wood, 2015).

In formulaic language literature, pragmatics is often cited as an area in which formulas are important (Bardovi-Harlig, 2006). Both formulaic language and pragmatics specialists agree that formulaic sequences that perform specific pragmatic purposes (i.e., pragmatic formulas) are beneficial for L2 pragmatics acquisition and performance (Coulmas, 1981; Yorio, 1980; Wray & Perkins, 2000; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; House, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig, 2012; Roever, 2011b; Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). According to Kasper and Schmidt (1996), the emergence of routine [or pragmatic] formulae is “tied to the communicative practices of speech community” (p.155). Moreover, such formulaic sequences are usually accepted as the most appropriate linguistic ways of ‘doing things’ (e.g., greetings, turn-taking, leave-taking, etc.) by native speakers, and, therefore, allow L2 speakers to enter the ‘inner circle’ of the target language speech community and maintain group identity (Coulmas, 1979; Bardovi-Harlig, 2012; Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). Research literature offers a myriad of labels to refer to formulas that express pragmatic functions. In the following subsection, the author discusses this terminological variety and provides her own operational definition of the ‘pragmatic formula’ construct used in this study.

1.2.1. Terminological Variety

In pragmatics literature, the broad term ‘formula’ refers to recurrent word combinations used for specific pragmatic purposes (Bardovi-Harlig, 2012). It is also important to note that the term ‘formula’ in pragmatics may be also used as a shortened form of *semantic formula* that usually describes a component of certain speech acts (Bardovi-Harlig, 2012) (i.e., expressing surprise or delight, expressing affection or emphasizing the depth of gratitude). Such semantic formulas tend to be used in a given speech act and add pragmatic value to the utterance if used appropriately (Cohen, 2005). There exist a number of specific labels which authors have

assigned to formulaic sequences performing pragmatic functions in oral communication. In their own studies, Bardovi-Harlig and colleagues seem to favour such terms as ‘pragmatic routines’ and ‘conventional expressions’ when referring to different types of pragmatic formulas (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig, 2014; Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011; Bardovi-Harlig & Stringer, 2016; Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012; Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman, & Vellenga, 2015). Kecskes (2010) points out that such terminological variety can be explained by the fact that formulaic language is discussed in different subfields of pragmatics and applied linguistics, and authors tend to use labels common in their field of study. Figure 2 presents a list of the most frequently occurring labels used to refer to formulas in pragmatics literature.

Figure 2. Formulas in pragmatics.

‘Routine formulae’ are formulaic sequences that perform speech act functions (e.g. *Good morning; See you soon*), while ‘speech formulae’ are used to organize messages and indicate speakers’ or writers’ attitudes (e.g., *You know what I mean; Are you with me?*) (Cowie, 1998b, as cited in Granger & Paquot, 2008). Yorio (1980) distinguishes between ‘situation formulas’, which are more common for oral speech (e.g., *You had to be there; I thought you’d never ask*) and ‘stylistic formulas’, which are more common for written speech, such as business

correspondence (e.g., *To whom it may concern*). Interestingly, Yorio (1980) also notes that situation formulas are quite difficult to teach to L2 students since they are very culturally bound, whereas stylistic formulas are more teachable because their variables are more limited.

Researchers like Kiefer (1996) and Kecskes (2000a, 2000b, 2010) prefer the term ‘bound’ or ‘situation-bound utterance’ when referring to formulas that are highly prefabricated and receive their ‘charge’ from the situations they occur in. Kecskes (2010) explains his preference for this particular label and states that “it refers to the main characteristic feature of these utterances: their strong tie, their boundedness to a particular situation” (p. 3). According to him, other terms like ‘routine formulae’ or ‘institutionalized expressions’ are either too broad or too specific. At the same time, Kiefer (1996) notes that bound utterances are stereotypical utterances which are “automatically evoked by certain speech situation” (p. 575). He also argues that such utterances are semantically compositional and are not different from free utterances; thus, they are semantically transparent. Their meanings, however, are determined and predicted by a concrete speech situation (e.g., *Hold the line, please; You have to sign your name here; May I invite you to dinner next Saturday?*). On the other hand, Kecskes (2000a) argues that some situation-bound utterances may partially lose their semantic transparency because they are used only in a specific social situation, and, as a result, their meaningfulness diminishes (Coulmas, 1981a, as cited in Kecskes, 2000a). For situation-bound utterances, which are frequently used in common speech acts like greetings or apologies, pragmatic function is more important than the original semantic meaning (e.g., *How are you?*). In terms of classification, Kecskes (2010) points out that situation-bound utterances belong to the category of pragmatic idioms. Unlike semantic idioms like *make both ends meet* or *kick the bucket* which are not related to any particular social

situation and can occur at any point in a conversation, the occurrence of pragmatic idioms is strictly determined by a particular social situation (e.g., *Welcome aboard; Please help yourself*).

In this dissertation, I use the term *pragmatic formula* for the sake of consistency and to avoid terminological confusion. The operational definition of the ‘pragmatic formula’ construct used in the present study is as follows:

The term *pragmatic formula* can be generally defined as a recurrent multiword combination whose occurrence, discourse function, and use is normally bound to a given communicative situation (i.e., speech event); pragmatic formulas are widely shared and accepted by members of a speech community as typical linguistic means of performing various social actions (i.e., speech act).

Examples of pragmatic formulas include: *See you soon; How can I help you; Sorry, I can't make it; Thank you for your understanding; I'm not interested, thanks*.

In addition, pragmatic formulas can also be:

- phonologically coherent (fluently articulated and non-hesitant if pronounced by a native or highly proficient speakers of a language) (Myles, Hooper, & Mitchell, 1998)
- accompanied by a certain gesture/body language (Pawley, 2007, 2009)
- idiomatically constrained (i.e., if one of the constituents is moved, inserted, or expanded, the formula is destroyed) (Pawley, 1986).

Examples include: *Who do you think you are* (formula) vs *Who do you think you will be* (not a formula); *I can't thank you enough* (formula) vs *I can't enough thank you* (not a formula).

- fully-fixed (or purely idiomatic³) or semi-fixed (or productive; formulas that contain gaps within a formulaic frame) (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Wray & Namba, 2003; Taguchi, 2007).

Examples of fully-fixed pragmatic formulas include: *I'll do my best; I owe you one; I'm in the middle of something right now; I can't thank you enough.*

Examples of semi-fixed pragmatic formulas include: *I'm sorry, but* [I have scheduled an appointment/I can't afford it/ I can't come]; *Thank you so much for* + gerund [covering my shift/ helping me]; *Let me know if* [I can ever do anything for you/can re-pay the favour sometime/there is anything I can do for you]; *I am* + gerund [calling/writing] *to* [inform you/let you know] *that* + [any meaningful completion of the phrase].

1.2.2. Formula Identification and Elicitation Tools

1.2.2.1. General Overview

Since the English language contains a vast range of formulaic sequences that vary in form and function, formulaic language researchers tend to focus on specific types of formulaic units depending upon the nature of inquiry (e.g., written/spoken discourse, phrase/sentence level expressions, etc.). Therefore, as Gries (2008) explains, researchers should “always be maximally explicit about which parameter settings are adopted in order to (i) render their [formulaic expressions] definitions maximally precise and (ii) allow researchers from other frameworks to

³ Given the ‘fuzzy borders’ of formulaicity (Wray, 2008), especially when dealing with pragmatic formulas, it might be difficult to determine whether a particular pragmatic formula is purely idiomatic and does not allow for any variations within its formulaic frame.

more easily recognize potential areas of overlap, or indeed conflict” (p.3). Thus, it is necessary to determine criteria of identification or extracting formulaic units from written or spoken language before performing any kind of data analysis.

Given the uncertain boundaries of formulaic language and its various representations, it is quite complicated to extract formulaic units from oral or written language. Granger and Paquot (2008) outlined two major approaches to the elicitation of multi-word units that have developed over time: the phraseological approach and the distributional (i.e. frequency/corpus-driven) approach. *Phraseological approach* (Nesselhauf, 2004, as cited in Granger & Paquot, 2008), also known as linguistic analysis, has its roots in Soviet Russian tradition and is considered a traditional approach to the analysis of formulaic sequences. It is a top-down approach which identifies phraseological units on the basis of linguistic criteria. These are such semantic criteria as lexical affinity (e.g., a ‘chestnut horse’, but not a ‘brown horse’) and non-compositionality (i.e. the global meaning is different from the sum of its parts). *Distributional, or corpus-driven approach* (Sinclair, 1987, as cited in Granger & Paquot, 2008), on the other hand, is a bottom-up method to identify lexical co-occurrences popular in British and North American research traditions. Meaning here is viewed differently as it is tied to the context of use. Frequency of occurrence in language output is another major characteristic that is used to extract formulaic sequences from corpora. This is especially relevant for studies involving corpus analysis of spoken and/or written discourse. However, Wray and Perkins (2000) stressed that frequency should not be considered as a defining feature of formulaicity since this phenomenon is much more complex.

Wray (2008) emphasized the power of intuitive judgement of native speakers in the process of identifying formulaic sequences. She argued that, despite concerns that intuitive identification cannot be replicated, “we should anticipate that formulaic sequences shared across a speech community can be reliably identified by most native speakers, provided they know what they are being asked to look for” (p.107). According to Wray (2008), intuition can come from informants’ own instincts; formulaic units can be also examined by a group of judges with consensus; lastly, a researcher’s own judgement continues to be one of the most common applications. Although a researcher’s intuition can be considered a valid identification method, Read and Nation (2004) note that this exercise is more acceptable from a scientific point of view if the working definition of what is meant by a formulaic sequence is carefully articulated and clearly communicated to a second investigator who will attempt to replicate the investigator’s identification procedure. Moreover, a high degree of interrater reliability is required to ensure the validity of analysis. Therefore, Read and Nation (2004) recommend that a panel of judges be formed to analyse the multi-word units instead of relying only on the researcher’s subjective judgement.

Researchers tend to explicitly state their own selection and identification criteria for the purpose of a particular study. Wood (2015) outlined four major checklists that have been proposed by formulaic language specialists thus far:

1. List of nine criteria proposed by Coulmas (1979);
2. Five criteria for identifying formulas in child first language speech proposed by Peters (1983);
3. Eleven diagnostic criteria proposed by Wray and Namba (2003);

4. Five judgement criteria based drawn from previous research on formulaic sequences proposed by Wood (2010).

It is worth noting that all four checklists share some common characteristics, such as native speaker intuition, greater length or complexity than other output (i.e., it must be longer than two words), phonological coherence, association with a specific register, and semantic and syntactic irregularity. Wood (2015) claims that these four checklists are designed only as guides for researcher' selection procedure since, when it comes to eliciting formulaic sequences from spoken or written language, "absolute certainty is elusive" (p. 32). All in all, specialists seem to agree that an eclectic or heterogeneous approach to identifying formulaic expressions is preferred since it enables researchers to use a combination of criteria; therefore, such approach seems to be the optimal way to obtain valid results (Read & Nation, 2004).

1.2.2.2. Elicitation of Pragmatic Formulas

Frequency of occurrence is not a determining factor for identifying formulas in pragmatics research, therefore corpus tools are rarely used (Bardovi-Harlig, 2012). Experts acknowledge the leading role of context when working with this particular subset of formulaic language (i.e., pragmatic formulas) and highlight the important role of consultation with members of a local speech community in the process of extracting pragmatic formulas (Bardovi-Harlig, 2009; Edmonds, 2014). Eliciting pragmatic formulas from native speaker speech can be done using a variety of methods. The most popular tools used in interlanguage pragmatics research are written, oral, or computer-based discourse completion tasks (DCT) (Kasper & Dahl, 1991). DCT is a questionnaire that includes a number of brief situational descriptions, followed by a short dialogue with an empty slot for the speech act under study (Kasper & Dahl, 1991).

Respondents are usually asked to respond to conversation scenarios by providing their possible responses in the ‘blanks’. An example of a written DCT is given in Figure 3 below.

<p><u>Scenario:</u> You work as a supervisor in a company. One of your employees is late with submitting his/her report on time. You need to talk to your employee and ask him to submit the report to you asap. What would you say to him/her?</p> <p><i>Note: Feel free to include any comments on the thought process that may have preceded your response. This is a face-to-face conversation.</i></p> <p>You:</p> <hr/> <hr/>

Figure 3. An example of a written DCT.

Furthermore, Bardovi-Harlig (2009) suggests observing and collecting samples of natural conversations in the local speech communities in order to identify the target formulas in the context where they occur. The scenarios for DCTs can be then constructed based on such observations. at the same time, Wood (2015) argues that researchers might need to first identify a situation or context to determine the sequences used or start with the formula(s) under investigation and then determine the specific situations where these formulas might occur. In terms of frequency of occurrence, this criterion may only be important within a researcher’s own corpus of collected language samples to determine which sequences are used most frequently by native speakers (Wood, 2015). To conclude, the chosen elicitation approach will largely depend on research questions one intends to answer (Bardovi-Harlig, 2012).

1.3. SLA Theoretical Frameworks

There seems to be a consensus among researchers that classroom-based studies on instructional pragmatics are based on three interrelated hypotheses from SLA theory: Schmidt’s

Noticing Hypothesis; Swain's Output Hypothesis; and Long's Interaction Hypothesis (Kasper, 2001). These insights from SLA theory are important for instructional pragmatics since they not only help explain the cognitive mechanisms that operate when the learner is processing input but also serve as grounds for teaching approaches to L2 pragmatic competence (Taguchi, 2011).

The *Noticing Hypothesis* (Schmidt, 1990) is premised on the assumption that L2 learners must first notice the target language structures and form before input can be turned into intake. It is worth mentioning, however, that multiple definitions exist for the construct of 'awareness' per se in SLA, cognitive psychology, psycholinguistics, and other areas that inform applied linguistics research. There might be different types of awareness, such as language awareness, metacognitive awareness, conscious or unconscious awareness (Leow, 2015). However, research in both cognitive psychology and SLA has shown that learning can take place without conscious awareness of what is being learnt (Gass, 1997); therefore, research has yet to provide more solid evidence to answer the questions about which type of learning, explicit (i.e., with awareness) or implicit (i.e., without awareness) works better in the L2 classroom (Leow, 2015). For the purposes of the present study, the researcher adopts the definition of awareness from Leow (2015) who defines it as "something taking place in our brain as we *process* language" (p. xii, emphasis in the original).

The *Output Hypothesis* (Swain, 1993, 1996) holds that learners may notice important features of the target language which they don't know when they are engaged in utterance production. This may help them notice the gap between what they want to say and what they can say, leading them to recognize what they do not know, or know only partially. Lastly, the *Interactional Hypothesis* (Long, 1996) integrates the noticing and the output hypothesis. According to the Interactional Hypothesis (Long, 1996), when L2 users participate in a speech

event and negotiate meanings with more competent interlocutors, this can facilitate acquisition, noticing, comprehension, and production of the target language structures. These three hypotheses have laid the foundations for the awareness-raising teaching approach which currently dominates instructional pragmatics.

1.3.1. Noticing, Comprehension, and Processing of Input

The concepts of noticing, comprehension, and processing of input are key theoretical notions that have shaped current understanding in SLA theory. These three notions constitute the conceptual framework of the present study; in addition, the researcher considered these processes when designing the instructional sequence of the innovative formula-enhanced approach proposed in the present study.

1.3.1.1. Noticing of Input

Krashen in his Input Hypothesis claimed that second languages are acquired by understanding messages, or by receiving ‘comprehensible input’ (Krashen, 1985). According to Krashen (1985), comprehensible input and a low affective filter are the only necessary conditions for successful SLA. Krashen’s approach to SLA has been since criticized for its apparent weaknesses, especially with the emergence of the ‘fluency-accuracy’ balance teaching principle that maintains that a combination of form and meaning is more beneficial for language learning, as opposed to exclusive use of either one (Spada, 1997). It is now widely accepted that simple exposure to appropriate input is unlikely to be sufficient for acquisition of linguistic and/or pragmatic knowledge because, as Schmidt (1993) explains, “the linguistic realizations of pragmatic functions are sometimes opaque to language learners because the relevant contextual factors to be noticed are likely to be defined differently or may be nonsalient for the learner” (p.

36). This implies that L2 learners need to be deliberately told during formal instruction to pay attention to certain linguistic or pragmatic features of the target language in order to facilitate successful acquisition. According to Schmidt (1993), pragmatics acquisition entails processing target pragmatic features by connecting linguistic forms, functional meanings, and relevant contextual features. Therefore, *noticing* is understood as conscious attention or attention with awareness, which seems to be necessary for the learning to take place (Schmidt, 1993; Leow, 2015). However, as Long (1996) observes, Schmidt's claim about the necessity of noticing does not refer to higher level *understanding* or awareness of language. Schmidt (1993) himself admits that he uses the term *noticing* to mean registering the simple occurrence of some event, whereas understanding, which is a result of a conscious problem-solving, implies recognition of a general principle, rule, or pattern" (p. 26).

1.3.1.2. Comprehension of Input

Input Processing theory (VanPatten, 2007) is based on the assumption that language acquisition is a by-product of comprehension. VanPatten (2007) argues that "although comprehension cannot guarantee acquisition, *acquisition cannot happen if comprehension does not occur*" (p. 115, emphasis added). In other words, input can only become intake if it has been comprehended (i.e., controlled by the learner). This comprehension implies learners' understanding of the meaning of a particular grammatical form in a given context (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). In other words, learners need to be able to make form-meaning-use connections in order to successfully interpret target language utterances. According to Gass (1997), comprehension can involve a myriad of possibilities ranging from semantics to rigorous analysis of language structures and can occur either at the level of semantic meaning (which is usually superficial and does not guarantee successful intake) or at a deeper level, which involves

understanding of not only the general message of an utterance but also its syntactic or phonological component parts. Notably, Gass (1997) argues that “an analysis at the level of meaning is not as useful for intake as an analysis made at the level of morphology, lexicon, or syntax” (p. 23). When deeper analysis takes place, learners might understand the components of an utterance and, in such a way, gain understanding of the underlying grammatical pattern (Gass, 1997).

1.3.1.3. Processing of Input

It follows from the discussion above that in order to help L2 learners engage in higher levels of analysis of input, opportunities for deep cognitive processing of or engagement with the target input should be created during the process of instruction. According to Leow’s model of instructed SLA (Leow, 2015), processing L2 data in greater depth may result in higher levels of awareness; this higher level of awareness, in turn, may facilitate the incorporation of intake into the learner’s interlanguage system. Depth of input processing is defined as “the relative amount of cognitive effort, level of analysis, and elaboration of intake, together with the usage of prior knowledge, hypothesis testing, and rule formation employed in decoding and encoding same grammatical or lexical item in the input” (Leow, 2015, p. 204). Leow (2015) operationalizes the depth of input processing as such that can occur at low, medium, or high level for lexical items category. *Low depth of processing* for lexical items involves L2 learners showing no potential for emerging form-meaning connections, such as repeating or carefully pronouncing target items; *medium depth of processing* for lexical items involves L2 learners showing some evidence of processing target items, such as spending more time to process target items or making relevant comments that indicate some processing of target items; finally, *high depth of processing* for lexical items involves evidence that L2 learners are able to make accurate form-meaning

connections and show high levels of cognitive effort to get the meaning of target items, such as providing an accurate translation of the target item or finding a different way to say almost the same thing. As for grammatical items, Leow (2015) observes that L2 learners can develop an awareness at the levels of noticing, reporting, or understanding. At the level of *noticing*, L2 learners show no potential for processing a target form grammatically; at the level of *reporting*, L2 learners might comment on target items in relation to grammatical features; finally, at the level of *understanding*, L2 learners may arrive at an accurate, partially accurate, or fully accurate target underlying grammatical rule, correct previous translation, or make hypotheses regarding target items.

1.3.2. Focus on Form in Pragmatics

1.3.2.1. Unification of Grammar and Pragmatics

Bardovi-Harlig (2003) argues that the *reunification* of grammar and pragmatics should be facilitated in contemporary language classrooms and the SLA-informed presentation of L2 pragmatics should be promoted. Researchers like Felix-Brasdefer and Cohen (2012) share this view and argue that by raising students' awareness about the pragmatic functions of grammatical structures as well as by directing learners' attention to them in different speech acts "learners will not only increase their grammatical competence, but will also improve their functional knowledge of how to negotiate communicative actions" (p. 664). In their study, Felix-Brasdefer and Cohen (2012) proposed teaching Spanish pragmatics using various pragmalinguistic resources such as conditional, imperative, modal adverbs, subjunctive, and others that occur in various speech acts. For example, the pragmatic function of a conditional sentence can be an expression of politeness (e.g., *I don't know if it would be possible; I would not be able to attend your party*).

Kasper (2001) notes that metapragmatic instruction may be often combined with metapragmatic discussion, requiring “active student participation in a teacher fronted format or small groups” (p. 53). Moreover, she argues that it would seem promising to extend a pedagogical grammar framework to instructional pragmatics. Notably, Kasper (2001) draws a parallel between focus on form and meaning in teaching grammar and focus on form and meaning in teaching pragmatics. She suggests calling this approach “focus on form and [communicative] function” (p. 53). In her view, any metapragmatic comment provided by the teacher in response to students’ pragmatic performance in pedagogical activities such as role-plays may be considered focus on both form and communicative function in teaching pragmatics.

Two major principles of grammar pedagogy adopted for the purposes of teaching pragmatics which have been reported in the literature are Focus on FormS, Focus on Form, and pragmalinguistic recasts⁴ (Long, 1991, as cited in Fukuya & Clark, 2001; Fukuya & Zhang, 2002). *Focus on Form* refers to drawing brief attention to linguistic forms while learners engage primarily with meaning, whereas *Focus on Forms* is an approach in which teachers present linguistic items in a linear and additive fashion (Long, 1991; Long & Robinson, 1998, as cited in Nassaji, 2016). For example, Fukuya and Clark (2001) in their study compared the efficacy of Focus on Form and Focus on Forms techniques in teaching mitigators in requests. In this study, pedagogical treatment based on the Focus on Form approach included watching a video which contained *typographical enhancement* (highlighting) of mitigators in captions, whereas Focus on FormS participants watched the version of the video with *explicit metapragmatic instruction* on mitigators. Thus, these two principles of grammar pedagogy were realized in this study by means

⁴ Pragmalinguistic recast technique is used in the Focus on Form approach.

of input enhancement and explicit instruction techniques. Fukuya and Clark (2001) concluded that despite the fact that typographical saliency helped to draw the learners' attention to the mitigators, it was not sufficient enough for pragmalinguistic learning. They suggest that in order for instruction to be more effective, at least four factors need to be made salient to L2 learners: (1) a pragmalinguistic form; (2) its function; (3) a situation in which such a form is required; and (4) the particular power, distance and imposition values involved (p. 121).

Different types of corrective feedback (e.g., recasts) also seem to work in facilitation of grammar acquisition in L2 pragmatics teaching (Fukuya & Clark, 2001; Martínez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005). However, the majority of teaching proposals for speech act teaching⁵ mainly suggest providing corrective feedback on the appropriateness of the utterance, paying attention only to the sociopragmatic aspect of language. Fukuya and Clark (2001) claim that feedback should be given not only on the appropriateness of the utterance but also on its pragmalinguistic accuracy. For example, Martínez-Flor and Fukuya (2005) in their study used a combination of two Focus on Form techniques-- typographical input enhancement and pragmalinguistic recasts.⁶ According to Martínez-Flor and Fukuya (2005), such a combination of techniques or 'coupled instruction' can have more instructional efficacy than a single technique can.

⁵ A more detailed discussion of this issue is presented in the following chapter.

⁶ Pragmalinguistic recast is defined as teacher's or a native speaker's reformulation of an utterance that is either pragmatically inappropriate or an utterance that is pragmatically appropriate but grammatically incorrect (Fukuya & Zhang, 2002).

1.3.2.2. Development of Explicit and Implicit Knowledge Types

The development of explicit knowledge (i.e., knowledge of facts about the language) can serve as a tool for facilitating the eventual development of implicit knowledge (i.e., a learner's ability to comprehend and produce language fluently), which is the ultimate goal of language instruction, and pedagogical grammar in particular (Ranta & Lyster, 2018). A parallel can be drawn between developing L2 grammatical competence and L2 pragmatic competence: the latter entails not only the knowledge of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic and sociocultural norms but also the ability to use these knowledge types to participate in an act of interaction (Taguchi, 2016).

When designing the pedagogical sequence used during the formula-enhanced instructional treatment (see Chapter 4 for a detailed overview) and in order to unite the principles of pragmatics and grammar pedagogy in one study, the researcher drew on the principles of instructed SLA theory put forth by R. Ellis (1997, 2008) as well as the major categories of proactive form-focused instruction outlined in Ranta and Lyster (2018). In his theory of instructed SLA, R. Ellis (1997, 2008) asserts that it is important to include teaching activities aimed at developing *explicit knowledge* with adult L2 learners because it may facilitate their *implicit knowledge* and *interlanguage system* development, which may later result in a more successful output. In this model, such activities are introduced after the learners have noticed the target items and established how they differ from their existing interlanguage representation. In the final phase (i.e., *Integrating*), learners can make use of their implicit knowledge during both controlled and automatic processing, and it is hoped that their interlanguage system will be modified to resemble the L2 standard. Similarly, Ranta & Lyster's (2018) overview of proactive grammar teaching techniques consist of input enhancement techniques that aim to promote the

noticing and consequent processing of targeted forms in the input, metalinguistic explanations to develop *explicit knowledge*, and practice to develop *automaticity for fluent use* of grammatical knowledge. Moreover, it is important to clearly distinguish between teaching activities that aim to build *metalinguistic knowledge* and activities that aim to practice developing *automatization of* or *access to* this knowledge (L. Ranta, personal communication, April 2017).

1.3.3. Mental Processing and Acquisition of Formulas

1.3.3.1. Mental Processing

It is believed that formulaic sequences are holistically stored in and retrieved from the mental lexicon at the time of communicative need (Wray, 2002, 2008). Previous research has yielded some evidence showing that formulaic units are processed more quickly than non-formulaic ones (e.g., Jiang & Nekrasova, 2007; Conklin & Schmitt, 2008). Nonetheless, as observed by Siyanova-Chanturia (2015), studies that report quicker processing of formulaic sequences mainly draw their conclusions on the basis of lower reading times, but do not usually take into account the existing body of evidence from psycholinguistics. Siyanova-Chanturia (2015) concludes that while phrasal frequency plays a crucial role in language acquisition, processing, and use, it cannot support the holistic storage assumption.

It is also important to bear in mind that there are multiple types of formulaic sequences, such as idioms, lexical bundles, conventional expressions, and others. Idioms, for example, tend to be processed faster and are left unanalysed due to their figurative nature. On the other hand, such formulaic expressions as lexical bundles and lexical phrases can be dealt with in more constructed manner. Therefore, many questions regarding the holistic nature of formulaic sequences remain and require future investigation (Wood, 2015). Although mental processing of such formulaic expressions as collocations and idioms has been researched extensively (Jing &

Nekrasova, 2007; Conklin & Schmitt, 2008; Siyanova-Chanturia, Conklin, & Schmitt, 2011), few studies have explored mental processing of longer pragmatic formulas with sentence-like structures (Pawley, 2007; Kesckes, 2000a). This raises a question regarding the way such expressions might be stored in mental lexicon. In other words, it is unclear whether L2 learners recognize them as wholes and retain them in memory as chunks, or whether L2 learners first decompose such sequences and analyse their constituent parts.

In the pragmatics literature, authors distinguish between *prefabricated routines* (e.g., *How are you?*; *I don't understand*), which are simply memorized at early stages of L2 acquisition (Krashen & Scarcella, 1978), and *prefabricated patterns* (Hakuta, 1974), also known as *productive speech formulas* (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992) or *semi-fixed grammatical patterns* (Taguchi, 2007) (e.g., *That's a ___ pen/knife/paper*). Productive speech formulas are believed to be partly 'creative' and partly memorized chunks that consist of a sentence frame with an open, fillable slot. Furthermore, Bardovi-Harlig (2006, 2009) distinguishes between *acquisitional (developmental) formulas* and *social (target) formulas*. While acquisitional formulas arise spontaneously during initial stages of acquisition and are not related to the level of interlanguage grammar development, social formulas (e.g., *Come in; go ahead*) are learnt later and their mastery usually characterizes advanced learners (Bardovi-Harlig, 2009).

1.3.3.2. Grammar Acquisition

The important role of formulaic sequences in language acquisition has been emphasized in the usage-based or associative model of SLA (N.C. Ellis, 1996, 2002, 2012). N. Ellis (1996) in his overview of sequencing in language acquisition links the knowledge of frequent multiword units to the acquisition of grammar and asserts that storing such sequences in long-term memory may be a source of productive grammar. The proponents of the usage-based model of SLA

believe that formulaic language may be used as a communicative strategy for second language acquisition by adult learners since it may allow them to use linguistic structures with much more complex syntax than those that they construct creatively (Wood, 2015). Furthermore, formulaic sequences can equip L2 learners with chunks of accurate and contextually appropriate language that helps them to come across as proficient and nativelike language speakers. It is believed that formulaic expressions, especially those known as ‘conversational fillers’ (e.g., kind of, you know, I guess, etc.), can serve as ‘islands’ or ‘zones of safety’ if properly stored in memory (Boers et al., 2006; N. Ellis, 2012). In other words, formulaic expressions can free speakers from concentrating on the mechanics of speech production and enable them to focus on tasks of higher order, that is, to combine utterances into sentences (Pawley, 1986). At the same time, Wood (2015) notes that various external and internal factors, such as cognitive and learning styles of L2 learners and degree of instruction may affect the acquisition process; as a result, some adults may be more analytic and attempt to infer rules from chunked units or from pieces of input, while others may rely heavily on acquired formulas and not attempt to break them down or analyze them.

On the other side of the debate are the scholars who believe that the acquisition of syntax is an independent process which is not driven by the knowledge of formulaic expressions (Bardvodi-Harlig & Stringer, 2016). Studies investigating interlanguage realization of pragmatic formulas have shown that L2 learners seem to creatively construct such formulas at initial stages of acquisition (Bardovi-Harlig, 2009; Bardovi-Harlig & Vallenga, 2012; Bardovi-Harlig & Stringer, 2016). Thus, learners tend to first use pragmatic formulas accurately in an unanalysed form. Later, as the level of grammatical competence increases, learners start to analyse the constituent elements of formulas, which results in the production of inaccurate and non-

nativelike forms. Finally, such expressions are acquired in the target-like form, usually after a period of pedagogical treatments and/or long-term exposure to and active participation in the target language environment (Bardovi-Harlig & Stringer, 2016). For example, a study by Taguchi et al. (2013) has shown that, when acquiring formulaic expressions, L2 learners go through stages of development, or ‘patterns of change’ (i.e., change toward target formula; change toward target-like slot-and-frame pattern; change toward non-target formula; stabilized non-target formula use).

Chapter 3: Review of Classroom-Based Research

This chapter presents a comprehensive review of intervention research in instructional pragmatics and formulaic language. The first section discusses ways in which pragmatics can be dealt with during classroom instruction in various educational contexts, followed by an overview of major speech act teaching models. The second section provides an overview of the most common teaching techniques used in formulaic language pedagogy and touches upon problems of selection and teachability of formulas. The third section reviews some key classroom-based studies that have focused on the role of formulaic language in acquiring L2 speech proficiency, particularly from the perspective of speech fluency and L2 pragmatic competence.

3.1. Pragmatics in the L2 Classroom

Pedagogical intervention is clearly needed to help L2 learners develop their L2 pragmatic competence as simple exposure to the target language input does not automatically lead to an adequate ability to comprehend and produce target pragmatic features (Takahashi, 2013). Three main lines of classroom-based research on instructional pragmatics have been identified in the literature (Kasper & Roever, 2005):

- observational research
- interventional research
- research that explores L2 learners' perceptions and judgements of various target pragmatic features as well as teachers' and learners' perceptions of pragmatics instruction.

3.1.1. Development of L2 Pragmatic Ability in the Language Classroom

Research studies of an interventional nature describe various ways in which pragmatic competence may be taught in the classroom and provide empirical evidence that supports the efficacy of a given teaching method(s). According to several comprehensive reviews on pragmatics in L2 learning (Rose & Kasper, 2001; Kasper & Roever, 2005; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996), the following major research questions have been guiding inquiry in the area of instructional pragmatics to date:

- What opportunities for developing L2 pragmatic ability are offered in language classrooms?
- Is instruction of the targeted pragmatic feature more effective than no instruction?
- What effects do various approaches to instruction have on pragmatic development?

It has been generally accepted that L2 classroom provides a safe setting where learners may ask clarification questions about language use in particular contexts and receive feedback from their teacher, whereas the teacher would usually demonstrate how to perform tasks in pragmatically appropriate ways (Wyner & Cohen, 2015). While the “classroom is the ideal place in which to help learners interpret language use” (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003, p. 38), it is important to understand that language input which learners are usually exposed to in the classroom is quite limited. In other words, it is unrealistic to expect that it would be possible to cover all potential contexts of language use and expose students to all possible speech acts which may occur in naturalistic settings within the limited scope of a lesson/course. Thus, specialists agree that the main goal of instruction in pragmatics is to provide learners with the range of pragmatic devices and practices of the target language (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor,

2003). Thus, teachers are encouraged to teach pragmatics based on research-informed data rather than relying on their own intuition or commercially available textbooks. To this end, teachers may consider collecting authentic language samples either from published research articles or through their own data collection. This could be also done in collaboration with their students (Ishihara, 2010). One more piece of advice that comes from the literature is to have learners become their own ethnographers and make them do their own observations outside of the classroom (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996). This approach is recommended for English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts; students in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts are not usually exposed to the target language structures outside of the classroom. Moreover, scholars agree that if learners wish to maintain their own sociocultural identities, they should not necessarily adapt to the target sociocultural rules (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Taguchi, 2011). On the other hand, teachers should make their learners aware of the consequences of pragmatic choices they make as well as encourage them to critically analyze the sociocultural implications of their language (Ishihara, 2010). This, of course, is not an easy endeavour, and, as Bardovi-Harlig (2001) notes, “the most appropriate and effective ways to deliver this information and the manner in which learners integrate such information into a developing interlanguage remain empirical questions” (p. 32). Scholars also emphasize the importance of teachers’ specific training and background focused on instructional pragmatics (Ishihara, 2010; Vasquez & Sharpless, 2009). According to Ishihara (2010), qualifications of an effective teacher of L2 pragmatics should include such aspects as an awareness of pragmatic norms in the target language, an ability to provide meta-pragmatic information and conduct pragmatic-focused instruction and assessment, and a sensitivity to learners’ cultures and subjectivities. In summary, there seems to be a consensus in the literature that a classroom setting does not

provide enough opportunities for pragmatics learning due to the lack of a range of representations of communicative events and registers in the classroom discourse (Taguchi, 2011). Therefore, it would seem reasonable for teachers to carefully select aspects of pragmatics that they think would be most appropriate to focus on given the learning context and students' communicative needs. Bardovi-Harlig (1996) is right to point out that “bringing pragmatics into the classroom successfully will require the *joint effort* of many professionals involved in different endeavors related to pragmatics” (p. 21, emphasis added).

3.1.1.1. Explicit versus Implicit Instruction of Pragmatics

Rose (2012) points out that studies on L2 instruction in pragmatics primarily use two main approaches: *explicit* and *implicit* teaching. These two methods are considered to be two main types of *awareness-oriented* instruction (Takimoto 2007) and have been extensively debated in the literature on L2 pedagogy due to inconsistencies in their definitions (Takahashi, 2010). Rose (2012) defines explicit instruction of pragmatics as a method where learners are provided with direct instruction on how linguistic forms are used in context, whereas implicit instruction of pragmatics implies exposing learners to pragmatic aspects of language and providing them with a means to make generalizations and conclusions about how language is used in context. In particular, availability of *metapragmatic information* during the course of the instruction can be considered a key factor in distinguishing between explicit and implicit instruction (Taguchi, 2015). Yet, the distinction between these two methods is not precise, and they often overlap. For example, *input enhancement* has been traditionally viewed as an implicit teaching method which does not provide metapragmatic information (Kasper, 2001).

Takahashi (2001, 2005) in her studies that investigated instructional effects in interlanguage pragmatics distinguished four different degrees and types of input enhancement which range from more explicit to less explicit teaching conditions: explicit teaching, featuring metapragmatic explanation about form-function relationship of the target structure; form-comparison (students compare their speech-act realizations with those of native speakers); form-search (students identify the target strategies in provided speech-act scenarios); and meaning-focused conditions (students listen and read the input and answer comprehension questions). Similarly, Takimoto (2007, 2009) also explored the instructional effects of three types of input-based approaches to teaching pragmatics: structured input tasks with explicit information; consciousness-raising; and structured input task without explicit information. Such tasks include a combination of teacher-fronted explanations and reinforcement activities which are meant to draw students' attention to both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of pragmatics in the target language.

Ishihara and Cohen (2010) distinguish between *deductive* and *inductive* teaching methods. In the deductive method, the teacher provides pragmatic norms to students before they analyse examples, which is similar to explicit teaching of metapragmatic information. In contrast, in the inductive method, learners would analyse pragmatic data and discover L2 pragmatic norms on their own; the teacher may simply guide learners in their discovery process. However, Ishihara and Cohen (2010) observe that language instruction in the classroom may reflect a combination of inductive and deductive approaches. In such a way, "the learning about pragmatic norms can be viewed as being co-constructed, rather than purely inductive or deductive" (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010, p. 117). Furthermore, research has shown that *guided induction*, as a method of explicit instruction, in which teachers help learners co-construct rules

by directing their attention to relevant aspects of the input and asking guiding questions, shows superior results since it leads to high levels of awareness of the L2 structure. By and large, an inductive approach to language teaching, which includes problem-solving activities, seems to be a better alternative since it is believed that such instruction can lead to greater depth of processing and create more memorable and meaningful experiences for learners (Cerezo, Caras, & Leow, 2016).

3.1.1.2. Proposals to Teach Pragmatics in Different Educational Settings

It is assumed that learners in the EFL environments have very limited opportunities to be exposed to the target language outside of classroom, while learners in the ESL environments have the advantage of residing in a target language community and, therefore, are expected to acquire L2 pragmatic ability faster and more efficiently. It has to be noted, however, that previous research (Taguchi, 2008) has revealed that living in the target language environment does not guarantee better development of L2 pragmatic ability in ESL learners than in their EFL peers. Due to advancements in the field of information technology and Internet, the distinction between ESL and EFL may be overly simplistic in the modern globalized world (Wyner & Cohen, 2015).

Issues pertaining to availability and selection of adequate teaching materials and textbooks that focus on pragmatics are also addressed in the literature. For example, Diepenbroek and Derwing (2014) analysed the extent to which oral pragmatic activities are represented in forty-eight popular student ESL textbooks and concluded that many textbooks lacked consistency in coverage of pragmatics and while a few textbooks included a wide range of speech acts, the majority of the reviewed textbooks offered rather inconsistent treatment. Given the limitations of traditional textbooks, corpus-informed textbooks are becoming quite

popular nowadays since it is claimed that they provide authentic language input. However, as Cohen (2008) notes, “it may not be easy to extract examples of speech acts from corpus data since the focus in such data sets is on forms, not functions, and speech acts occur across numerous turns” (p. 218). In addition, it may be challenging for teachers to elicit complex speech acts or speech act sets and determine the appropriateness of the target expressions using corpus tools. For this reason, Cohen (2008) suggests that teachers turn to free-access websites that contain examples of lessons. Teachers may consult the following web resources:

- The Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA) at University of Minnesota (can be accessed at <https://carla.umn.edu/speechacts/index.html>)
- The Michigan State University Center for Language Education and Research (CLEAR) (can be accessed at <https://globaledge.msu.edu/global-resources/resource/6445>)
- Online resources for teaching workplace pragmatics developed by a team of researchers at NorQuest College in Edmonton, Alberta (can be accessed at <https://www.norquest.ca/research-innovation/colbourne-institute-for-inclusive-leadership/projects/completed-projects/diversity-at-work-web-based-simulation-activities.aspx>)
- Thirty sample pragmatics lessons collected and posted by Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor (2003) on the US Department of State web page (can be accessed at <https://americanenglish.state.gov/resources/teaching-pragmatics>)
- Resources on teaching pragmatics developed by Prof. D. Koike at the University of Texas at Austin (can be accessed at <https://coerll.utexas.edu/methods/modules/pragmatics/>)

To sum up, research has shown that pragmatic features of the target language can be teachable. However, educational objectives should be carefully identified by both teachers and learners (Sykes, 2010). Also, both implicit and explicit instruction improves pragmatic competence, but the explicitly taught students tend to perform better (Koike & Pearson, 2005; Soler, 2005). Researchers have observed that different aspects of pragmatic competence require different instructional techniques and different measures of effectiveness (Kasper, 2001; Rose, 2005; Bardovi-Harlig, 2001). For example, scholars agree that pragmalinguistic features of the target language can be learnt through explicit intervention, whereas sociopragmatic knowledge is more difficult to acquire (Ishihara, 2010). In addition, Takahashi (2010) claimed that many of the studies she reviewed provide both positive and negative outcomes, in terms of the effectiveness of pragmatic intervention, irrespective of the explicitness of the input conditions.

3.1.2. Approaches to Speech Act Teaching

There are several major proposals to teach pragmatics in both ESL and EFL settings. These proposals either suggest strategy-based instruction of target language speech acts (Cohen, 2005, 2008) or present comprehensive frameworks for teaching particular aspects of pragmatic competence consisting of a series of pedagogical steps (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006). Six major speech act teaching models that can be found in the literature are presented in Table 1 below. As can be seen in Table 1, almost all speech act teaching approaches emphasize the importance of awareness-raising activities as well as providing explicit metapragmatic explanations.

For example, Cohen (2005) argued that introducing L2 learners to various strategies of learning and performing speech acts may be a key to successful development of L2 pragmatic

ability. He proposed a taxonomy of learner strategies for acquiring speech acts. The taxonomy includes strategies for the initial learning of speech acts; strategies for using speech act material that has already been learnt to some extent; and learners' metapragmatic considerations regarding the deployment of these strategies. As for speech act learning strategies, Cohen (2005) proposes the following:

- conduct a 'lay' cross-cultural analysis and compare what would be the appropriate thing to say for that speech act in learners' L1 and target language community, depending on the situation
- identify the socio-pragmatic norms for performance of those speech acts in the target language
- identify semantic formulas and linguistic structures that tend to be used by NS in the target language community within a given speech act.

As for speech act use strategies, teachers may consider engaging students in imaginary interactions focusing on certain pragmalinguistic aspects of speech acts. This can be done through role-play with fellow L2 learners or native speakers (if possible); students are also encouraged to ask native speakers for feedback in terms of the appropriateness of the performance in a given speech act. Finally, it is up to learners which aspect of the speech act (comprehension or production) they will work on. In order to avoid pragmatic failure, teachers should encourage students to consider such factors as the appropriateness of the chosen level of directness or indirectness and the sociopragmatic appropriateness of the selected semantic formulas and pragmalinguistic accuracy of linguistic structures used. All in all, as Cohen (2005) himself acknowledges, this taxonomy has to be empirically validated; therefore, it is rather a series of suggestions, as opposed to strict rules which have to be followed.

Several other teaching approaches were put forward by Martinez-Flor and Uso-Juan (2006) and by Cruz (2013, 2015). Martinez-Flor and Uso-Juan (2006) created a so-called ‘6Rs Approach’ to develop learners’ pragmatic competence in the foreign language context and in the particular academic discipline (tourism). This approach consists of six main steps or stages: (1) researching; (2) reflecting; (3) receiving; (4) reasoning; (5) rehearsing; and (6) revising. According to Taguchi (2011), “this model brings together several critical elements of pragmatics teaching: cultural comparisons, explicit pragmatic information, awareness-raising of pragmalinguistic forms and their situational variations, focused practice, and feedback” (p.297). In this approach, at each stage students receive worksheets with questions about various pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects that are supposed to stimulate awareness-raising; students are also encouraged to become data-collectors and evaluators: they are presented with scenarios and conversation and then asked to review them and evaluate their appropriateness. According to the authors of the 6Rs Approach, the purpose of these activities is to engage learners in a series of communicative practices where a natural use of the speech acts can take place. Based on Martinez-Flor and Uso-Juan’s (2006) taxonomy, Cruz (2013) suggested an approach for teaching the pragmatics of phatic communion and then a proposal to teach complaints (Cruz, 2015). The main pedagogical steps offered in her model include:

- defining and identifying target speech acts by means of teacher’s explicit explanations or with the help of awareness-raising questions
- reflecting and reasoning about target speech acts (teachers should make students aware of the negative consequences of improper usage of language structures in the target speech acts)

- using control and free oral and written activities focusing on target speech acts (e.g., role-plays, discourse completion tests, contextualized gapped sentences, analysing documents or videos containing target speech acts).

Table 1.

Major approaches to speech act teaching

Approach	Suggested pedagogical activities
Cohen (2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cross-cultural comparisons - identifying semantic formulas and linguistic structures within a given speech act - using native speaker speech act behavior as a model - encouraging students to become ethnographers and data-collectors - role-plays, 'real plays' with native speakers - asking native speakers for feedback in a variety of contexts
Martinez-Flor and Uso-Juan (2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - creating worksheets with questions about various pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects to stimulate awareness-raising
6Rs Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - encouraging students to become ethnographers and data-collectors - explicit instruction on the pragmalinguistic forms used in speech acts - oral and written production tasks - interviews with native speakers - feedback sessions
Cruz (2013, 2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - explicit metapragmatic explanations and awareness-raising - control and free oral and written activities (e.g., role-plays, discourse completion tests, analysing documents or videos containing target speech acts)

3.2. Formulaic Language in the L2 Classroom

The mastery of the idiomatic forms and expressions is an important component of successful language learning (Wray, 2000). Meunier (2012) points out that “our increasingly refined understanding and knowledge of the formulaic nature of language has clearly impacted L2 teaching” (p. 122). As opposed to even ten years ago, when formulaic language was only entering the reality of L2 classrooms, current ESL teaching materials tend to incorporate, at least partially, some formulaic language input. The body of intervention studies which have attempted to explore instructional effects of different pedagogical approaches on formulaic language acquisition by adult L2 learners continues to grow.

3.2.1. Pedagogical Techniques Used in Formulaic Language Teaching

Some of the earliest approaches for teaching formulaic language were proposed by Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) and Lewis (1997, 2008- the updated version). Lewis’s teaching method has been named the ‘Lexical Approach’. When it was first introduced, it revolutionized the way vocabulary was taught. Instead of teaching individual words, it suggested teaching ‘lexical items’ (e.g., polywords, collocations, sentence frames) that could range from individual words to full sentences and form institutionalised utterances that “convey fixed social or pragmatic meaning within a given community” (Lewis, 1997, p. 255). According to Lewis (2008), noticing, which seems to overlap with consciousness- or awareness-raising, is the key idea that informs all exercises and activities in the Lexical Approach.

Hatami (2015) notes that the majority of contemporary strategies and techniques used in formulaic language teaching attempt to incorporate “the three important psychological conditions for successful vocabulary learning: noticing, retrieving, and generating” (p. 118). Among the main approaches to formulaic language teaching she named raising the awareness of learners and

selecting appropriate formulaic sequences to teach. A similar framework was proposed by Boers and Lindstromberg (2012). They described several major types of intervention strategies for teaching formulaic sequences to L2 learners: awareness-raising, attention directing, stimulating lookups to foster learner autonomy, and stimulating retention.

Awareness-raising is premised on the notion that an enhanced awareness of formulaicity will foster independent learning because L2 learners will be more inclined to notice formulaic sequences in the target language outside the classroom. In addition, it is hoped that learners will be more attentive to information about the syntagmatic behaviour of words they look up in a dictionary. Participants in the studies that use attention directing and stimulating retention types of instruction are prompted to remember particular vocabulary items so that they can be stored in their mental lexicon. This can be done with the help of specific teaching techniques, such as text chunking, collocation recognition, L1 comparative translations, etc. (e.g., Webb & Kagimoto, 2010). Moreover, the effects of drawing learners' attention to mnemonic effects of formulaic sequences as well as encouraging learners to notice alliteration in lexical chunks have been researched quite extensively (e.g., Boers, Eyckman & Stengers, 2006; Lindstromberg & Boers, 2008).

3.2.1.1. Pedagogical Text Chunking

Text-chunking is the central pedagogical strategy proposed by Lewis (2008) for fostering comprehensibility and memorization of formulaic expressions. Boers et al. (2006) conducted a fundamental study that put the Lexical Approach to the test. In this study, the students in the experimental group were encouraged to notice recurring lexical chunks in language input in both listening and reading material. In addition, the participants engaged in exploration activities through different kinds of gap-fill exercises focusing on meaning of the given word sequences.

The results showed that those participants who were made aware of the standardized word combinations in authentic reading and listening materials significantly improved their oral proficiency in later retells of the reading texts. However, Boers et al. (2006) noted that such an improvement could be caused by fact that the students repeated the words verbatim from the input materials.

3.2.1.2. Typographical Enhancement, Glossing, and L1 Translations

Peters (2012) drew her participants' attention to German formulaic sequences and single words by using typographical salience (i.e., bold typeface and underlining) technique. The participants were asked to write down unfamiliar sequences occurring in the reading text. The results revealed that typographical salience facilitated learners' noticing and learning of unfamiliar formulaic sequences. However, the attention-directing instructional method used by Peters (2012) did not have a significant effect on learners' ability to learn the target sequences. The author concluded that simple attention-drawing does not seem to facilitate vocabulary learning. Another study that used glossed sentences (English to Japanese) was conducted by Webb and Kagimoto (2010). The researchers asked students to learn five sets of L2 collocations taken from the British National Corpus and the Bank of English. The collocations were typographically enhanced (put in italics) along with their L1 translations. In addition, the target collocations and their meanings were written in bold above each sentence. The participants were instructed to try to understand the collocations and the sentences in which they appear within a three-minute period. The results indicated an increase in the participants' productive knowledge of both meaning and form of the target collocations.

3.2.1.3. Drawing Learner's Attention to Mnemonic Effects of Formulas

Boers, Eyckman and Stengers (2006) surveyed experimental studies which explored the potential of drawing learners' attention to the mnemonic effects of formulaic expressions to foster their better acquisition and memorization. Such studies draw on theories of cognitive linguistics according to which language is considered to be 'motivated' if its semantics and lexical composition cannot be fully predicted or explained. According to Boers, Eyckman and Stengers (2006), linguistic motivation can be of two types: *semantic motivation*, which is based on figurative and conceptual metaphors, and on tracing the semantics of idioms to their historical and cultural origins (e.g., *He reached his boiling point*- 'anger is a hot fluid in a container'; *back to square one*- the domain of games) and *phonological motivation*. In the latter, such phonological features as alliteration and assonance may help learners memorize the precise form or lexical makeup of formulas or help motivate the precise lexical selection (e.g., *tell a tale, say a prayer; publish or perish, below the belt, about the bush*). Boers, Eyckman and Stengers (2006) conclude that making learners recognize these types of linguistic motivation which underline some formulaic expressions is an alternative to "a long and daunting road of blind memorisation" (p. 186) and may bring positive long-term effects on learning behaviour.

3.2.1.4. Encouraging Memorization and Repetition

The role of simple memorization in formulaic language acquisition should not be underestimated, even though it has been viewed in Western contexts as an archaic learning technique (Wood & Namba, 2013). Wood and Namba (2013) emphasize that learners can improve their speech fluency and start paying closer attention to collocations and other formulas by means of memorization and repetition of large amounts of texts. Wood and Namba (2013) provided their participants (L2 Japanese university students) with formulaic expressions specific

to a performance task and for a specific performance goal (oral presentation) and asked them to repeat and memorize those expressions prior to the presentation. The results showed that the participants who followed all the directions of the researchers used formulaic expressions comprehensively in their presentations. Thus, this study has shown that equipping L2 learners with task-specific formulaic expressions and encouraging their memorization can help them achieve their communicative goals in a more efficient and nativelike manner.

3.2.2. Selection and Teachability of Formulas

Since there is a variety of formulaic sequences of different forms and communicative functions, it is unlikely that L2 learners will ever develop a lexical repertoire equivalent to that of native speakers of English. Even though research shows that L2 learners can benefit from pedagogical treatment, one should consider what formulas to teach, especially taking into account limited classroom instruction time (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). Therefore, specialists recommend applying specific criteria when selecting appropriate formulaic expressions to teach (e.g., Yorio, 1980; Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). For example, Yorio (1980) identifies five criteria for the selection of teaching material for formulaic language. These are:

- *need* (involves analysis of the goals and objectives of the learner)
- *usefulness* (analysis of the urgency of applicability; short term and long-term teaching objectives must be established: items with high pragmatic value and survival strategies must be taught first; items of a more sophisticated nature may be taught later)
- *productivity* (analysis of the range of applicability, including considerations of the variables of use: age, gender, social status, etc.)

- *currency and frequency* (involve the specific needs in terms of dialect and register of the students); and
- *ease* (analysis of individual student ability; the easiest to produce should be the one adopted in case there is a choice).

In addition, Boers and Lindstromberg (2009) identify *frequency of occurrence* and *semantic opacity* as two major criteria for selecting formulaic sequences for L2 classrooms. Semantic opacity is one of the major characteristics of formulaic sequences that presents an obstacle for acquisition. The majority of formulas cannot be easily paraphrased or translated into learners' L1s. For example, Bahns and Eldaw (1993) tested the productive knowledge of English collocations of advanced German EFL learners and concluded that it would be beneficial to pay close attention to those collocations that cannot directly paraphrased or translated. With the development of corpus linguistics, frequency of occurrence has become another main criterion of formulaic language categorization and selection. It has been established that the more frequent a formula occurs in input, the faster it will be acquired by an L2 learner. For example, N. Ellis, Simpson-Vlach, and Maynard (2008) looked at three corpus-derived metrics that affected accuracy and fluency of processing formulaic sequences: length, frequency and mutual information. They found that for the native speakers it was predominantly the mutual information, a statistical measure which refers to the strength of association between collocating words, whereas for the non-native speakers the frequency of occurrence played the most important role. However, linguistic descriptions based on corpus analysis are not necessarily pedagogically relevant (Widdowson, 2003; Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). Widdowson (2003), for example, observes that "the more significant words are likely to be the *infrequent* ones" (p. 97, emphasis in the original). Boers and Lindstromberg (2009) argue that in order to help

diminish the likelihood of collocation error and to help students progress, teachers may want to focus on the expressions which belong to the medium-frequency class.

At the same time, both DCT and corpus data present some pedagogical potential when used for selecting appropriate formulas to teach (Schauer & Adolphs, 2006). While the traditional purpose of the DCT is to collect cross-linguistic data of individual interactions in a controlled environment, the corpus tools have mainly been used to facilitate language description in a variety of discourse contexts which are usually not available through DCTs. For example, Schauer and Adolphs (2006) attempted to compare native speakers' responses elicited via a DCT (i.e., expressions of gratitude) to the distribution and realization of the same responses found in the Cambridge and Nottingham Corpus of Discourse in English (CANCODE). Schauer and Adolphs (2006) conclude:

Our investigation of expressions of gratitude in the DCT and corpus data has revealed that the data elicited with the discourse completion task contained a great variety of interactional formulaic sequence categories that can be linked to a controlled contextual environment, while the corpus data provided detailed insights into additional situational thanking contexts and the use of expressions of gratitude over several conversational turns (pp. 131-132).

Finally, Ellis, N., Simpson-Vlach, and Maynard (2008) suggest ranking formulas according to a measure of utility called 'formula teaching worth' (p. 392) to balance the criteria of frequency and mutual information. According to Ellis, N., Simpson-Vlach, and Maynard (2008), high utility for and relevance to L2 learners' needs should be the main selection criteria when choosing formulaic sequence for classroom instruction.

3.3. Formulaic Language and Spoken Language Proficiency

It has been widely accepted that a good mastery of a range of formulaic sequences is an important component of successful L2 spoken performance. Wray (2000) identified two main processing advantages which formulaic sequences may bring to L2 learners. First, formulaic expressions can help L2 speakers save effort in spontaneous speech processing which facilitates fluency of expression; second, formulaic expressions help L2 speakers in achieving interactional or communicative functions more effectively. Saving effort in processing refers to the fact that formulaic sequences provide ready-made frameworks for building utterances (Becker, 1975, as cited in Wray, 2000). In addition, Wray (2000) observes that formulaic expressions perform such functions as processing short-cuts, which leads to increased production speed; time-buyers (e.g., *If you like*); and manipulation of information or others (e.g., *I wonder if you'd mind*).

Research on formulaic language concerned with spoken language proficiency centers around two major areas: speech fluency and pragmatic competence (Wood, 2015). Research has shown that acquiring “a stock of automatized formulaic sequences” (Wood, 2010, p.193) is key to fluency development. Furthermore, it has been noted in the literature that formulaic chunks facilitate both fluency of language production and language comprehension (Boers and Lindstromberg, 2009). The value of formulas for L2 pragmatic competence development is in their capacity to serve as a pragmalinguistic resource for expression of pragmatics in L2 learners’ speech (Bardovi-Harlig, 2006). The ability to use appropriate utterances during an ongoing talk is also known as ‘pragmatic fluency’ (House, 1996).

3.3.1. Fluency Development

Wood has conducted a number of studies devoted to formulaic language and L2 speech fluency. In one of these studies (Wood, 2006), he analysed how L2 learners use formulaic expressions in narration. Eleven ESL students placed in an intensive study-abroad context met with the researcher several times over a period of six months and were asked to watch an animated movie and then spontaneously retell its plot. The results revealed certain gains in fluency by the end of the study period; in addition, it was reported that L2 learners tended to use formulas as rhetorical devices to organize discourse (e.g., to start or finish a story) (Wood, 2006). In this study, Wood employed blind judges to assess participants' fluency of expressions. Interestingly, he found a strong association between judges' evaluation and the number of formulaic expressions used by the students in their narratives. A positive correlation between the use of formulaic expressions and the increased level of fluency has been also reported in Wood (2009). A study participant was a female Japanese learner of English whose monologic speech was tested before and after a series of fluency workshops. The results showed that due to the intensive instruction the L2 learner improved her fluency in the measures of speech rate (measured as syllables uttered per minute) and length of runs (measured as mean number of syllables uttered between pauses). In particular, Wood (2009) noted that the participant started to use longer and more semantically complex formulaic expressions which had a wider range of functions and types after the treatment period. The increased use of formulaic expressions taken from the fluency workshops promoted longer runs and fluency in the participant's performance, as well making her speech sound more native-like.

The positive correlation between the number of formulaic chunks used by L2 learners and fluency as perceived by blind judges has also been reported in studies conducted by Boers et

al. (2006), Eyckmans (2007), and Stengers (2009). Participants in these studies were given a pedagogical treatment based on Lewis's (1997, 2008) Lexical Approach, which mainly involves an awareness-raising technique called 'text chunking'. In Boers et al. (2006), the students were encouraged to notice and underline useful word combinations in authentic listening and reading materials. Participants' oral performance was assessed by a blind judge during the post-treatment oral interview, which required the students to discuss a short article related to one of the topics dealt with in the course and engage in a spontaneous conversation about a topic familiar to the students. Interestingly, in addition to the increased level of formulaic sequences after the treatment, the students in both Boers et al (2006) and Stengers (2009) were awarded additional scores by blind judges for the 'range of expression' parameter defined as "lexical richness and syntactic complexity" (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009, p.37).

3.3.2. Pragmatic Competence Enhancement

Classroom-based studies of the acquisition of formulas have mainly explored the role of language proficiency (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998; Xu, Case and Wang, 2009) and the role of study abroad experience and/or the length of residence in a target language community (e.g., Taguchi, 2013; Roever, 2011b, Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011) in the production of pragmatic formulas in L2. These studies revealed a complex relationship between pragmatic formulas, length of exposure to the target language and the level of grammatical proficiency. For instance, Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011) found that the length of stay in the English-speaking environment did not have a significant effect on either recognition or accurate production of formulaic expressions; however both proficiency and intensity of interaction did have a significant impact on students' performance. Similarly, a study by Xu, Case and Wang (2009) showed that, while both length of residence and L2 proficiency had a positive impact on L2

pragmatic competence development, L2 proficiency level had a greater impact on participants' performance. In another study, Taguchi (2013) found that higher-level proficiency may be beneficial for better pragmalinguistic control of formulas. However, she pointed out that additional opportunities to "observe and practice routines in daily interaction might be the factor that most clearly affects the learning and internalization of routines" (p. 117). Finally, Roever (2011b) concluded that the longer L2 learners reside in an English-speaking country the more likely they are to acquire routine formulae and use them in their speech. Nevertheless, Roever (2011b) stressed that residence should not be understood simply as physical presence in a target-language country; instead, residence implies constant contact with target language speakers in a variety of social settings.

The role of formulas in the realization of target language speech acts deserves closer attention. Cohen (2008) observes that contemporary pragmatics research tends to move beyond a traditional approach to focus on speech acts in isolation. Instead, there is a tendency to study speech acts and speech act sets in situated interaction and to employ approaches from such fields as conversational analysis. However, Cohen (2008) argues that it would be extremely beneficial to focus on individual speech acts for the sake of second and foreign language pedagogy. The reason why the realization of speech acts is closely tied to pragmatic formulas is that the use of pragmatic formulas is one of the main pragmatic strategies which is shared cross-culturally (Kasper, 1995, as cited in Kasper & Schmidt, 1996). Bardovi-Harlig, Rose, and Nickels (2008) in their study explored the use of formulas in the realization of three speech acts: expressions of gratitude, apologies, and refusals. The authors in this study used specific scenarios for computer-delivered DCTs which would encourage both native speakers and L2 learners to use target pragmatic formulas. When learners' performance was compared to that of native speakers,

Bardovi-Harlig, Rose, and Nickels (2008) found that learners tended to use shorter (or less sophisticated) expressions as opposed to native speakers (e.g., *Thank you* vs *Thank you for your help*). In addition, the researchers concluded that the use of formulas by L2 learners was constrained by sociopragmatic knowledge. In particular, the learners did not always perceive a particular context as an appropriate environment for speech act to occur, and, as a result, did not use the expected target formulas.

Initial attempts to teach pragmatic formulas explicitly were reported in several earlier studies (Tateyama, 2001; Yoshimi, 2001; Rose & Kwai-fun, 2001). Tateyama (2001) focused on the use of Japanese thanking formulas by Japanese as a foreign language learners, Yoshimi (2001) focused on explicit instruction of Japanese interactional discourse markers, and Rose and Kwai-fun (2001) devoted their study to teaching of compliments and compliment responses in American English. In terms of teaching methods, they mostly used the awareness-raising/noticing approach. Students were either prompted to pay attention to formulas when watching a video, or review handouts with detailed explanations of contexts and proper use of formulas combined with teacher's detailed explanations and guidance. Nevertheless, these studies have revealed weak potential of awareness-raising on retention of a wide range of taught formulas, despite the reported positive attitudes of the students towards the treatment (Yoshimi, 2001).

Several other studies made an attempt to introduce activities which are hoped to stimulate learners' cognitive processing mechanisms 'beyond mere noticing' (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). The first such study was conducted by Olshtain and Cohen (1990) and devoted to the teaching of the speech act of apology. The teaching intervention consisted of the following elements: (1) teacher's explicit explanations of speech act behaviour in English apology

realizations; (2) information sheets presenting the main points of the lesson; (3) role-play activities with specification pertaining to the apology situation and the relations holding between participants; (4) pair work activities in which students were expected to discuss appropriacy of apology realization in given situations; (5) listening to native speaker dialogues involving the use of apologies; and (5) classroom discussion of the ways in which apologies are realized in English (p. 52). Olshtain and Cohen's (1990) study showed that after the instruction, the students started to use more appropriate apology strategies. However, despite the fact that the teaching approach in this study was not limited to only to explicit explanation of pragmatic material, learners' attention was not explicitly directed to pragmatic formulas of the apology speech acts. Two examples of teaching intervention studies which did focus explicitly on formulaic language while teaching pragmatics are Bardovi-Harlig and Vellenga (2012) and Zavialova (2016).

Bardovi-Harlig and Vellenga (2012) in their study used the efficacy of *focused noticing* activities that train learners to notice conventional expressions outside of instructional setting. These included *contextualized input* and *guided metapragmatic noticing*. In the first part of the instruction, students were asked to predict situational contexts in which the presented expressions may occur (i.e., shopping, at a restaurant, at home). In the second part of the instruction, the students were presented with contextualized written input extracted from a *Friends* TV series episode that illustrated how an expression was used in context and a corresponding directed noticing activity. Afterwards, they were given an opportunity to record their observations about pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic features of each conventional expression. It is worth noting that in addition to stimulating noticing through metapragmatic questions (e.g., What are the two parts of *Sorry I am late?*), the authors also used typographic salience (italics) to draw learners' attention to the target expressions. However, as opposed to

Olshtain and Cohen (1990), Bardovi-Harlig and Vellenga (2012) did not use any productive activities due to the nature of their research questions. Nonetheless, the results of this study suggest that such guided metapragmatic noticing activities seem “to promote the use of some conventional expressions, especially of those expressions are relatively transparent and consistent with learners’ current interlanguage grammar” (Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012, p. 86).

In Zavialova (2016), learners were encouraged to complete various activities designed to facilitate acquisition and retention of refusal and thanking formulaic expressions. These activities were based on several fundamental approaches to formulaic language teaching reviewed in Boers and Lindstromberg (2012). At the same time, Zavialova (2016) drew on strategies for the initial learning of speech acts (Cohen, 2005) to design activities aimed at teaching semantic formulas of the refusal and thanking speech acts. In summary, during the course the participants received a significant amount of metapragmatic information (Taguchi, 2015); they also participated in various whole class discussions devoted to the nature of refusal and thanking formulaic expressions and the differences between their L1s and English in terms of the usage of both formulaic expressions and semantic formulas, their meanings and pragmatic functions. In addition, after each teaching session, the researcher encouraged students to write short reflections and answer several awareness-raising questions and compare thanking or refusal formulaic expressions used in their L1S and those used in English (based on the list of the target expressions provided to them during the treatment period). Zavialova (2016) concluded that L2 learners may benefit from a combination of explicit instruction techniques (e.g., attention-drawing, explicit explanations, and whole class discussions) in terms of acquisition and retention

of situation-specific formulaic expressions and, by this means, develop their L2 pragmatic competence.

3.4. Conclusion

Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) argue that L2 learners' insufficient control of pragmalinguistic knowledge becomes particularly obvious when it comes to the use of appropriate pragmatic routines in speech acts. This claim implies the importance of teaching pragmatic formulas explicitly to facilitate speech act performance in a second language. Another widely-cited researcher in the area of interlanguage pragmatics, K. Bardovi-Harlig, maintains that the insufficient amount of evidence-based materials and pedagogical approaches in this area is "the most pressing issue for the instruction of pragmatic [and formulaic language]" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2012, p. 219).

The literature review has shown that key teaching intervention studies in formulaic language pedagogy mainly use teaching methods that are rooted in the awareness-raising approach and lack techniques that could stimulate long-term retention as well as deep cognitive engagement with the target formulaic sequences (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). To date, studies have mainly focused on whether or how learners notice and/or recognize target formulas. However, it has been acknowledged that noticing alone is not sufficient for successful production (Bardovi-Harlig, 2009). Thus far, very few studies have explored the production of pragmatic formulas by L2 learners in different speech acts and speech act sets, despite the fact that such formulas can be particularly beneficial for acquisition and teaching of L2 speech act realization patterns. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, only few classroom-based studies have attempted to merge principles of formulaic language and pragmatics pedagogy in one study and

test the efficacy of such instruction for enhancing L2 pragmatic competence (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig, Rose, & Nickels, 2008; Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012; Zavialova, 2016, 2017).

Furthermore, only several models (i.e., Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006; Cohen, 2005; Yoshida et al., 2000, as cited in Martínez Flor & Usó Juan, 2010) mention explicit instruction of ‘pragmalinguistic forms’, ‘linguistic structures’, or ‘key expressions’ as part of the suggested pedagogical sequences. Major approaches to speech act teaching emphasize awareness-raising and noticing activities and encourage explicit meta-pragmatic explanations aimed at drawing learners’ attention to the degrees of power, distance, and imposition involved in interaction but do not suggest activities that would help L2 learners master the linguistic building blocks of the target speech acts (i.e., pragmatic formulas).

Finally, it is important to acknowledge that the majority of the existing teaching intervention studies focusing on L2 pragmatic competence enhancement have been conducted in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) educational settings involving university-level students with rather advanced levels of English and strong previous educational backgrounds (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011; Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012; Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman, & Vellenga, 2015). To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, no classroom-based studies, except for her own (Zavialova, 2016, 2017), were conducted in a community-based educational setting involving recent immigrants, such as LINC program.

To address the abovementioned gaps in classroom-based research concerned with formulaic language pedagogy and instructional pragmatics, the research objective of the present study was twofold. The first goal of the study was to make a case for a more refined, formula-enhanced approach to teaching L2 pragmatic competence as a better alternative to the traditional

awareness-raising approach currently suggested in the literature; the second goal of the study was to suggest improvements for LINC program's curriculum that currently lacks specific pedagogical models of speech act teaching that have been tested empirically in the actual LINC classroom. For example, the CLB Support Kit (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2012) in the section on incorporating pragmatics into a CLB-based Program provides LINC teachers with a list of helpful resources that are meant to help instructors include pragmatics in their lesson plans. However, the majority of these resources include references to theoretical and research publications or suggest pedagogical models intended for university level programs, such as EAP. Moreover, the language data for most of these online resources were collected in the USA and, therefore, contain authentic exemplars of American English; in addition, these teaching modules were piloted with university or college level students and, therefore, do not necessary apply to LINC. As far as the author is aware, the only Canadian resource on teaching pragmatics available online is an online database of modules on workplace pragmatics developed by a team of researchers at NorQuest College in Edmonton, Alberta.⁷

3.4.1. Research Questions

The present study was guided by the following four research questions:

1. Is a formula-enhanced approach to speech act teaching more effective than the awareness-raising approach in terms of enhancing both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities of L2 learners?

⁷ These resources can be accessed at <https://www.norquest.ca/research-innovation/colbourne-institute-for-inclusive-leadership/projects/completed-projects/diversity-at-work-web-based-simulation-activities.aspx>)

2. What signs of interlanguage formula development could be observed in the formula-enhanced treatment group and in the awareness-raising treatment group before and after the pedagogical intervention and are these signs different?
3. Which pedagogical features of the formula-enhanced approach make it more effective from both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic perspectives?
4. Are there any observable differences in teachers' implementation of the formula-enhanced approach as compared to the awareness-raising approach?

The first two research questions were 'product-oriented' and aimed at measuring the learning outcomes of the two treatment programs (i.e., formula-enhanced versus awareness-raising), while the last two questions were 'process-oriented' and aimed at collecting classroom evidence that might be used to support the claim that the formula-enhanced approach to speech act teaching is more effective in terms of both pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics.

Chapter 4: Method

This chapter provides a full account of the methodological processes used to answer the guiding research questions of the study. The chapter first reviews the data collection phases and then explains the data analysis procedures carried out for the purposes of the present investigation. The data were collected in two main phases: *Pre-Intervention Phase* (Phase 1) and *Teaching Intervention Phase* (Phase 2). Figure 4 below provides a visual representation of the data collection steps undertaken during the present study.

Figure 4. Phases of data collection.

4.1. Pre-Intervention Phase

Phase 1 (Pre-Intervention) was motivated by several major objectives. First, the researcher conducted a pilot study to test the original version of the formula-enhanced instructional sequence that had laid the foundation for the main study; the methods used in the pilot study were later modified for the teaching intervention that took place in the main study. The second objective of the Pre-Intervention phase was to compile the researcher's own corpus of pragmatic formulas covering a wider range of interactional contexts that later informed the teaching materials developed for the Teaching Intervention phase. The third objective of the Pre-intervention phase was to design lesson materials to be used during the Teaching Intervention phase (Phase 2).

4.1.1. Emerging Formula-Enhanced Approach in the Pilot Study

The pilot study was conducted in winter of 2016, and the results were later published in the Special Issue of *TESL Canada Journal* (Zavialova, 2017). The pedagogical sequence used during the teaching intervention in the pilot study laid the foundation for designing the refined version of the instructional sequence in the formula-enhanced approach to speech act teaching used during the Teaching Intervention phase in the main study.

The main objective of the pilot study was to explore ways- beyond awareness-raising- in which pragmatic formulas can be taught efficiently and develop a more refined approach to teaching pragmatic formulas and enhancing L2 pragmatic competence by integrating various techniques from both formulaic language and pragmatics pedagogy. To this end, a six-hour course (see Figure 5) was designed to teach refusal (e.g., *I won't be able to make it*) and thanking (e.g., *I appreciate it*) pragmatic formulas. The course was taught over a two-week period to four

intermediate ESL students enrolled in one of the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) programs in Ottawa.

As shown in Figure 5, the course consisted of three teaching phases, two hours per session; each phase, in turn, consisted of several microlevel teaching activities. During initial assessment, each student participated in six role-plays focused on three thanking and three refusal speech acts; During final assessment conducted at the end of the course, students participated in six role-plays based on slightly changed scenarios. All data were audio-recorded and transcribed to compare students' performance before and after the instruction.

The study participants received two lists with the target pragmatic formulas. The first list was comprised of 40 refusal pragmatic formulas, and the second list was comprised of 34 thanking pragmatic formulas. These formulas were extracted from the corpus collected for the purposes of the researcher's Master's study (Zavialova, 2015). The participants were encouraged to review the formulas from both lists and received explicit explanations with regard to the idiomatic nature of the target formulas.

The teaching activities in Phase 1 (Awareness-raising) were aimed at raising students' awareness in a focused and contextualized way. The micro-level teaching techniques in this phase included⁸:

- Metapragmatic explanations and corpus consultation (Zavialova, 2016)

⁸ A detailed description of pedagogical activities at each stage of the course is provided in Zavialova (2017).

- Focused noticing and contextualized input tasks (Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012).

In Phase 2 (Deep cognitive engagement), the instruction focused on stimulating long-term retention of the refusal and thanking pragmatic formulas by engaging the students in activities requiring deep cognitive engagement. The micro-level teaching techniques in this phase included:

- Form-comparison and corpus consultations (Takahashi, 2005; Zavialova, 2016)
- Speech act analysis in terms of semantic formulas⁹ (Cohen, 2005) and group discussion

Finally, in Phase 3 (Guided and autonomous practice), the students were provided with opportunities to engage in both control and free practice activities. The micro-level teaching techniques in this phase included:

- Written multiple-turn discourse completion tasks (DCT) completion (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010)
- Role-plays

Results of the initial assessment showed that the participants mainly used non-nativelike formulas that contained multiple deviations from the nativelike equivalents, whereas the results of the final assessment showed a general increase in the number of nativelike formulas. Overall, two participants expanded their repertoires of both refusal and thanking pragmatic formulas, while the other two participants improved their performance in the thanking speech acts.

⁹ A sequence of rhetorical steps taken by a speaker when performing a given speech act.

Figure 5. A 6-hour course in the pilot study intervention.

The pilot research provided a foundation on which to build a larger project. One limitation of the six-hour course was the fact that, due to the limited time allocated for the study, the participants were exposed to a large number of pragmatic formulas (40 refusal and 34 thanking formulas) within a very short period of time. It became clear that in order to ensure that L2 learners are not overwhelmed by the amount of target formulas presented to them within one lesson, the instruction has to be spread over a longer period of time. This would make it possible to target a wider range of pragmatic formulas within a more adequate time frame and ensure better acquisition and long-term retention of pragmatic formulas. It also follows from these observations that, in order to collect and eventually provide L2 learners a *wider range* of pragmatic formulas during the teaching intervention, DCTs based on scenarios targeting other social situations had to be created. Furthermore, it was decided to modify or exclude some of the

micro-level activities used in the pilot study for the purposes of the teaching intervention in the main study and ensure that the students were provided with more opportunities to engage with the semantically and syntactically complex pragmatic formulas on a deeper cognitive level.

4.1.2. Refined Formula-Enhanced Approach in the Main Study

4.1.2.1. Compiling a Corpus of Pragmatic Formulas

In order to obtain authentic examples of the pragmatic formulas that were later used as a source of written input during the teaching intervention in both treatment groups, the researcher created her own Native Speaker Corpus (NSC, Appendix A) of pragmatic formulas based on data collected from 35 native speakers of Canadian English who volunteered to participate in the study and responded to a series of Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs). In order to create scenarios for the written DCTs, the researcher analyzed LINC 5-7 Curriculum Guidelines (Hajer et al., 2007) to determine which social interaction contexts are suggested for the LINC classroom. The analysis revealed the following types of interactional contexts recommended for the classroom activities:

- Social interaction (friends, family, colleagues, management)
- Workplace teams and reporting relationships
- Customer service relations
- Resolving conflicts
- Professional meetings (group and one-on-one)
- Telephone calls (personal, professional).

Based on this analysis, it was decided to select scenarios that would generally fall under one of the three categories: social interaction; customer service interaction; and workplace

interaction; these categories later became the topics of the teaching units. While some scenarios were taken verbatim from pedagogical tasks included in the LINC curriculum document, the wording in other scenarios was slightly changed. Overall, the native speakers responded to 33 written DCTs. The respondents were also asked to provide any relevant reflective comments on their thought processes while responding the scenarios; a note on whether the scenarios assumed face-to-face or over-the-phone interaction was also included to help the respondents imagine a given situation. Once the DCT data was collected, the next step involved analyzing the responses and eliciting the target pragmatic formulas. This was done in two cycles.

During the first elicitation cycle, the researcher compiled a list of criteria meant to guide the selection process and help determine word strings that could be considered pragmatic formulas. These criteria were taken and partially adapted from those suggested in research literature on formulaic language identification, with an emphasis on pragmatic formulas identification. The criteria were as follows:

1. This word combination is at least two morphemes long (Myles, Hooper, & Mitchell, 1998; Bardovi-Harlig, 2009);
2. This word combination is used repeatedly by respondents and is frequent in the sample collected (Myles, Hooper, & Mitchell, 1998; Bardovi-Harlig, 2009);
3. This word combination always appears in the same fixed form (Wray & Namba, 2003).
Examples from the corpus include: *Hope you can make it*
4. This word combination contains gaps within its formulaic frame, and these gaps accommodate one of the three types of variations (Wray & Namba, 2003):
 - 4a. Morphological (verb or noun endings).

Examples from the corpus include: *I was/am wondering why this happened?*

4b. Limited lexical variation (closed class sets or a small group of interchangeable words)

Examples from the corpus include: *If you could ____ + [do something] for me by ____ + [time period], that would be great*

4c. Any word, phrase, or clause that leads to meaningful completion of the frame

Examples of this type include: *I'd love to, but + ____ [excuse]; Thanks for the invite, but + ____ [excuse]*

5. This word combination appears to be closely tied to a specific communicative situation/context/register (Kecskes, 2010);
6. This word combination performs a specific pragmatic function in a given context (Bardovi-Harlig, 2012).

After the initial analysis, it became apparent that not all DCTs produced enough formulaic responses; at the same time, some scenarios were somewhat redundant. It was, therefore, decided to reduce the number of the DCTs to 12, keeping four scenarios per interactional context. These were:

1. *Social interaction context* (i.e., declining an invitation to go to the movies; accepting an invitation to attend a dinner; inviting neighbours to a barbeque party; suggesting a venue for special celebration);
2. *Customer service interaction* (i.e., rejecting a sales offer; cancelling and rescheduling appointments; inquiring about specific information; fixing issues related to financial transactions or poor customer service;

3. *Workplace interaction* (i.e., responding to management's requests; initiating requests at work; thanking one's colleague for a favour; calling in sick).

During the second elicitation cycle, the researcher invited five graduate students in applied linguistics to serve as expert judges and analyze the formulas selected from the 12 scenarios in the first cycle to confirm or refute the researcher's own intuitive judgement. The objective of this cycle was to compile the final revised lists of pragmatic formulas for the NSC. The judges first read several foundational theoretical articles discussing the nature of pragmatic formulas (i.e., Coulmas, 1979; Kecskes, 2010; Bardovi-Harlig, 2012), and then met with the researcher for the formula elicitation workshop. During this workshop, the researcher explained the operational definition of *pragmatic formula* used in the study to the expert judges (see Chapter 2 for the definition).

Next, the judges were presented with seven diagnostic criteria for justifying their intuitive judgements about formulaicity. The criteria were primarily based on Wray and Namba's (2003) diagnostic list as well as other relevant characteristics from the literature (i.e., Pawley, 2007, 2009; Kecskes, 2010). The diagnostic criteria are summarized in Figure 6 below. The judges then practiced applying these criteria to 20 examples of the word combinations that the researcher had elicited from the DCTs in the first elicitation cycle. These criteria served as support to help the judges decide whether a given word combination could be considered a pragmatic formula. If at least three out of five judges agreed that a word combination was formulaic, it was included into the final revised list. Three sub-lists were eventually compiled, according to the levels of agreement between the judges. The first sub-list included formulas which all five judges had selected; the second sub-list contained formulas that had received approval from four out of five judges; finally, formulas selected by three out of five judges were

included in the third sub-list. As a result, a total of 241 pragmatic formulas were elicited and included into the NSC (see Appendix A).

<p>1. By my judgement, the pragmatic meaning of this word string is closely tied to/associated with this particular communicative situation (each speech event will be evaluated separately). In other words, this word string is ‘charged’ by this situation only.</p>				
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don’t know or n/a	Agree	Strongly agree
<p>2. By my judgement, if this word string is used out of this communicative/interactional context, its discourse function will change.</p>				
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don’t know or n/a	Agree	Strongly agree
<p>3. If I were to respond to the same situation, I would use this precise formulation.</p>				
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don’t know or n/a	Agree	Strongly agree
<p>4. If I were to pronounce this word string, I would articulate it fluently and in a non-hesitant manner. If needed, I would also emphasize some parts with my intonation.</p>				
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don’t know or n/a	Agree	Strongly agree
<p>5. By my judgement, the speaker has marked this word string grammatically or lexically/ or this word string is marked grammatically or lexically in a way that gives it special status as a unit.</p>				
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don’t know or n/a	Agree	Strongly agree
<p>6. Based on my intuitive judgement, I have encountered this precise formulation multiple times in communication from other people in the same communicative context.</p>				
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don’t know or n/a	Agree	Strongly agree
<p>7. By my judgement, although this word string is novel, it is a clear derivation, deliberate or</p>				

Figure 6. Diagnostic criteria for justifying intuitive judgements about formulaicity.

When selecting the target formulas for the teaching intervention, the researcher tried to include a variety of formula types presented in the corpus. These included both fixed and semi-fixed formulas (see examples above), as well as those that were semantically opaque and could be challenging for L2 learners (e.g., *How is it coming along?* or *Can you look into it?*). For the purposes of the teaching intervention, a total of 34 target pragmatic formulas were selected from four DCTs (out of 12 analyzed)¹⁰. The four target speech events¹¹ selected for the teaching intervention included:

- Extending invitations (one speech event; *Social interaction context*)
- Cancelling or rescheduling appointments and resolving financial or service issues (two speech events; *Customer service interaction context*)
- Responding to managerial requests (one speech event; *Workplace interaction context*).

The target pragmatic formulas selected for the teaching intervention are included in Appendix B.

4.1.2.2. Overview of the Formula-enhanced Treatment Program

The formula-enhanced approach designed for the teaching intervention in the main study builds on the revised version of the pedagogical sequence presented in researcher's pilot study (Zavialova, 2017). This approach attempts to stimulate deep cognitive engagement with the target pragmatic formulas which lie at the centre of speech acts; the teaching activities in this approach are presented in a balanced fashion, so that an equal amount of attention is paid to both

¹⁰ Due to limited time allocated for the teaching intervention phase, it was decided to reduce the number of contexts.

¹¹ Speech events may include multiple speech acts, such as academic advising sessions, interviews, doctor's appointments, or service encounters (Bardovi-Harlig, 2017).

sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic aspects of pragmatic competence. All activities in this approach draw on the best teaching principles currently promoted in classroom-based research literature on formulaic language and instructional pragmatics. Each lesson consists of three phases: Guided Noticing; Deep Cognitive Engagement and Stimulating Retention; and Practice. The target pragmatic formulas in this approach are explicitly taught.

Phase 1- Guided Noticing (approximately 30 minutes). The learners are offered two exercises in this phase. Exercise 1, *Warm-up and predicting*, aims to activate background knowledge and prepare the learners for the exercises that followed in Phase 2. The teacher gives some key examples of pragmatic formulas from each scenario and asks the students to predict the situations in which these formulas may occur (Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012). Exercise 2, *Exploration through written contextualized input*, a term borrowed from Bardovi-Harlig and Vellenga (2012), aims to stimulate noticing of the target pragmatic formulas. The students read responses to the scenarios provided by 8-10 native speakers of English for each scenario elicited from the DCTs data and are asked to underline any expressions/word combinations similar to those in Exercise 1.

Phase 2- Deep Cognitive Engagement and Stimulating Retention (approximately 60 minutes). This phase includes three exercises. Exercise 1, *Form-comparison* (Takahashi, 2005) and *metapragmatic explanation*, aims to engage learners in intentional and conscious learning of target pragmatic formulas based on the exemplars from input (Takimoto, 2007). In this exercise, the students receive the pre-selected lists of pragmatic formulas from researcher's corpus (8-10 per session) and compare them with the expressions they underlined in Phase 1. Meanwhile, the teacher circulates around the classroom to check students' progress. Once every student has completed the exercise, the teacher provides the class with the explicit explanation about

formulaic (i.e., fixed or semi-fixed) nature of the target formulas and benefits they provide for L2 fluency and pragmatic competence development (scripts are provided in the teacher's version of the booklet). Exercise 2, *Understanding the implied meaning of the target formulas*, consists of two parts (reviews). The main objective of this exercise is to provide the students with an opportunity to process the target pragmatic formulas on a deeper cognitive level and to stimulate deep cognitive engagement with the language form; in addition, the exercise aims to promote 'insightful learning' and the chance of retention of the target formulas in learners' long-term memory (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009, p. 130). Review 1 focuses on formula recognition and targets the pragmalinguistic aspect (language form). The *hints* under each formula are added to avoid 'blind guessing' and stimulate a more conscious learning (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). Review 2 focuses on interpreting pragmatic implicature (directness/indirectness) and targets the sociopragmatics aspect (contextual meaning). In Review 2, the students review the same formulas again and evaluate their degrees of directness. Finally, in Exercise 3- *Speech act analysis*, the students identify and analyze pragmatic patterns (i.e., speaker's communicative strategies) in the input examples. This activity targets both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of the language and can be considered a controlled practice activity (Ranta & Lyster, 2018). At the same time, this exercise provides additional scaffolding in preparation for the Practice phase.

Phase 3- Practice (approximately 30 minutes). In the Practice phase, students participate in a communicative activity specifically designed to encourage them to repeatedly use the target formulas to achieve a meaningful communicative goal. This activity meets the following criteria required for communicative practice: it is genuinely communicative; it is inherently repetitive; and it is functionally formulaic (Gatbonton & Segalowitz, 2005). The objective of the Practice

phase is to stimulate *repeated exposure* to and *use* of the target formulas and promote *automatization* of knowledge. The teacher can also provide corrective feedback during the practice phase if necessary.

4.1.2.3. Overview of the Awareness-Raising Treatment Program

An alternative treatment program had to be designed in order to have the second treatment group and contrast the traditional awareness-raising approach to speech act teaching with the refined version of the formula-enhanced approach during the Teaching Intervention phase in the main study. The awareness-raising approach designed for the teaching intervention in the main study incorporates some common features of major pedagogical approaches to speech acts teaching reported in the literature on instructional pragmatics (e.g., Usó-Juan & Martínez-Flor, 2007; Cohen, 2005, 2008; Cruz, 2013, 2015). The main elements of the major pedagogical frameworks have been adapted for the teaching intervention purposes to better suit the requirements of the LINC curriculum and make the materials more feasible to use in practice. The teaching sequence consists of two phases: *Exploration and Awareness-raising* and *Practice*¹². In this approach, the target pragmatic formulas are not explicitly taught since it is assumed that the students would be able to notice them in the input by means of various awareness-raising activities.

Phase 1- Exploration and Awareness-raising (approximately 1 hour 30 minutes). This phase includes three exercises. In Exercise 1, *Brainstorming and metapragmatic explanation*, a

¹² In the majority of current approaches to speech acts teaching the practice phase comes immediately after awareness-raising activities with no ‘in-between’ phase that would stimulate deep cognitive engagement with the language form.

teacher introduces a scenario/context (depending on that week's topic) and asks the students to brainstorm and write down what they would say if they were in that situation. The students first write these responses in their first language and then translate them into English. At the same time, the teacher encourages the students to think about the levels of social distance, power, and imposition (potential risks involved) that exist between them and their imaginary interlocutors. Scripts with simplified explanations of these three factors are provided for the teachers in their version of the booklet. At the end of this activity, the students share their translated English versions with the rest of the class in a discussion facilitated by the teacher. The purpose of this exercise is to start exploring a given communicative context and raise the students' initial awareness about the differences between their first language and English in terms of speech act realization. In Exercise 2, *Lay cross-cultural analysis* (Cohen, 2005), the students are provided with written input (adapted from DCT data, identical to the formula-enhanced approach) and to read and compare the responses given by the native English speakers with their own versions from Exercise 1 to see if there any similarities and/or differences between the responses. To this end, the students answer four reflection questions in a whole-group discussion format facilitated by the teacher. The purpose of this exercise is to further enhance students' awareness about the cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences of the speech act realization in hopes that this could help avoid negative transfers or automatic translations from students' L1s during the practice phase. Finally, Exercise 3, *Speech act analysis*, is similar to that presented in the formula-enhanced approach. In this exercise the students analyze pragmatic patterns (i.e., speaker's communicative strategies) of the speech acts from the written input and evaluate their degrees of directness. This activity targets both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of the language and provides additional scaffolding in preparation for the Practice phase.

Phase 2- Practice (approximately 30 minutes). The communicative activity in this phase is identical to the one suggested for the formula-enhanced approach (see previous sub-section).

4.2. Teaching Intervention Phase

The data collection in Phase 2 (Teaching Intervention) lasted for approximately 16 weeks (8 weeks in each treatment group). This phase included the following procedures in each treatment group: initial briefings with the participating teachers, administration of the pre-tests, a model lesson delivery, a 4-week treatment and observation period, administration of the immediate post-tests, administration of the delayed post-test two weeks later, and final debriefings with the teachers. The teaching intervention in the FE group was conducted during the months of May and June, 2018; the teaching intervention in the AR group was conducted during the months of October and November, 2018. The present study received ethics clearance from the Carleton University Research Ethics Board-A (Protocol Clearance ID # 106916, see Appendix C).

4.2.1. Participants

Two teachers and 13 students agreed to participate in the study. Since LINC is known for its sporadic attendance¹³, it was challenging for the researcher to recruit a larger number of participants for the study. The participating students and their teachers came from two different LINC programs based in Ottawa and were selected using a convenience sampling method (Dörnyei, 2007).

¹³ According to a recent LINC evaluation report (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2010), more than 90% of LINC classes feature continuous intake.

At the time of the study, the students were placed in LINC levels 4/5, and their proficiency levels ranged from lower to upper-intermediate, which correspond to Canadian Language Benchmarks (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2012) levels 5-7, or Stage 2 (Intermediate Language Ability). The students and their teachers were assigned to two treatment groups: formula-enhanced group (henceforth- FE) and awareness-raising group (henceforth- AR). The FE group was comprised of seven students, and the AR group was comprised of six students. To protect the participants' identity and maintain confidentiality agreements, the student participants will be referred to using numerical codes (e.g., Student 1, Student 2, etc.) and to the teacher participants using the treatment group initials (e.g., FE group teacher and AR group teacher).

The student participants came from diverse linguistic, cultural, and professional backgrounds. Seven male students and six female students participated in the study. The FE group students were Students 1 to 7; the AR group consisted of Students 8 to 13. Here is a brief description of each participant:

Student 1 (L1 Mandarin Chinese) immigrated to Canada from China where he used to work as a communications engineer. At the time of the study, he was looking for a job in his field in Canada.

Student 2 (L1 Mandarin Chinese) immigrated to Canada from China where he used to work as a mechanical engineer. At the time of the study, he was looking for a job in his field in Canada.

Student 3 (L1 Swahili) immigrated to Canada from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. At the time of the study, he was working as a car mechanic at an auto body shop in Ottawa.

Student 4 (L1 Arabic) came to Canada as a refugee from Syria. She has a degree in accounting from her home country and was looking for a job in her field in Canada. At the time of the study, she was working at a women's clothing store in one of the shopping malls in Ottawa.

Student 5 (L1 Tigrinya) came to Canada as a refugee from Eritrea. The information about this student's previous educational background was unavailable to the researcher. At the time of the study, he was working as a gas station operator in Ottawa.

Student 6 (L1s French and Kirundi) immigrated to Canada from Burundi. He has a university degree in organization management and was looking for a job in the federal government of Canada at the time of the study.

Student 7 (L1 French) immigrated to Canada from Ivory Coast. He has a university degree in education. At the time of the study, he was working as a supply teacher of mathematics at the French Catholic School board in Ottawa.

Student 8 (L1 Arabic) came to Canada as a refugee from Syria. At the time of the study, she was a stay-at-home mother. In addition, she was considering going back to school to get a degree in nursing from a local community college.

Student 9 (L1 Arabic) came to Canada as a refugee from Syria. At the time of the study, she was a stay-at-home mother. In addition, she was considering going back to school to get a degree in nursing from a local community college.

Student 10 (L1 Arabic) came to Canada as a refugee from Syria. At the time of the study, she was a stay-at-home mother. She was also looking for a part-time job in food industry to help her husband earn income to support her family.

Student 11 (L1 Farsi) immigrated to Canada from Iran to join his daughter. In his home country, he used to own a small business. He had sold his business before moving to Canada and was not looking for a job at the time of the study.

Student 12 (L1 Nepali) came to Canada as a refugee from Nepal. At the time of the study, she did not have a permanent job; however, she was employed as a seasonal worker at a strawberry farm in Quebec.

Student 13 (L1 Somali) came to Canada as a refugee from Somalia. At the time of the study, she was a stay-at-home mother and was considering looking for a part-time job once her English improved.

The FE group teacher received her TESL training from Algonquin College in Ottawa and had worked as a LINC teacher for about two years at the time of the study. She also had experience teaching English overseas as well as teaching English for Academic Purposes.

The AR group teacher had a Bachelor's degree in Linguistics and a TESL certificate from Carleton University. She had been teaching community-based ESL for about one year. Before she started teaching in the LINC program, she had worked as a pronunciation and writing tutor.

The study participants' linguistic and educational profiles generally reflect demographic characteristics of LINC student population outlined in the federal report of the government of Canada (Dempsey et al., 2009). The reason why the student population in the AR group was dominated by female students from Syria with low levels of prior education is because the LINC location where the AR treatment took place had recently accepted a large influx of Syrian refugees. According to Statistics Canada, Syria was the main source country of refugees who landed in Canada between 2011 and 2016, and less than 3% of these Syrian refugees had a university degree (Houle, 2019).

4.2.2. Data Collection

The participating students were tested at three points in time: before the intervention (pre-test); immediately after the intervention (post-test); and approximately two weeks after the intervention (delayed post-test). During each test, the students responded to four open-ended oral discourse completion role-plays (DCRPs) (see Appendix D for DCRPs scenarios). The researcher role-played the scenarios with each individual student and audio-recorded and later transcribed the responses. Two separate teaching packages with lesson plan notes and answer keys were designed: the first package included one model lesson booklet and four booklets based on the refined version of the formula-enhanced approach designed for the intervention in FE group; the second package included one model lesson booklet and four booklets based on the awareness-raising approach designed for the intervention in AR group. The FE booklets are included in Appendix E; the AR booklets are included in Appendix F.

Lesson 1 was dedicated to the social interaction context (i.e., *Extending invitations*) and included eight target formulas. Lessons 2 and 3 were dedicated to the customer service

interaction context (i.e., *Cancelling/rescheduling appointments* and *Resolving financial/service issues*); Lesson 2 included ten target pragmatic formulas, and Lesson 3 included eight target pragmatic formulas. Lesson 4 was dedicated to the workplace interaction context (i.e., *Responding to management's requests*) and included eight target formulas. In the FE treatment group, both teachers and students were provided with the target pragmatic formulas lists and the formulas were taught explicitly. In the AR group, on the other hand, the target pragmatic formulas were not explicitly taught since it was assumed that the students would be able to notice them in the input by means of the awareness-raising activities. The model lesson in both treatment groups was dedicated to the customer service interaction context and was centered around the speech event of rejecting a sales offer at a shopping mall. Lesson plan notes received by the teachers in each treatment group can be found in Appendix G.

During the initial briefings, the researcher provided the participating teachers with all the necessary instructions and teaching materials pertaining to the approach used in their treatment group. Moreover, prior to the start of the 4-week teaching intervention, the researcher had taught a 2-hour model lesson in each treatment group, and the participating teachers had a chance to observe the lessons as well as provide their feedback, pose relevant questions or express concerns regarding the feasibility of the treatment implementation in their classes¹⁴.

Lastly, in order to have a full account of the instruction processes in both treatment groups, the researcher observed as well as audio-recorded each treatment session. Given the exploratory nature of the study, no clear pre-determined categories or observation schemes were

¹⁴ Some of the steps in the AR pedagogical sequence had to be modified as per the AR teacher's request.

utilized. The researcher had her own printed copy of the booklet during each observed session and took notes to keep track of various classroom episodes pertaining to the development of the students' pragmalinguistic and/or sociopragmatic abilities. Moreover, the researcher kept a reflective journal in which she recorded her observations on how the instructional techniques and methods contributed to the learning processes of the student participants and affected the classroom behaviour and teaching styles of the participating teachers.

4.2.3. Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using three complementary methods for the purposes of methodological triangulation (see Figure 7 below). In particular, these three methods were used in order to increase the validity of the qualitative data analysis by using three different analytical lenses (Mathison, 1988).

The qualitative utterance analysis as well as expert judgements were performed in order to address the first two research questions of the study, in particular:

1. Is a formula-enhanced approach to speech act teaching more effective than the awareness-raising approach in terms of enhancing both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities of L2 learners?
2. What signs of interlanguage formula development are observed in the formula-enhanced treatment group and in the awareness-raising treatment group before and after the pedagogical intervention and are these signs different?

The analysis of the classroom episodes recorded during the observation sessions was carried out to answer both third and fourth research question of the study, in particular:

3. Which pedagogical features of the formula-enhanced approach make it more effective from both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic perspectives?

4. Are there any observable differences in teachers' implementation of the formula-enhanced approach as compared to the awareness-raising approach?

Figure 7. Methodological triangulation of data analysis methods.

4.2.3.1. Qualitative Utterance Analysis

In order to determine whether the formula-enhanced approach to teaching speech acts was more effective than the awareness-raising approach in terms of enhancing both sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic abilities of L2 learners, the researcher conducted a qualitative utterance analysis of the transcript data collected from 13 student participants via four oral DCRPs during pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests. The coding during the qualitative utterance analysis was done in two cycles in order to identify which signs of interlanguage

formula development could be observed in the formula-enhanced treatment group and in the awareness-raising treatment group before and after the pedagogical intervention and whether these signs differ. The first cycle of coding and analysis focused on identifying major patterns of interlanguage formula development which emerged before and after the treatment period in each target speech event. The second cycle of coding and analysis was carried out in order to delve deeper into each of these patterns and explain how the students' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities evolve after the teaching intervention in both treatment groups.

During the first cycle of coding, the researcher developed and used a pre-defined list of categories to code patterns of students' formula development before and after the treatment period. Several categories were partially adapted from a study conducted by Taguchi et al. (2013), in which Taguchi and her co-researchers qualitatively analyzed patterns of formula development in 31 Chinese as a second language American students during a study abroad context. During the data analysis, each utterance produced by the students was assigned a label (category) using the tools available through NVivo 12 software. Then, the total numbers of utterances corresponding to each category were manually calculated for each target speech event (i.e., Extending invitations; Making suggestions; Cancelling/rescheduling appointments; Resolving issues; Responding to requests; and Making requests); finally, the total sum of occurrences recorded in all six speech events was calculated for each coding category. The pre-defined categories used to label instances of formula use in the first coding cycle were as follows:

1. Non-target use;
2. Target-like use;
3. Target-like slot-and-frame use;

4. Repetitive use.

Authentic pragmatic formulas selected from the NSC (see Appendix A) served as a baseline. If an utterance produced by a student in a given speech event directly matched the pragmatic formula from the target list for that scenario, the utterance was assigned the *target-like* use label (e.g., ‘Would you and your family like to come?’, *Invitations*). If an utterance produced by a student was a slight modification of the target form, or if there were some deviations from the norm in the target slot-and-frame pattern (mostly for the semi-fixed formulas), the utterance was coded as the one that has the *target-like slot-and-frame* pattern (e.g., ‘It will be great if you come’, *Invitations*). Next, if the same student produced the same formula multiple times and in more than one speech event, such instances were assigned the *repetitive use* label (e.g., ‘Can you come with family?’; ‘Please, can you come you and your family?’, *Invitations*).¹⁵ Finally, if an utterance produced by a student was a complete deviation from the target norm, it was coded as an instance of the *non-target* use (e.g., ‘Do you like to take my invitation to be part of my organization?’, *Invitations*).

During the second cycle of coding, each of the four patterns of interlanguage formula development identified during the first cycle was further analysed (see Figure 8 below for the visual representation of the coding process). Utterances which contained inaccurate lexical or grammatical choices within the non-target use category and the target-like-slot-and-frame pattern category were coded as *pragmalinguistic violations*, while instances of inappropriate tone (e.g.,

¹⁵ In the first cycle of analysis, the repetitive use category included both nativelike and non-nativelike utterances.

too direct or too indirect) or inappropriate speech act produced by the student participants (e.g., a request instead of an invitation) were coded as *sociopragmatic violations*.

Examples of utterances containing pragmalinguistic violations recorded in the speech event of *Extending invitations* include:

- ‘I want to invite you and your family if you can take place to this party’
- ‘This weekend my family will be have a birthday party and I want to invite you to coming’
- ‘I’m inviting you for... I have barbecue party today’

Examples of utterances containing sociopragmatic violations recorded in the speech event of *Extending invitations* include:

- ‘Excuse me, can I join us for a barbecue?’
- ‘Would you like it?’
- ‘If you have time or if you are free, you can come’

Furthermore, utterances produced by the student participants in the repetitive use category were divided into two sub-categories: *nativelike overuses* and *stabilized non-nativelike overuses*. The former sub-category contained utterances that were produced multiple times across speech events by at least two students and that would either directly correspond to the target form from the NSC or were deemed to be acceptable since they did not impede the communicative meaning of a given speech act (e.g., ‘Can you come with family?’; ‘Can you join us with your family?’, *Invitations*), whereas the latter subcategory contained repetitive utterances which contained lexical or grammatical violations that impeded the communicative function of a given speech act (e.g., ‘Please come over’; ‘Please, can you come you and your family?’).

Finally, the target like use category was broken down into three sub-categories: *purely native-like* sub-category, *creatively nativelylike* sub-category; and *minor deviations* sub-category. For an utterance to be coded as ‘purely nativelylike’, it had to precisely match one of the pragmatic formulas for a given speech event in the NSC; on the other hand, if a formula produced by a student did not appear in the NSC, but was still considered to be an acceptable response in a given speech event, such utterance was coded as ‘creatively nativelylike’ (e.g., ‘I’m planning to organize a party for my birthday’, *Invitations*). Finally, some student participants produced utterances which slightly deviated from those in the NSC. These deviations included a misuse of a preposition or a lack of an indefinite article before a noun, among others. Such utterances were coded as ‘target-like with minor deviations’ because these deviations from the target norm did not negatively impact the communicative function of a given speech act (e.g., ‘Feel free to bring present or some... some dessert or chocolate’; ‘I will have a kid party on Sunday’, *Invitations*).

Figure 8. First and second cycle coding categories in the qualitative utterance analysis.

4.2.3.2. Expert Judgements

To better address the first and the second research question of the study and increase the validity of the qualitative utterance analysis, three trained expert judges were employed to diagnostically assess each student's sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic ability before and after the teaching intervention. The diagnostic assessment done by the judges served as a complementary method of data analysis and was performed alongside the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis. Each judge listened to three sets of randomized audio-recordings of the oral discourse completion role-plays as well as read the transcripts (to facilitate comprehensibility). In an effort to achieve a more objective judgement, the judges were not made aware of whether a particular recording was made before or after the teaching intervention or whether a particular student belonged to the FE group or to the AR group. The judges had met with the researcher on two occasions before the rating procedures began. During the first meeting, the researcher went over the diagnostic rubric and explained how to use it. The judges also received theoretical explanations on the concepts of sociopragmatics, pragmalinguistics, and pragmatic formulas. The judges were also provided with the lists of the target pragmatic formulas so that they could refer to them during the evaluation process. Since the judges had also participated in the Pre-Intervention Phase and helped select the target pragmatic formulas from the NSC for the teaching intervention, they were already familiar with the theoretical concepts as well as having read relevant literature on the topic; the meeting, therefore, aimed to refresh this knowledge in their memories. During the second meeting, the researcher held a benchmarking session to make sure the judges were comfortable with using the rubric as well to check the overall consistency of the judgement. Any final questions and concerns were addressed during

the second meeting. The judges were then given approximately four weeks to do the assessment individually to avoid fatigue and to better accommodate their schedules.

The judges evaluated each student's performance using a diagnostic rubric (see Figures 9 and 10 below). The rubric was comprised of two components. Component 1 (pragmalinguistic aspect) included five main diagnostic criteria. Criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4 were based on the codes that had emerged during the qualitative utterance analysis, whereas Criterion 5 was adapted from Wray and Namba's (2003) diagnostic list. In addition, Criterion 3 and Criterion 4 each included a sub-criterion (3a and 4a) which aimed at eliciting more information pertaining to students' pragmalinguistic performance. Component 2 (sociopragmatic performance) also included five diagnostic criteria borrowed from Hudson et al. (1995). The judges were prompted to choose the most applicable criteria when evaluating each individual student as well as leave comments in a designated column to better explain the rationale behind their judgement.

Pragmatic competence component addressed	Analytic criteria	Judgement							
		n/a	Yes, major or numerous		Yes, minor		No, not at all		Comments
PRAGMALINGUISTIC	1. Does the response contain inaccurate grammatical choices that negatively affect the meaning/impede comprehension?		1	2	3	4	5	6	
	2. Does the response contain inaccurate lexical choices that negatively affect the meaning/impede comprehension?		1	2	3	4	5	6	
	<i>Note:</i> Based on your judgement, mark all applicable criteria below:		No, not at all		Yes, somewhat		Yes, absolutely		
	3. Does the response contain a target-like pragmatic formula?		1	2	3	4	5	6	
	3a. If answered YES, is the formula appropriately applied in this context?		1	2	3	4	5	6	
	4. Does the response contain a target-like slot-and-frame pattern?		1	2	3	4	5	6	
	4a. If answered YES, is the pattern appropriately applied in this context?		1	2	3	4	5	6	
	5. Does the response contain a word string that seems to be a derivation from and/or adaption of another word string that can be considered formulaic?		1	2	3	4	5	6	

Note: Criterion 5 adapted from Wray and Namba's (2003) diagnostic list.

Total score for PRAGMALINGUISTIC component- _____/24

Figure 9. Pragmalinguistic component of the diagnostic rubric.

Pragmatic competence component addressed	Analytic criteria	Judgement						
		Very inappropriate		Somewhat appropriate		Completely appropriate		Comments
SOCIOPRAGMATIC	1. Is the level of formality appropriate for this context?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	2. Is the level of directness appropriate for this context?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	3. Is the level of politeness appropriate for this context?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	4. Is the speech act used by the speaker appropriate for this context?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	5. Is the amount of information given appropriate for this context?	1	2	3	4	5	6	

Note: Adapted from Hudson et al. (1995).

Total score for SOCIOPRAGMATIC component _____/30

Figure 10. Sociopragmatic component of the diagnostic rubric.

Similar to the qualitative utterance analysis, the analysis of the results of the expert judgements was carried out in two cycles. In the first cycle of analysis, individual scores were calculated for each individual student in each target speech event, first for the pragmalinguistic component and then for the sociopragmatic component of the rubric in all three tests. Mean group scores were then computed on the raw scores assigned to each individual student by each judge in the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests in each target speech event. In the pragmalinguistic component, a maximum of 24 marks could be earned. When interpreting the results of the judgement, anything between 0 and 8 marks was considered a low performance, anything between 9 and 16 marks was considered an average performance, and anything between 17 and 24 marks was considered a high performance. In the sociopragmatic component, a maximum of 30 marks could be earned. When interpreting the results of the judgement, anything between 0 and 14 marks was considered a low performance, anything between 15 and 20 marks was considered an average performance, and anything between 21 and 30 marks was considered a high performance. Lastly, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated based on the raw scores to measure the consistency of the judgement as well as the inter-rater reliability when assessing each target speech event. Both procedures were undertaken using IBM SPSS Statistics software (Version 24). The second cycle of analysis was undertaken in order to show how pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities of the student participants in both treatment groups had evolved on an individual level. To this end, some prominent individual cases from both FE and AR treatment groups were analyzed and compared in each target speech event; this procedure was used to ensure that the results of the expert judgements are better aligned with the findings of the qualitative utterance analysis when addressing the first research question of the study.

4.2.3.3. Analysis of Classroom Episodes

The researcher conducted a qualitative content analysis of the classroom episodes recorded during eight observed sessions in order to determine which pedagogical features of the formula-enhanced approach make it more effective from both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic perspectives. The classroom observation also helped to keep track of any possible differences in teachers' implementation of the formula-enhanced approach as compared to the awareness-raising approach.

To this end, those recurrent classroom episodes that occurred during the observed sessions and focused on the language form (e.g., pragmatic formula used in a given speech act or any relevant grammatical aspects) were coded as those pertaining to the pragmalinguistic aspect. In turn, those recurrent classroom episodes that occurred during the observed sessions and dealt with the notions of directness, politeness, appropriateness, as well as power, distance, and imposition factors involved in a given speech event were coded as those pertaining to the sociopragmatic aspect. These recurrent episodes were then further divided into relevant themes pertaining to the enhancement of either pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic aspect of pragmatic competence; eventually, these themes allowed the researcher to distinguish major trends that have emerged during the instructional treatment in both AR and FE treatment groups. The content analysis of the classroom episodes was also used to support or refute the key findings obtained from both qualitative utterance analysis and expert judgements and to achieve convergence of the analyzed data (Mathison, 1988).

Chapter 5: Results and Discussion of the Qualitative Utterance Analysis

This chapter reports on the results of the qualitative utterance analysis of the transcript data collected from 13 student participants at three points in time (i.e., pre-, post, and delayed post-tests)¹⁶ via four oral DCRPs based on the four target speech events from three interactional contexts (i.e., social interaction; customer service interaction; workplace interaction). The analysis was performed in two cycles using NVivo 12 software (a detailed description of the coding process is outlined in Chapter 4).

The first subsection presents the results of the first cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis, which involves a comparison of the four major interlanguage formula development patterns identified in both treatment groups before and after the teaching intervention. The second subsection presents the key findings of the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis, which includes an examination of the nature of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic violations recorded in each target speech event and in each treatment group before and after the teaching intervention. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the role of pragmatic formulas in the acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence.

5.1. First Cycle of Analysis: Major Patterns of Interlanguage Formula Development

Four major patterns of interlanguage formula development were identified during the first cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis in both FE and AR groups: *target-like use*; *target-like slot-and frame use*; *non-target use*; and *repetitive use*. As noted earlier, these labels were borrowed and partially adapted from the study by Taguchi et al. (2013). Figure 11 shows the total number of utterances corresponding to each of the four categories (patterns) of

¹⁶ The DCRPs scenarios can be found in Appendix D.

interlanguage formula development produced by the students in the FE group before and after the teaching intervention calculated for all four target speech events (i.e., Extending invitations; Cancelling/rescheduling appointments; Resolving issues; Responding to requests).

FE Group. As shown in Figure 11, prior to the teaching intervention, only four instances of the target-like formula use category were recorded in the FE group. Similarly, only five instances of utterances falling under the target-like slot-and-frame category were recorded in the pre-test. As for the non-target use category, a high number of instances was recorded in the pre-test: 24 non-target utterances. Finally, a relatively high number of utterances in the repetitive use category was recorded prior to the teaching intervention (21 instances).

Figure 11. Patterns of interlanguage formula development observed in the FE group.

There was a general increase in the target-like category after the teaching intervention: 17 instances were recorded in the post-test, and 15 instances were recorded in the delayed post-test.

A similar observation can be made regarding the target-like slot-and-frame category: 15 such utterances were produced immediately after the intervention, while in the delayed post-test the total number slightly decreased to 14 instances, which is still much higher than the pre-test result. On the other hand, the number of utterances in the non-target category as well as in the repetitive use category decreased after the teaching intervention. As Figure 11 illustrates, only one non-target utterance was recorded in the post-test, and three in the delayed post-test; similarly, a smaller number of repetitive utterances was recorded after the treatment: eight instances in the post-test and 11 instances in the delayed post-test.

Examples of utterances containing target-like pragmatic formulas produced by the students in the FE group include¹⁷:

- ‘I’m planning to organize a party for my birthday’ (Student 1, *Extending invitations*, post-test)
- ‘I need to reschedule, please’ (Student 4, *Cancelling/rescheduling appointments*, post-test)

Examples of utterances that were coded as the ones containing the target-like slot-and-frame pattern include:

- ‘If you can come, I will be happy’ (Student 2, *Extending invitations*, post-test)
- ‘Please if you can find another date for me, for another appointment, it will be good for me’ (Student 7, *Cancelling/rescheduling appointments*, post-test)

¹⁷ Native speaker data were used as a baseline for the judgement; slight deviations from the native speaker norm were still coded as ‘target-like use’.

Examples of utterances that contained deviations from the target norm (non-target uses) include:

- ‘I’m inviting you for... I have birthday party’ (Student 5, *Extending invitations*, pre-test)
- ‘Can you explain how is going on?’ (Student 6, *Resolving issues*, pre-test)

Finally, some examples of repetitive uses include:

- ‘I want to invite you and your family to come’ (Student 2, *Extending invitations*, pre-test)
- ‘Please, can you cancel, please?’ (Student 5, *Resolving issues*, pre-test)

A full list of FE group students’ utterances elicited from each target speech event and coded according to the categories of the first cycle of analysis is provided in Appendix H.

AR Group. As for the students in the AR group, a different tendency of interlanguage formula development was observed. As shown in Figure 12, a very small number of utterances corresponding to the target-like use category was recorded at all three stages of the data collection: no instances were recorded in the pre-test, whereas only one instance was recorded in the post-test, and three instances in the delayed post-test. In terms of the target-like slot-and-frame category, the number of utterances produced by the students in this category did not dramatically change either: while one instance was recorded in the pre-test, only three instances were recorded in the post-test, and two instances in the delayed post-test. In addition, the number of non-target uses decreased only slightly and went down from 21 instances in the pre-test to 14 instances in the post-test and 13 instances in the delayed post-test. Finally, the students in the AR group produced a higher number of repetitive formulas in both the post-test and delayed post-test compared to the pre-test result: while in the pre-test the total number of utterances in this category was 16, it went up to 24 instances in the post-test and stayed at a relatively high level in the delayed post-test (19 recorded instances).

Examples of utterances containing the target-like pragmatic formulas produced by the students in the AR group include:

- ‘I have to cancel my appointment’ (Student 12, *Cancelling/rescheduling appointments*, delayed post-test)
- ‘Sorry, I would, but I have appointment for my son’ (Student 8, *Responding to requests*, post-test).

Examples of utterances that were coded as the ones containing the target-like slot-and-frame pattern include:

- ‘I need cancel please’ (Student 8, *Cancelling/rescheduling appointments*, post-test)
- ‘On Saturday night I have birthday for my two kids’ (Student 13, *Extending invitations*, delayed post-test).

Examples of utterances that contained deviations from the target norm (non-target uses) include:

- ‘If you have time, I hope she coming’ (Student 9, *Extending invitations*, pre-test)
- ‘How can I do for that?’ (Student 9, *Resolving issues*, pre-test).

Finally, some examples of repetitive use in the AR group include:

- ‘I can’t because I have children’ (Student 9, *Responding to requests*, pre-test)
- ‘I can’t because I take my children to Arabic school’ (Student 9, *Responding to requests*, post-test).

A full list of AR group students’ utterances elicited from each target speech event and coded according to the categories of the first cycle of analysis is provided in Appendix I.

Figure 12. Patterns of interlanguage formula development observed in the AR group.

It is also worth highlighting that the first cycle of analysis revealed that certain speech events contained more instances of the non-target uses, while other speech events contained more instances of the target-like or repetitive uses. Table 2 shows how many utterances were produced by the students in both groups per category and in each target speech event¹⁸. For example, the speech events of *Extending invitations* and *Responding to requests* contained the biggest number of non-target utterances recorded in both FE and AR groups; on the other hand, the highest number of repetitive utterances was recorded in the students' responses to the speech event of *Resolving Issues* in both treatment groups. At the same time, the speech event of *Cancelling/Rescheduling Appointments* contained the highest number of target-like utterances as

¹⁸ The number of occurrences was manually calculated for all three tests and then combined for both treatment groups to show the general trends in the data.

well as utterances falling under the target-like slot-and-frame pattern recorded in both treatment groups.

Table 2.

Distribution of codes in the 1st cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis

Speech event	Non-target use			Repetitive use			Target-like slot-and-frame			Target-like use		
	FE	AR	Total	FE	AR	Total	FE	AR	Total	FE	AR	Total
Invitations	8	20	28	12	12	24	9	1	10	12	1	13
Appointments	7	9	16	3	21	24	15	4	19	13	2	15
Resolving issues	4	5	9	15	15	30	4	1	5	5	0	5
Responding to requests	9	14	23	10	11	21	7	0	7	5	1	6

Note: The table includes instances recorded in the pre-, post-, and delayed post-test combined.

The findings from the first cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis laid the foundation for the second cycle of analysis, which was conducted in order to further investigate how the students' pragmatic ability evolved in terms of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects. To this end, each target speech event was analyzed separately using the coding categories from the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis (see Figure 8 in Chapter 4). The following sub-sections discuss some key findings that emerged from the second cycle of analysis of each target speech event and in each treatment group.

5.2. Second Cycle of Analysis: Pragmalinguistic and Sociopragmatic Violations

An important next step was to examine each individual target speech event in terms of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic violations recorded in each treatment group and determine which factors could have contributed to these violations and whether any qualitative

differences could be noticed between the treatment groups in terms of speech act realization patterns before and after the teaching intervention. The key findings that emerged during the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis are presented in the following sub-sections.

5.2.1. Invitations

5.2.1.1. FE Group

The second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis showed that most students in the FE group seemed to lack precise vocabulary needed to extend an invitation prior to the teaching intervention. For example, Student 7 used a non-target expression ‘take place to this party’ instead of ‘join this party’, while Student 1 used the verb ‘open’ when trying to say that he was going to ‘host’ or ‘organize’ a party. Another example of the inaccurate lexical choice was ‘take my invitation to be part of my organization’ (Student 6, pre-test). As for inaccurate grammatical choices, the main issue in the pre-test was the inability to choose an appropriate aspect of a verb tense. For instance, most native speakers¹⁹ in this particular communicative context preferred using the progressive aspect of the present tense when talking about their intention to host a party: ‘I’m hosting/having/organizing a barbeque party’. Student participants, on the other hand, experienced difficulty choosing the appropriate aspect of the verb tense. The utterance produced by Student 5 illustrates this well: ‘I’m inviting you for... I have birthday party’. As can be seen from this example, the student first chose the Present Progressive ‘I’m inviting’, but then switched back to the Present Simple ‘I have’.

Similarly, the pragmalinguistic violations in the post- and delayed post-test were caused by inaccurate lexical and grammatical choices. However, if students’ utterances are examined

¹⁹ Based on the data in the NSC (see Appendix A).

more closely, it becomes clear that the FE group students attempted to incorporate one of the target pragmatic formulas into their speech acts to a certain extent, which made their speech acts sound more nativelike. For example, Student 2 tried to use the future aspect of the verb ‘have’, despite it being inaccurately applied: ‘This weekend my family will be have a birthday party’. Even though this particular utterance contains a pragmalinguistic violation, the fact that the student utilized the verb ‘have’ when referring to hosting a party, shows a shift towards nativelikeness since it somewhat resembles a common formula utilized by the native speakers in this context: ‘I’m *having* a ___ [party]’. The same observation can be made about the utterance produced by Student 3 in the post-test, ‘Would you like to come to join with me?’, or the utterance produced by Student 1 in the delayed post-test, ‘Feel free to take dessert or vegetable’. In the first example, the student did use the verb ‘join’, which made his invitation sound more natural; however, the utterance ended up being redundant because the verb ‘come’ was used along with ‘join’. In the second example, the student’s utterance contained the formulaic frame ‘feel free to...’, but the verb ‘take’ makes this lexical choice inappropriate in this context and should be replaced with the verb ‘bring’ to make it sound native-like (compare to the formula from the NSC ‘feel free to *bring* a salad’).

Moreover, most student participants started to use unreal conditional structures in both post- and delayed post-tests, which could still be considered a pragmalinguistic improvement, despite the fact that these utterances contained minor grammatical violations (inappropriate verb tense in either if-clause or result clause). Examples of such utterances include ‘If you join my birthday party, I would be very happy’ (Student 1); ‘If you can come, I will be happy’ (Student 2); or ‘It will be great if you come’ (Student 6) and can be contrasted with such native-speaker

formulas as: ‘Would be happy if you could ____ [join the party] or ‘It would be great if you could ____ [come]’ (refer to Appendix A for other possible equivalents).

The second cycle of analysis also revealed that the student participants in the FE group tended to misuse modal verbs such as ‘would/would like’ or ‘can’, which led to several sociopragmatic violations both before and after the teaching intervention. For example, the utterance produced by Student 1 in the pre-test, ‘Would you like it?’ sounds more like a general inquiry rather than an invitation to a barbeque party. The native-speaker formula appropriate for this context would be ‘Would you like to come to the party’ or ‘Would you and your family like to come?’ (refer to Appendix A for other possible equivalents). Another example of a sociopragmatic violation (i.e., inappropriate speech act) is ‘Do you have time?’ (Student 2, pre-test), which sounds more like a random question and does not make it clear to the hearer that this is an invitation. To make his communicative intention clearer, the student could have chosen to use formulas like ‘Do you think you can make it?’, ‘Are you able to come?’, or ‘I want to know if you would like to join’ (examples taken from the NSC). He failed to do so most likely due to limited pragmalinguistic resources.

The utterances produced by the students in the delayed post-test resembled the nativelike norm to a greater extent, but some still contained sociopragmatic violations that negatively affected the communicative function of the produced speech acts. For example, modal verb ‘can’ in the utterance ‘If you have time or if you are free, you can come’ (Student 4, delayed post-test) makes this speech act sound more like giving permission rather than an invitation. A possible native-speaker equivalent in this context could be ‘Come by if you’re free’ or ‘Hope you can make it’ (refer to Appendix A for other possible equivalents). Student 4 had most likely made an

attempt to reproduce one of these target pragmatic formulas, but the utterance he produced ended up being his own interpretation of their meanings. Finally, the utterance produced by Student 1 in the delayed post-test, ‘Would your children and you come here?’ is missing the ‘like’ component, which makes it sound more like a speculation about possible future actions (as in the second conditional structure referring to an unreal situation in the present ‘Would you come if I invited you to my party?’).

Furthermore, certain students tended to overuse as well as misuse the modal verbs ‘can’ and ‘could’ in the context of this speech event both before and after the intervention, which made some of the speech acts sound like polite requests (‘Can you come with your family’, Student 5, post-test) or overly polite requests (‘Could you come please?’, Student 5, delayed post-test). Some students also tended to place ‘please’ at the beginning of the speech act (‘Please, come over’ Student 4, pre-test or ‘Please, can you come you and your family?’, Student 7, delayed post-test), making it sound more like a plea rather than a friendly invitation when compared to the utterances produced by the native speakers in this context. The native speakers, for the most part, tended to use hedging and other mitigators when extending their invitations, as in ‘We’re hoping you can come’ or ‘I was wondering if you would like to ___ [come/join]’.

At the same time, several instances of repetitive utterances produced in the pre-test were coded as ‘nativelike overuses’. These utterances show the participants’ tendency to use the verb ‘want’ when extending an invitation (e.g., ‘I want to invite you to join us’, Student 1). There were no such instances recorded after the intervention, however. Instead, the participants started to produce more diverse and creatively constructed target-like utterances (e.g., ‘I am planning organize a party for my birthday’, Student 1, post-test or ‘We are having a birthday party for my

son', Student 6, post-test), which appears to be a shift towards nativelikeness and lexical flexibility and diversity. Refer to Appendix J for a full list of utterances produced by the FE group students in the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests and categorized according to the codes of the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis in the speech event of *Extending invitations*.

5.2.1.2. AR Group

The second cycle of analysis of the utterances produced by the AR group participants revealed that the majority of recorded pragmalinguistic violations were caused by an inaccurate aspect of the verb tense. In the pre-test, most students tended to use the Present Simple instead of the Present Progressive when extending their invitations for an imaginary barbeque party happening later that week, according to the pre-test scenario: 'We have BBQ today' (Student 13) or 'Tomorrow we have party' (Student 11). A common formula utilized by the native speakers in this context contained the Present Progressive aspect: 'I'm *having* a __ [party]'. Another prominent example which clearly shows the lack of both grammatical and lexical resources to engage in a speech event is an utterance produced by Student 8 in the pre-test: 'Do you come an invite me?'. Finally, Student 11 seemed to make an attempt to use an unreal conditional structure in his invitation, but due to a lack of grammatical knowledge the utterance he produced ended up being inaccurate: 'I am so happy if you answer... if you come to my home' Some target pragmatic formulas from the NSC expressing the same communicative function are: Would love it if you could ____ + [verb: join]; It would be great to have you there!; Would be happy if you could ____ + [verb: come]) (refer to Appendix A for other possible options).

However, as opposed to the FE group participants, the participants of the AR group did not show any tangible signs of pragmlinguistic improvement after the teaching intervention. Nevertheless, certain attempts to reproduce the target pragmatic formulas were observed in the post- and delayed post-test. For example, Student 10 in the post-test produced the following utterance: ‘Tell me if you can come and you can give anything for the party’. This utterance appears to be a semi-successful attempt to reproduce one of the target pragmatic formulas from the NSC: ‘Feel free to bring a ____ + [noun- salad/dessert] or ‘Come by if you are free’ (See Appendix A). In addition, there were multiple attempts to reproduce the target pragmatic formulas containing the verb ‘would’, as in the native speaker example ‘Would you and your family like to come?’. The utterances that the students produced after the intervention, however, sounded as if they were expressing their own preferences as opposed to extending invitations: ‘I would like to invite you to my daughter’s birthday’ (Student 9, post-test) or ‘I would like to invite you and your children to my house party’ (Student 9, delayed post-test). At the same time, there was another unsuccessful attempt to reproduce the target formula ‘Would love it if you could ____ + [verb: join]’: ‘I love to come you my children birthday’ (Student 11, post-test). Finally, with just one exception in the delayed post-test, ‘Would you like to come to party?’ (Student 12), there were no instances of target-like utterances recorded in the AR group, and most violations persisted even after the teaching intervention.

As for the sociopragmatic violations, they were mainly caused by the inappropriate use of the modal verbs ‘can’, ‘could’, ‘will’, ‘would/would like’, as well as semi-modals ‘have to’ and ‘need to’, both before and after the teaching intervention. Most likely, due to the students’ insufficient understanding of the communicative functions these verbs may perform depending on the context, the utterances they produced did not sound like typical invitations in the English

language. For example, in the utterance produced by Student 13 in the pre-test, ‘I will invite you, you have to come’, the modal verb ‘will’ makes her speech act sound more like a promise of future action, while ‘you have to come’ sounds more like an obligation or a command rather than a friendly invitation. Another example of a speech act resembling an expression of need or obligation was recorded in the delayed post-test: ‘We invite you, you need to come’ (Student 13). Furthermore, the student participants tended to misuse the modal verbs ‘can’ and ‘could’ which led to inappropriate speech acts in this speech event. The utterance analysis revealed that most students utilized these verbs at the beginning of a speech act: ‘Can you and your husband, you child can come?’ (Student 11, pre-test); ‘Could you please come for my house?’ (Student 9, pre-test); Can you come? (Student 8, post-test); ‘Could you please come if you have time?’ (Student 9, delayed post-test). As a result, these utterances resembled polite requests rather than invitations. Moreover, the formula ‘could you please’ was overused both before and after the intervention by the majority of the students in the AR group. The data in the NSC corpus suggest that the most frequent pragmatic formulas used by the native speakers when extending invitations were formulas containing hypothetical structures, such as Would love it if you could ____ [verb: join/come]; Would be happy if you could ____ [verb]; or It would be great if you could ____ [verb: come]. The results of the qualitative utterance analysis, however, has shown that these particular formulas were the most challenging for the students in both treatment groups. Refer to Appendix K for a full list of utterances produced by the AR group students in the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests and categorized according to the codes of the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis in the speech event of *Extending invitations*.

5.2.2. Appointments

5.2.2.1. FE Group

The majority of the FE group students lacked pragmalinguistic resources (in this case, mainly lexical resources) to formulate appropriate and efficient speech acts prior to the teaching intervention. When analyzing the students' utterances produced in the pre-test, it became apparent that none of the students was able to use the verb 'reschedule' in their speech acts (as in the target pragmatic formula 'I need to reschedule/cancel [my appointment]'). There were attempts to express the same concept using different language, but the utterances produced by the students ended up being wordy and non-nativelike: 'But I have some personal things to do next Saturday morning, so I want to change time' (Student 2, pre-test); 'I have something problem today, can you change the day please?' (Student 5, pre-test); or 'I will call later to let you know what time I will come again' (Student 3, pre-test). At the same time, the FE group students seemed to favour the verb 'want' when formulating their pre-test utterances, resulting in quite a few nativelike overuses of the same formula recorded both before and after the teaching intervention (e.g., 'I want to cancel my appointment', Student 1, pre-test; 'I want to cancel my appointment on Wednesday', Student 2, delayed post-test).

In terms of the sociopragmatic violations recorded in the pre-test, these were mainly caused by the fact that the student participants tended to place 'please' at the very beginning of a speech act²⁰, making the tone of their utterances sound unnaturally submissive in this communicative context. Examples of such utterances include 'Please, you can cancel my

²⁰ Interestingly, a similar tendency was observed in the speech of event of *Extending invitations* in the FE group.

appointment?’ (Student 4, pre-test) and ‘Please if you can find another date for me, for another appointment, it will be good for me’ (Student 7, pre-test). In contrast, the majority of the native speaker utterances in this context were direct speech acts with almost no softeners (e.g., ‘I’m calling to cancel my appointment’, ‘I need to reschedule my appointment’, or ‘Can/could we reschedule?’). Other instances of sociopragmatic violations were associated with inappropriate speech acts produced due to the lack of pragmalinguistic resources. If we take a closer look at such utterances as ‘I cancel my appointment’ (Student 3, pre-test) or ‘The time will be next Wednesday. Is it ok?’ (Student 2, pre-test), it will become apparent that these students do not have enough linguistic resources to use modal verbs and/or modal expressions required in this context in order to efficiently achieve the communicative goal of the intended speech act. In other words, if Student 3 had used the semi-modal ‘need to’ or the modal expression ‘would like to’ in his speech act, it would have sounded like an actual request to cancel an appointment, rather than a declaration (‘I need to/would like to cancel my appointment’). Similarly, if Student 2 had used the modal verb ‘would’ instead of ‘will’ when referring to potential reschedule date (as in the target pragmatic formula ‘I was wondering if it would be possible to ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?’), his utterance would have sounded more accurate from both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic perspectives.

The analysis of the FE students’ utterances after the teaching intervention revealed two major positive changes. First, the students’ lexical repertoire expanded with context-specific vocabulary like ‘reschedule’, ‘availability’, and ‘available’ (e.g. ‘Do you have any availability next week?’, Student 6, post-test). Second, not only were the students able to reproduce the target pragmatic formulas in their responses to the tests after the teaching intervention, but they were also able to creatively use the elements of the target pragmatic formulas to formulate their

own unique utterances. Some prominent examples of creatively nativelike utterances produced by the FE students include: ‘Can you reschedule me?’ (Student 3, post-test); ‘I will reschedule when I am available’ (Student 2, delayed post-test), and ‘I can make it Friday’²¹ (Student 3, delayed post-test). Refer to Appendix L for a full list of utterances produced by the FE group students in the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests and categorized according to the codes of the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis in the speech event of *Cancelling/rescheduling appointments*.

5.2.2.2. AR Group

The analysis revealed similar patterns in the nature of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic violations in the utterances produced by the AR group participants. The pragmalinguistic violations were mainly caused by the lack of linguistic resources (lexical or grammatical) necessary to perform the intended speech act of cancelling/rescheduling an appointment. For instance, an utterance produced by Student 13 in the pre-test, ‘Can you change the schedule to... for me’ demonstrates that this student was unable to properly explain their communicative intention due to the lack of lexical resources²². At the same time, utterances like ‘I will don’t come because I am busy, I have another appointment. I am sorry, not come today’ (Student 10, pre-test) or ‘I am not coming to able this appointment because my daughter is sick that’s why I am not possible to come this appointment’ (Student 12, pre-test) clearly show insufficient grammatical resources necessary to adequately perform the target speech act.

²¹ A variation of the target pragmatic formula ‘I can’t make it’.

²² Compare to the target pragmatic formula ‘I need to reschedule’.

Several similar patterns to those observed in the FE group were also recorded in the formula overuse category. As for the nativelike overuse category, the AR students tended to overuse the verb ‘want’²³ and the formula ‘could you please’²⁴ when performing the speech act of cancelling/rescheduling an appointment (e.g., ‘I want to cancel my appointment because I can’t come’, Student 9, pre-test or ‘Could you please make another schedule for me’, Student 12, delayed post-test). As for the non-nativelike overuse category, the most common violations were associated with the sociopragmatic aspect. In particular, the placement of ‘please’ at the very beginning of the students’ utterances (e.g., ‘Please, if you can give me next appointment for Saturday?’, Student 11, pre-test or ‘Please, can you give me next appointment for tomorrow?’, Student 11, post-test) made their speech acts sound meek compared to the direct speech acts produced by the native speakers in the same speech event (e.g., ‘I’m calling to cancel my appointment’, ‘I need to reschedule my appointment’, or ‘Can/could we reschedule?’). Moreover, there were instances where the tone of the students’ utterances ranged from overly direct or even aggressive (‘Cancel, please, the appointment’, Student 10, pre-test) to overly indirect and submissive (‘I am very sorry because I wanna cancel my appointment because I have appointment with my family doctor’, Student 12, post-test).

The analysis of the utterances produced after the teaching intervention by the AR group participants showed slight improvements, mostly from the pragmalinguistic perspective. The students started to use utterances containing the target vocabulary like ‘reschedule’, ‘need’, or

²³ A similar pattern was observed in the FE group in this speech event.

²⁴ A tendency to overuse this particular formula was observed across speech events in both treatment groups.

‘cancel’; those utterances, however, still contained various kinds of discrepancies, mainly associated with the omission of the particle ‘to’ as in ‘I need cancel please’ (Student 8, delayed post-test) or confusion around the verbs ‘schedule’ and ‘reschedule’ as in ‘I want to schedule²⁵ the appointment because I have another appointment for my son’ (Student 10, delayed post-test) or in ‘Could you please make another schedule for me?’²⁶ (Student 5, delayed post-test). None of the AR group students, but for one participant (‘Can you reschedule?’, Student 8, delayed post-test), was able to reproduce any of the target pragmatic formulas after the intervention, nor were the students able to come up with their own creative equivalents that could be considered nativelike. Instead, the AR group participants tended to overly rely on formulas like ‘I’m sorry, I can’t come’ or ‘Could you please’, especially in the delayed post-test. The opposite tendency was observed in the FE group, where the participants started using a greater variety of the target formulas after the teaching intervention. Refer to Appendix M for a full list of utterances produced by the AR group students in the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests and categorized according to the codes of the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis in the speech event of *Cancelling/Rescheduling Appointments*.

5.2.3. Resolving Issues

5.2.3.1. FE Group

This speech event yielded the largest number of repetitive utterances²⁷, especially in the pre-test. The majority of these repetitive utterances contained sociopragmatic violations and were coded as ‘stabilized non-nativelike overuses’. The results of the second cycle of the

²⁵ It has to be ‘reschedule’ in this context.

²⁶ ‘Schedule’ is used as a noun here, which changes the communicative meaning of the speech act.

²⁷ The same observation applies to the AR group.

utterance analysis showed that the FE students tended to produce direct speech acts when trying to resolve a financial issue with the insurance company (following the pre-test scenario). When comparing the native speaker utterances produced in the same speech act to those produced by the student participants, it became evident that the native speakers tended to mitigate their speech acts by using openers such as ‘I was hoping’ or ‘I was wondering’ (see more examples in Appendix A). In contrast, most of the utterances produced by the student participants did not include mitigators; instead, the students tended to formulate direct questions, which might sound slightly aggressive in English: ‘Why you are not cancelling?’ (Student 5, pre-test), ‘Why do you take some money in my account’ (Student 7, pre-test), or simply ‘What happened?’ (Student 3, pre-test).

On the other hand, there were several instances where the students’ utterances had an unnaturally submissive tone caused by either incorrect placement or overuse of the intensifier ‘please’, as in ‘Please, can you cancel, please?’ (Student 5, pre-test) or ‘Please, could you check to tell me why he didn’t come?’ (Student 7, post-test). At the same time, the nativelike overuses were associated with the repetition of the utterances containing the modal verb ‘can’, as in ‘Can you tell me why?’ (Student 2, post-test) or ‘Can you check for me what happened?’ (Student 3, delayed post-test). As for the pragmalinguistic violations, they were mainly caused by the lack of lexical resources necessary to formulate appropriate speech acts. This lack of lexical resources had impeded the communicative meanings of the students’ speech acts resulting in awkward sounding utterances such as ‘Which is condition to cancel insurance?’ or ‘Can you explain how is going on?’ (Student 6, pre-test).

Two positive changes in the FE group students' interlanguage development were observed during the analysis of utterances produced after the teaching intervention. First, no instances of repetitive non-nativelike utterances were recorded after the teaching intervention. Instead, quite a few instances of the target-like utterances were recorded in both post- and delayed post-tests, such as 'Could you check and see my line please?' (Student 5, post-test) or 'I was wondering what happened' (Student 3, post-test). What is notable about these examples is the fact that the FE students started incorporating target-like mitigation devices like 'I was wondering' or 'I hope', which made their speech acts sound more polite and less direct²⁸. Second, the second cycle of the utterance analysis showed that the FE students started using a variety of modal verbs, in addition to 'can'. Example include 'Who could I speak about it?' (Student 1, post-test) or 'So, who should speak to about these things?' (Student 1, delayed post-test). The latter example, however, contains a minor grammatical discrepancy since this student omitted the personal pronoun 'I' ('Who should *I* speak to').

It is also worth noting that several utterances with similar discrepancies were recorded in both post- and delayed post-test possibly caused by the fact that certain target pragmatic formulas²⁹ were not fully acquired by the student participants. Examples include 'Please, could you check to tell me why he didn't come?' (Student 7, post-test) or 'Could you fix and see my internet?' (Student 5, delayed post-test). The former utterance could be rephrased as 'Could you check and see why he didn't come?', while the latter utterance could be rephrased as 'Could you

²⁸ It is important to note that the concepts of politeness and directness are interpreted here from the perspective of the English language using the data in the NSC as a benchmark.

²⁹ Here the author refers to the semi-fixed formulas with 'fillable slots' such as 'Could you check___ and see if___ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]'.

please check and see if my internet can be fixed?’ or ‘Can you please check if my internet can be fixed?’³⁰. Refer to Appendix N for a full list of utterances produced by the FE group students in the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests and categorized according to the codes of the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis in the speech event of *Resolving issues*.

5.2.3.2. AR Group

As mentioned earlier, the highest number of repetitive utterances was recorded in this speech event. A tendency to use direct speech acts when resolving issues was also observed during the analysis of the utterances produced by the AR group participants. Just like the FE group students, the students in the AR group overly relied on the interrogative adverb ‘why’ when formulating their utterances (e.g., ‘Hi, I check with insurance, I cancel direct. Why?’, Student 8, pre-test; ‘I don’t know why’, Student 11, delayed post-test). Moreover, due to the lack of pragmalinguistic resources, most utterances containing these interrogations did not appear to be complete speech acts and simply consisted of one word ‘why’ (e.g., ‘Why? Because I cancel insurance’, Student 10, pre-test; ‘How about the technician? Late. Not here yet. Why?’, Student 10, post-test). Furthermore, certain stabilized non-target utterances were recorded even after the teaching intervention (e.g., ‘What’s going wrong?’, Student 12, pre-test; ‘What’s going wrong and what can I do?’, Student 12, post-test).

It is also worth noting that the AR group students did not use any mitigation devices except for the repetitive ‘Can/could you please’ formula. The AR group students mostly tended to produce direct speech acts, which were recorded both before and after the teaching intervention (e.g., ‘What’s wrong?’, Student 13, pre-test; ‘What happened?’, Student 11, post-

³⁰ See Appendix A for alternative options.

test). In contrast, the most frequently used native speaker formulas contained hedges like ‘I was wondering’ __+ [request for help] or ‘I’m hoping __+ [request for help]. As for ‘can/could you please’, this formula was repeatedly used by the students after the teaching intervention (e.g., ‘Can you please come and connect my internet?’, Student 13, post-test; ‘Could you please send anyone to fix it?’, Student 9, delayed post-test). On the one hand, this could be considered an improvement since the students’ utterances became more polite; on the other hand, the fact that the AR students did not use any other of the target pragmatic formulas for this speech event suggests that their lexical repertoire had not expanded after the teaching intervention.

Moreover, the AR group students continued to lack adequate pragmalinguistic resources even after the teaching intervention and, as a result, were not able to fully achieve the target speech act (e.g., ‘How can I do for that?’, Student 9, pre-test; ‘Can you talk me about time?’, Student 11, post-test; ‘If you can send someone fix it or check it’, Student 10, delayed post-test). Finally, no instances of purely nativelike utterances were recorded in the AR group before or after the teaching intervention in this speech event. Refer to Appendix O for a full list of utterances produced by the AR group students in the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests and categorized according to the codes of the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis in the speech event of *Resolving issues*.

5.2.4. Responding to Requests

5.2.4.1. FE Group

The pre-test utterances produced by the FE student participants demonstrate a clear lack of pragmalinguistic resources necessary to properly perform a speech act of refusal. This becomes especially evident when utterances containing attempts to offer to work overtime on a different day as an alternative solution are analyzed more closely. Even though the students seemed to understand the necessity to suggest an alternative option in this context in order to save face while declining a manager's request to work overtime³¹, the lack of lexical and grammatical resources prevented them from doing it efficiently. To illustrate this point further, select target pragmatic formulas from the NSC can be compared with the utterances produced by the students. In the first example, an utterance produced by Student 7 in the pre-test, 'Can you try for another solution?', slightly resembles a native speaker formula 'Is there another way I can/could help?'; in the second example, an utterance produced by Student 2 in the pre-test, 'The work may be... We can do the work tomorrow?', slightly resembles a native speaker formula: 'I would be happy to ____ + [work overtime] another day'.

Another observation that emerged from the second cycle of analysis of this speech event is the fact that the students tended to overuse the modal verb 'can' in their pre-test utterances. This negatively affected the communicative meanings of the speech acts they produced, which, in turn, resulted in various sociopragmatic violations in the pre-test. Most of these violations were associated with inappropriate speech acts produced. For example, utterances like 'Can you

³¹ Most target pragmatic formulas in the NSC contained semantic formulas of offering alternative options or help (see Appendix A).

change the day please for me because it can't for me today' (Student 5, pre-test) or 'You can ask another colleague if he can do it, because me, I am very busy' (Student 7, pre-test) sound more like a request (the former example) or like granting a permission (the latter example). Another prominent sociopragmatic violation observed in the pre-test was the stabilized use of 'please' at the very beginning of a speech act, which made students' utterances sound more impertinent rather than polite (e.g., 'Please, I can't do that', Student 7, pre-test). As mentioned earlier, this particular violation was also recorded multiple times in other speech events in both FE and AR group.

The analysis of the post- and delayed post-test utterances revealed several noticeable improvements in the patterns of interlanguage formula development in the FE group. First, the students started using mitigators like 'possible/possibly' ('It is possible if I can work overtime next week on Monday?', Student 6, post-test) or 'unfortunately' ('Unfortunately, I'm unable to take part in your project', Student 2, delayed post-test; 'Oh, sorry, unfortunately I have a job', Student 5, delayed post-test). Second, several instances of purely nativelike formulas with the 'offering help/alternative solution' component were recorded after the teaching intervention, such as 'I would be happy to work next Saturday' (Student 4, post-test) or 'I'm not able to do [it] this week, but I would be happy to do next week' (Student 4, delayed post-test).

While the students' utterances produced after the teaching intervention contain signs of positive improvement, the second cycle of analysis of post- and delayed post-test utterances revealed insufficient control of the pragmalinguistic aspect in the complex semi-fixed target pragmatic formulas with 'fillable' slots such as 'I would usually ____ + [help], but ____ + [excuse]' or 'I could ____ + [promise of future action], if that would help'. Select target

pragmatic formulas from the NSC (see Appendix A) can be compared with the students' utterances to better illustrate this point: native speaker formula: 'I *would love* to help, but ____ + [excuse]' versus Student 6, post-test: 'I *would like* to help, but I have another plan for today'; native speaker formula: 'I *could* ____ + [promise of future action], if that *would* help' versus Student 2, post-test: 'I *can* come on Sunday if it *will* be help'.

These examples point to certain confusion experienced by the FE group students around the usage of modal verbs 'could', 'will' as well as modal expression 'would [like/love]' which are typically used in English when referring to imaginary or hypothetical situations (second conditionals). For instance, the utterance 'I can come on Sunday if it will be help' produced by Student 2 in the post-test signals a shift towards the target-like slot-and-frame ('I could ____ + [do something] if that would help'); however, due to the inaccurate use of the second conditional ('can' instead of 'could' and 'will' instead of 'would'), this utterance was coded as a pragmalinguistic violation under the target-like slot-and-frame pattern category. Another common confusion had to do with the misuse of expressions 'would like' and 'would love'. The utterance 'I *would like* to help, but I have another plan for today' produced by Student 6 in the post-test was most likely an attempt to reproduce the target pragmatic formula 'I *would love* to help, but ____ + [excuse]'; however, due to the use of 'like' instead of 'love', the student's utterance sounded a bit unnatural in this context. Refer to Appendix P for a full list of utterances produced by the FE group students in the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests and categorized according to the codes of the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis in the speech event of *Responding to requests*.

5.2.4.2. AR Group

The utterances produced by the AR students in the pre-test contained various pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic violations, which affected the tone of their speech acts, making them sound unnaturally direct in this context compared to the utterances produced by the native speakers in the same speech event (see Appendix A). The students' pre-test responses mostly contained direct speech acts with no mitigators, except for several instances of 'sorry' or 'very sorry'. For example, the utterance 'I don't want to stay more time' (Student 12, pre-test) sounds rude in this context because of the inappropriate word choice ('I don't want to'). As mentioned earlier, most target pragmatic formulas in the NSC contained semantic formulas of offering alternative option or help, such as 'I wish I could stay and help out, but ____ + [excuse]' or 'I would love to help, but ____ + [excuse]'. Another example of a pragmalinguistic violation negatively affecting the communicative meaning of a speech act is the utterance produced by Student 12 in the pre-test: 'I am very sorry because I have another plan'. The student was not able to adequately decline manager's request, most likely due to insufficient pragmalinguistic resources. In this context, it would be more appropriate to use such target pragmatic formulas from the NSC as 'I can't make it' or 'I am unable to make it'. As for the repetitive uses, the dominant formula recorded across all three tests in the AR group was 'I am sorry, I can't [stay]' (e.g., 'Sorry, I can not, I have appointment at this time', Student 11, pre-test; 'I am sorry, I cannot stay', Student 10, post-test; 'Oh sorry, I can't because my project not finished for me' (Student 9, delayed post-test). Interestingly, the number of repetitive formulas increased after the teaching intervention.

The analysis of the utterances produced by the AR students after the teaching intervention revealed one major improvement. While before the teaching intervention none of the students offered an alternative option or solution when refusing to stay overtime, several

attempts to incorporate this semantic formula into the main speech act were recorded after the teaching intervention. Examples include ‘Could you give me work on Sunday? I can come on Sunday’ (Student 11, post-test); ‘Can I... can we do tomorrow?’ (Student 12, post-test); or ‘Could you give me second day for I make this project?’ (Student 11, delayed post-test). Nevertheless, these utterances were coded as non-target since all three of them contained the same pragmalinguistic violation (inappropriate speech act). While the native speakers would use their own initiative and offer an alternative time or solution (e.g., ‘Is there another way I can/could help?’; ‘I would be happy to work overtime another day’), the students’ utterances were more similar to requests due to the misuse of modal verbs ‘can’ and ‘could’. Such nativelike formulas, however, require sophisticated grammatical structures, which could pose difficulties for lower-intermediate L2 users like this study’s participants. As noted earlier, the analysis of the post-treatment utterances in the FE group showed that even the students who received targeted instruction of the pragmatic formulas still struggled when producing such complex formulaic structures. Likewise, the analysis of the utterances produced in this speech event by the AR group students showed that, for the most part, the students lacked pragmalinguistic resources to produce complete speech acts (e.g., ‘Can you... Can Monday?’, Student 8, delayed post-test).

Lastly, several unsuccessful attempts to reproduce the target pragmatic formulas were recorded after the teaching intervention, namely the formulas containing mitigators such as ‘I wish I could’ and ‘I would love to, but’. To illustrate this point further, select target pragmatic formulas can be compared with the utterances produced by the students. In the first example, an utterance produced by Student 12 in the post-test: ‘I would like to able to do, but I am very sorry because I have an appointment with my special doctor’ slightly resembles a native speaker

formula ‘I would love to help, but ____ + [excuse]’; in the second example, an utterance produced by Student 10 in the delayed post-test ‘I hope that, but I have not finish my project yet’ slightly resembles a native speaker formula ‘I wish I could stay and help out, but ____ + [excuse]’; in the third example, an utterance produced by Student 10 in the post-test: ‘I am busy all Saturday. Maybe next day I can’ slightly resembles a native speaker formula: ‘I could ____ + [stay tomorrow] if that would help’.

These examples suggest that the AR students could not clearly distinguish between ‘I would like’ and ‘I would love’³² as well as confused ‘I hope’ with ‘I wish’³³. The last example shows an attempt to express possibility, but instead of using the modal verb ‘could’ like in the target formulas, the student compensated it with a more familiar adverb ‘maybe’. While these attempts to reproduce the target formulas can be considered a positive change from the sociopragmatic perspective, due to the insufficient pragmalinguistic resources, none of the students in the AR group was able to reproduce any of the target pragmatic formulas after the teaching intervention. Instead, the students kept relying on already familiar formulas such as ‘I’m sorry, I can’t’ or ‘Could you ____ + [request].’ Refer to Appendix Q for a full list of utterances produced by the AR group students in the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests and categorized according to the codes of the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis in the speech event of *Responding to requests*.

³² A similar observation was made in the FE group in this speech event.

³³ This seems to be a common negative transfer from L1 Arabic.

5.2.5. Summary of Results

The first cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis revealed several main trends in the interlanguage formula development in both treatment groups. First, the utterances produced by the students in the FE group contained a higher number of nativelike pragmatic formulas in both post- and delayed post-tests compared to the pre-test results; in addition, the FE group students started to use a greater variety of pragmatic formulas across speech events after the teaching intervention, which led to a decrease in the number of repetitive uses (both target-like and non-target-like). As for the AR group, no noticeable shift towards nativelikeness was observed after the teaching intervention. The students in this group tended to overuse and, at times, misuse certain pragmatic formulas when performing different speech acts. Moreover, the results of the first cycle of analysis suggest that the majority of students in the AR group did not manage to reduce the number of stabilized non-target utterances (i.e., fossilized errors) even after the teaching intervention.

The second cycle of analysis of the utterances produced by the FE group students revealed multiple improvements in terms of both grammatical accuracy (e.g., the use of tense and aspect; second conditionals; modal verbs) and contextual appropriateness (e.g., the proper use of tone and speech act type) after the teaching intervention. Furthermore, the FE group students demonstrated an ability to utilize the target formulas in a creative and flexible manner. In particular, the FE group participants utilized a higher number of the target pragmatic formulas containing various hedges and other mitigation devices, which led to the improvement of these students' sociopragmatic ability after the teaching intervention. The use of the target pragmatic formulas containing hedging devices was particularly crucial for successful realization of speech

acts in the speech events that imply higher degrees of social distance, power, and imposition (i.e., *Resolving financial issues* or *Responding to requests*).

The second cycle of analysis of the utterances produced by the AR group students revealed a different pattern of interlanguage formula development. In this group, the students continued to overuse the non-target utterances even after the teaching intervention across all target speech acts. The analysis showed that the more instances of the stabilized non-nativelike uses were recorded, the greater the chances for either pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic violations to occur. At the same time, since the AR group students tended to resort to the same pragmatic formulas when performing the target speech acts, neither lexical variety nor creativity was improved after the teaching intervention, except for some rare instances. Even though several attempts to reproduce the target pragmatic formulas were recorded after the teaching intervention in the AR group, the majority of those attempts ended up being unsuccessful due to limited pragmalinguistic resources.

5.3. Discussion

The results of the qualitative analysis of the utterances produced by the student participants before and after the teaching intervention point to exceptionally complex processes involved in the acquisition of the target pragmatic formulas. Despite the fact that the FE group students showed multiple improvements in terms of both grammatical accuracy and contextual appropriateness, as opposed to the AR group students, who did not demonstrate any visible shift towards nativelikeness in either of these two aspects, the participants in both treatment groups experienced similar difficulties with both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of the target speech events.

The second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis (see Figure 8 in Chapter 4) revealed that the utterances produced by the student participants in both treatment groups in the *non-target use* category and in the *target-like slot-and-frame use* category contained two types of violations (i.e., deviations from the native speaker norm): the first type was associated with pragmalinguistics (i.e., inaccurate grammatical or lexical choices), whereas the second type was associated with sociopragmatics (i.e., inappropriate tone or speech act)³⁴. When each target speech event was analyzed more closely, it became clear the utterances produced in certain speech events contained more pragmalinguistic violations, while other speech events yielded more sociopragmatic violations.

In addition, the key finding of the qualitative utterance analysis is that it revealed that both types of violations were caused by the lack of appropriate pragmatic formula(s) needed to perform a given speech act. This observation provides additional evidence to support the claim that pragmatic formulas play a crucial role in successful speech act realization as well as acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence in general, which has long been recognized in the research literature (Coulmas, 1981; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993; House, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig, 2006, 2012; Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2008; Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). In what follows, the role of pragmatic formulas in interlanguage pragmatic development is discussed in more detail; in particular, the acquisitional nature of identified pragmatic violations in each target speech act is explained by drawing on some key examples from the data

³⁴ Note that the distinction between pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic violations is artificial and is used by the researcher only for the purpose of data analysis; this does not imply that these two aspects of L2 pragmatic competence are not interrelated.

analysis of the utterances produced by the participants in both treatment groups before and after the teaching intervention and by relating these findings to the existing body of research on formula acquisition.

5.3.1. The Nature of Pragmalinguistic Violations in Both Treatment Groups

Those few studies that have focused on interlanguage realization of pragmatic formulas (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig, 2009; Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012; Bardovi-Harlig & Stringer, 2016) show that L2 learners seem to creatively construct pragmatic formulas at initial stages of acquisition. Later, as the level of grammatical competence increases, learners start to analyse the constituent elements of pragmatic formulas, which results in the production of inaccurate and non-nativelike forms. Finally, such expressions are acquired in the target-like form, usually after a period of pedagogical treatments and/or long-term exposure to and active participation in the target language environment (Bardovi-Harlig & Stringer, 2016). The results of the present study are in line with the current belief that pragmatic formulas appear to be stored in the learner's mental lexicon which can be viewed as a continuum with more fixed expressions placed on the holistic end, and expressions that allow for certain variations placed on the opposite end of the continuum (Wood, 2015).

In this study, the target pragmatic formulas of the semi-fixed (discontinuous) type with complex grammatical and syntactic structures as part of their formulaic frames presented the biggest challenge for the students in both treatment groups in terms of the pragmalinguistic aspect, and none of the participants was able to retain such formulas in a purely target-like form after the teaching intervention. The highest numbers of *non-target utterances* with pragmalinguistic violations were recorded in the speech events of *Extending invitations* and

Responding to requests in both treatment groups (see Table 2). Examples of the most common target pragmatic formulas in these two speech events include³⁵:

- Would love it if you could ____ + [verb: join] (Extending invitations)
- Would be happy if you could ____ + [verb: come] (Extending invitations)
- I could ____ + [promise of future action], if that would help (Responding to requests)
- I would usually ____ + [help], but ____ + [excuse] (Responding to requests)
- I would be happy to ____ + [work overtime] another day (Responding to requests)

When the students attempted to reproduce these formulas in their responses to the post- and delayed post-test, these attempts resulted in multiple pragmalinguistic violations. It is worth noting, however, that there was one major difference in the interlanguage formula development between the utterances produced by the FE group students and utterances produced by the AR group students. Even though the utterances produced by the FE group students were not purely target-like, they contained only minor lexical or grammatical discrepancies, which did not impede their functional meanings; therefore, such utterances were coded under the *target-like slot-and-frame pattern* of development category and were considered a positive sign of interlanguage formula development since this suggests that the shift towards nativelikeness occurred after the teaching intervention. On the other hand, the utterances produced by the AR group students did not at all resemble the target norm even after the teaching intervention, with a few instances when the students attempted to ‘paraphrase’ the target formulas using their own limited pragmalinguistic resources (e.g., ‘I love to come you my children birthday’; ‘I like to come... if you can, you come’ in *Extending invitations*)

³⁵ Refer to Appendix A for more examples.

The pragmalinguistic discrepancies observed in the FE group after the teaching intervention were likely caused by the students' insufficient level of grammatical competence and were associated with errors in the realization of the second conditional structures (i.e., the uses of modal verbs *will/could/can/could*) as well as wrong word order (i.e. syntactical discrepancies), as shown in the examples below:

- 'If you *join* my birthday party, I *would* be very happy' (Extending invitations, FE group)
- 'If you *can* come, I *will* be happy' (Extending invitations, FE group)
- 'It *will* be great if you *come*' (Extending invitations, FE group)
- '*It is possible if I can* work overtime next week on Monday?'³⁶ (Responding to requests, FE group)
- 'If you want, I *can* work overtime another day' (Responding to requests, FE group)
- 'I *can* come on Sunday if it *will be* help' (Responding to requests, FE group)

On the other hand, the speech event of *Cancelling/Rescheduling Appointments* contained the highest number of *target-like* utterances as well as utterances falling under the *target-like slot-and-frame* pattern recorded in both treatment groups (see Table 2). This could be due to the fact that the target pragmatic formulas selected for this speech event were the least complex in terms of their semantic transparency and grammatical structure, with the majority of the formulas belonging to the fully-fixed type (see examples in Appendix A); therefore, the students in both groups were quite successful at retaining most of these formulas in the target-like form and had

³⁶ An example of a syntactical discrepancy.

demonstrated adequate levels of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities even before the teaching intervention took place (see Tables 6, 7, 13, and 14 in Chapter 5).

As mentioned earlier, the participants had problems with pragmalinguistics in the speech acts of *Extending invitations* and *Responding to requests* since the accurate production of complex semi-fixed formulas typical for these speech events would require an advanced level of grammatical proficiency. Niezgoda and Roever (2001) note that a question of whether learners' pragmatic and grammatical competence develop hand in hand or separately remains one of the most under-researched areas in applied linguistics. Yet, research in the area of interlanguage pragmatics has shown that adult L2 learners either develop grammatical competence more slowly than they acquire pragmatic competence or have these two competences developed at different levels (Pearson, 2006); this may result in the production of pragmatically accurate utterances which contain grammatical errors (Niezgoda & Roever, 2001). Previous research findings also suggest that increased proficiency may lead to a wider variety of learners' linguistic repertoire, and, as a result, to more appropriate and nativelike speech act realization. For example, Bardovi-Harlig (2002) investigated the acquisition of future expressions 'will' and 'be going to', whereas the study by Salsbury and Bardovi-Harlig (2000) explored the acquisition of modal and semi-modal expressions 'I think', 'maybe', 'can', 'will', 'could', 'would'. These studies found that learners would first acquire and produce less sophisticated expressions like 'will' to express future aspect, or 'maybe' and 'I think' to express ideas, as opposed to more complex expressions containing modal expressions such as 'should', 'could', or 'going to'. A more recent study by Roever and Al-Gahtani (2015) found that beginner learners used imperatives and 'want-statements' to formulate requests, whereas more advanced learners used modal verb 'could' or more complex expressions to formulate requests in English.

The results of the present study are consistent with the previous research that suggests that an underdeveloped grammatical competence may impede successful realization of speech acts in L2, resulting in learners utilizing their “existing grammatical competence to convey the pragmatic information” (Pearson, 2006, p. 476). At the same time, the shift towards production of nativelike formulas with only minor grammatical discrepancies observed in the FE group after the teaching intervention suggests that focused instruction of pragmatic formulas can not only enhance L2 learners’ pragmatic competence, but also improve their grammatical competence. These findings are in line with the emergentist or usage-based model of SLA (Ellis. N.C., 1996, 2002, 2012) which maintains that the knowledge of multiword sequences may be linked to grammatical proficiency. In particular, the proponents of this view argue that formulas serve as the input for the acquisition of syntax. On the other side of the debate are the scholars who believe that the acquisition of syntax is an independent process which is not driven by the knowledge of formulaic expressions (Bardovdi-Harlig & Stringer, 2016). Even though more research is clearly needed to establish a systematic understanding of the role of pragmatic formulas in the L2 acquisition of syntax, the findings of the present study bear some evidence of the FE group students’ emerging ability to construct their own *creatively nativelike*³⁷ formulas. Instances of such creatively nativelike utterances were recorded in the FE group after the teaching intervention in three out of four target speech events, which suggests that the formula-enhanced instruction had triggered those interlanguage developmental processes responsible for

³⁷ Formulas produced by the students and that did not match any of the formulas in the NSC but were still considered acceptable in a given speech event.

the acquisition of the target syntactical structures (see Appendices J, L, and N for examples the students' utterances coded under *creatively nativelike category*).

5.3.2. The Nature of Sociopragmatic Violations in Both Treatment Groups

Past research on L2 pragmatic development has found that L2 learners tend to resort to the same formula(s) due to limited language proficiency, negative transfer from L1, or inability to correctly interpret communicative functions of the target formula(s), which can lead to various pragmatic failures (Cohen & Olshtain, 1993; Kasper, 1992; Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996). In a similar vein, the results of the present study suggest that the lack of adequate pragmalinguistic resources needed to perform a given speech act can lead to formula overuse, which, in majority of cases, causes sociopragmatic violations. In this study, the highest number of utterances containing sociopragmatic violations caused by the *repetitive use*³⁸ of the same formula or illocutionary device were recorded in the speech event of *Resolving issues* in both treatment groups (see Table 2). The analysis showed that sociopragmatic violations in both *native-like overuse* and *stabilized non-nativelike overuse* categories were caused by the lack of pragmalinguistic resources necessary for performing an intended speech act (i.e., overuse or misuse of core modal verbs; non-target word order and/or question formation; partially acquired formulas).

The analysis of utterances produced in the *nativelike overuse* category showed that the participants in both treatment groups tended to overly rely on formulas containing modal verbs 'can' and 'could' both before and after the teaching intervention when formulating their requests

³⁸ This category includes both *native-like overuses* and *stabilized non-nativelike overuses* (see Figure 8 in Chapter 4).

to fix service-related issues (see Appendix D for scenarios). Examples of such utterances include:

- ‘Can you help me’ (AR group, pre-test)
- ‘Can you tell me what have happened?’ (FE group, post-test)
- ‘Could you please see him and what happening?’ (AR group, post-test)
- ‘Can you check for me what happened?’ (FE group, delayed post-test)
- ‘Can you send me someone fix it?’ (AR group, delayed post-test)

Such utterances were coded as *nativelike* uses since the functional meanings of the intended speech acts were not impeded; nevertheless, this was deemed to be a negative pattern of interlanguage formula development since such formula overuse pointed to the limited pragmalinguistic repertoires of the student participants. It is important to acknowledge, however, that the FE group students started using a greater variety of target-like formulas after the teaching intervention, shifting away from overusing ‘can’ and ‘could’ modals, which suggests that focused instruction of formulas can not only improve L2 learners’ grammatical proficiency but can also help enhance the lexical richness of expression in L2.

As for the utterances in the *stabilized non-nativelike overuse* category, the analysis showed that sociopragmatic violations were mainly caused by the student’ inability to accurately follow the word order when formulating questions, which led to the overuse of the question word ‘why’ by some participants, who continued relying on the same strategy even after the teaching intervention. Examples include:

- ‘Why still withdrawal money from my accounting bank?’ (FE group, pre-test)
- ‘Why? Because I cancel insurance’ (AR group, pre-test)

- ‘How about the technician? Late... Not here yet... Why?’ (AR group, post-test)
- ‘I have appointment today for my internet at 10 o’clock, but not come early. Why?’ (AR group, post-test)

At the same time, limited pragmalinguistic resources led to production of conventionally indirect speech acts without any hedges or other downgraders normally used by native or proficient speakers in polite requests; this was probably due to students’ inability to properly evaluate the degrees of directness of the formulas they utilized in their speech acts. Examples include:

- ‘What happened?’ (FE group, pre-test)
- ‘What’s wrong?’ (AR group, pre-test)
- ‘What happened?’ (AR group, post-test)

Moreover, one of the AR group students, Student 12, tended to use the same non-target version of a partially acquired formula (Scarcella, 1979) — ‘what’s going wrong’ (instead of ‘what’s going on’) — when asking for fix service issues; the student maintained this tendency even after the teaching intervention, hence it was considered a stabilized (i.e., fossilized) non-target use:

- ‘What’s going wrong?’ (Student 12, pre-test)
- ‘What’s going wrong and what can I do?’ (Student 12, post-test)

Cross-cultural differences in speech act production by native and non-native speakers usually reflect the degree of indirectness, with English speakers tending to utilize more conventionally indirect strategies compared to speakers of other languages (Ishida, 2013; Félix-Brasdefer, 2005; Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Cohen & Olshtain, 1993). Previous research has established that L2 learners tend to rely on direct strategies of performance of face-threatening speech acts (e.g., requests, apologies) by using illocutionary devices such as ‘I’m

sorry', 'Can you', or 'Please' at initial stages of acquisition; at later stages, L2 learners use a wider variety of internal modifications, such as 'I was wondering if you could possibly' (Ishida, 2013).

The results of the present study showed that the FE approach may help learners proceed to such higher stages faster by using pragmatic formulas when performing target speech acts. As suggested by the results of the qualitative utterance analysis, the AR group students continued relying on the same direct devices with no syntactic and lexical downgraders even after the teaching intervention, which prevented them from advancing their level of pragmatic development, whereas FE group students started producing more advanced and nativelike formulas with downgraders such as 'I was wondering' or 'I hope' as part of their requests.

Finally, the utterance analysis showed that misapplication of the core modal verbs in a given interactional context can alter the illocutionary force of the intended speech act. The most vivid illustrations of this observation can be observed in the speech event of *Extending invitations*, where the modal verbs 'can' and 'could' used by the student participants to extend invitations produced speech acts that resembled requests or inquiries as opposed to friendly invitations, as can be seen in the following examples:

- 'Can you inviting me... you enjoy with me?' (FE group, pre-test)
- 'Can you come with family?' (FE group, post-test)
- 'Can you please come with me and join us?' (AR group, post-test)
- 'Can you please come with me and join us?' (AR group, post-test)
- 'Could you please come if you have time?' (AR group, delayed post-test)

Several recent studies on cross-cultural pragmatics have shown that speakers of languages other than English may have different perceptions of power, social distance and imposition involved in production of a given speech event; this can sometimes lead to different speech acts being produced by non-native speakers which would differ from those normally produced by the native speakers during the same social interaction context (Han, 2013; Yazdanfar & Bonyadi, 2016). The findings of the present study demonstrate that by acquiring a sufficient stock of pragmatic formulas and developing an ability to adequately judge the social interaction context(s) in which the formulas can be applied, L2 learners can avoid negative transfer from their L1s as well as adhere to the sociopragmatic norms of the English language.

Chapter 6: Results and Discussion of the Expert Judgements

This chapter reports on the results of the expert judgements of the students' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities. This diagnostic evaluation was performed in order to complement the qualitative utterance analysis by obtaining more robust evidence to support the claim that the FE approach to speech act teaching can be more effective than the AR approach in terms of enhancing both sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic abilities of the L2 learners. Three expert judges evaluated the students' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities before and after the teaching intervention using the diagnostic assessment rubric; the results of the expert judgements were analyzed in two cycles (a detailed description of the judgement process and data analysis procedures were outlined in Chapter 4).

The first sub-section presents the results of the first cycle of data analysis; this includes the presentation and comparison of the groups' mean scores for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components before and after the teaching intervention received from each judge. The second sub-section presents the results of individual students' assessment along with the analysis of the judges' qualitative comments related to both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of students' performance in both treatment groups. Finally, the chapter concludes with a discussion on the role of pragmatic formulas in the development of the student participants' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities based on the key findings that emerged from the results of the expert judgements.

6.1. First cycle of analysis: Group Mean Scores

6.1.1. FE Group

The group mean scores for the pragmalinguistic component of the rubric obtained from the judges in each target speech event are presented in Tables 3, 5, 7, and 9. The group mean

scores for the sociopragmatic component of the rubric obtained from the judges in each target speech event are presented in Tables 4, 6, 8, and 10.

According to the results of the judgement in the speech event of *Extending invitations*, all three judges agreed, with high level of internal consistency ($\alpha = .86$), that the pragmalinguistic ability of the FE group students improved after the teaching intervention. As shown in Table 3, the FE group's overall pragmalinguistic ability in the pre-test was evaluated as average by Judge 1 and Judge 3 and as low by Judge 2; however, the group's overall pragmalinguistic ability in the post-test was evaluated as high by Judge 1 and Judge 3, and changed from low to average as per Judge's 2 assessment. The overall pragmalinguistic ability was also maintained at a relatively high level in the delayed post-test, as can be seen from the mean scores presented in Table 3. A similar pattern was observed when analyzing the results of the diagnostic assessment for the sociopragmatic ability. As shown in Table 4, the mean scores for this component increased from average (Judges 1 and 2) and low (Judge 3) in the pre-test to high (Judges 1 and 2) and average (Judge 3) in the post- and delayed post-tests. Interestingly, the degree of inter-rater agreement was lower for the sociopragmatic component ($\alpha = .65$).

Table 3.

Invitations FE group: Pragmalinguistic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
N= 7	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	12.43	8.00	14.86	21.00	17.14	19.57	19.71	12.86	18.29
Std. Deviation	6.451	4.123	3.237	3.266	3.934	2.440	3.861	5.610	4.957
Minimum	4	4	12	16	12	16	15	4	12
Maximum	21	15	20	24	22	24	24	21	24

Note: Maximum score: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Table 4.

Invitations FE group: Sociopragmatic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
N= 7	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	13.86	16.29	14.43	22.57	22.14	19.43	20.43	26.57	19.71
Std. Deviation	7.175	7.111	1.902	5.287	7.175	4.036	8.324	5.028	5.407
Minimum	9	5	11	15	14	14	10	18	15
Maximum	29	25	17	30	30	25	30	30	28

Note: Maximum score: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

The analysis of the results of the judgement of the speech event of *Cancelling/rescheduling appointments* revealed that both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities of the students in the FE group were quite high even before the teaching intervention. The levels of internal consistency were high in the pragmalinguistic component ($\alpha=.81$) and moderate in the sociopragmatic component ($\alpha=.62$). According to the pre-test mean scores shown in Table 5, both Judge 1 and 3 evaluated the students' pragmalinguistic ability as high, while Judge 2 gave an average score for this component in the pre-test; the same pattern repeated in the post-test, with mean scores slightly increasing for all three judges. Finally, the mean scores for the pragmalinguistic component increased even further in the delayed post-test, with all three judges evaluating the students' ability as very high. A similar pattern was observed in the assessment of the sociopragmatic component. The group's mean scores continued to steadily improve after the teaching intervention, with the highest scores gained in the delayed post-test, as shown in Table 6. The fact that the students' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic ability was highly evaluated by the expert judges in this particular speech event resonates with the results of the qualitative utterance analysis which showed that the biggest number of target-like utterances was recorded in this speech event (see Table 2 in the previous section). This finding will be further elaborated on during the presentation of the results of the second cycle of analysis.

Table 5.

Appointments FE: Pragmalinguistic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
<i>N</i> = 7	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	19.00	13.29	17.29	19.86	16.00	19.43	22.43	19.57	21.14
Std. Deviation	5.000	6.499	5.122	2.795	4.830	2.440	1.134	5.350	1.864
Minimum	11	5	9	15	10	15	21	12	19
Maximum	24	23	24	24	23	22	24	24	24

Note: Maximum score: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Table 6.

Appointments FE: Sociopragmatic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
<i>N</i> = 7	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	21.86	21.71	17.71	20.43	23.57	18.29	22.71	27.00	21.57
Std. Deviation	2.545	4.071	4.231	5.028	5.442	4.716	1.704	3.873	5.412
Minimum	18	17	12	10	15	14	21	20	15
Maximum	26	28	25	24	30	25	25	30	30

Note: Maximum score: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

According to the results of the judgement in the speech event of *Resolving issues*, the FE group students' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities were evaluated as very low or average in the pre-test; however, the results of the assessment improved quite substantially after the teaching intervention for both components. The results of the assessment of pragmalinguistic ability ($\alpha = .86$) showed that the students demonstrated average (according to Judges 1 and 3) or low (Judge 2) ability in the pre-test; in the post- and delayed post-test, however, the situation improved, and the group's mean scores increased from average to high (Judges 1 and 3) and from low to average (Judge 2), as can be seen from Table 7. A similar pattern was observed in the assessment of the sociopragmatic component ($\alpha = .80$). The group's mean scores continued to

steadily improve after the teaching intervention, with the highest scores gained in the delayed post-test, as shown in Table 8.

Table 7.

Resolving issues FE: Pragmalinguistic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
<i>N</i> = 7	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	13.71	7.43	14.29	19.14	13.29	18.57	20.43	15.57	19.43
Std. Deviation	3.251	2.878	3.147	5.460	6.873	4.577	3.910	5.028	3.735
Minimum	9	5	12	8	5	13	13	6	12
Maximum	19	12	20	23	24	24	24	21	22

Note: Maximum score: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Table 8.

Resolving issues FE: Sociopragmatic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
<i>N</i> = 7	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	14.00	17.86	13.71	21.14	19.14	19.71	23.29	27.14	21.00
Std. Deviation	4.761	6.336	3.498	4.845	6.866	4.990	1.976	2.478	4.082
Minimum	10	9	10	15	9	13	20	24	15
Maximum	24	26	18	28	26	27	25	30	25

Note: Maximum score: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

The analysis of the results of the judgement in the speech event of *Responding to requests* of the FE group showed several discrepancies between the assessment of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components. As for the assessment of the pragmalinguistic component ($\alpha = .91$), a steady increase in the mean scores can be observed (see Table 9). While the group's overall pragmalinguistic ability was evaluated as average by all three judges in the pre-test, Judges 1 and 3 gave high evaluations in the post- and delayed post-test, whereas the mean scores assigned by Judge 2 after the teaching intervention slightly increased but remained within the average range. In contrast, the assessment of the sociopragmatic component ($\alpha = .78$)

was inconsistent in the pre-test. As shown in Table 10, Judge 1 evaluated the group's overall sociopragmatic ability as low, whereas the evaluation of Judge 2 was very high, and the evaluation of Judge 3 was average. The assessment of the post- and delayed post-test showed improvements in the students' sociopragmatic ability, according to Judges 1 and 3. Based on the assessment of Judge 1, the group's mean scores increased from low in the pre-test (14.71 marks) to average in the post-test (17.43 marks) and high in the delayed post-test (23.29 marks); in turn, based on the assessment of Judge 3, the group's mean scores increased from low-average in the pre-test (15 marks) to high-average in the post-test (20.57 marks), and, finally, to high in the delayed post-test (21.57 marks). The evaluation of Judge 2, on the other hand, remained at a high level in all three tests. It is worth noting that Judge 2 tended to give lower scores for the pragmalinguistic component almost for every speech event, whereas Judges 1 and 3 maintained a better level of inter-rater agreement across speech events. This discrepancy in the judgement will be further addressed during the presentation of the results of the second cycle of analysis; some possible reasons for such differences in the judgement will be put forth in the following chapter.

Table 9.

Responding to requests FE: Pragmalinguistic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
<i>N</i> = 7	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	12.00	11.71	16.14	17.57	13.14	18.71	18.71	15.86	19.14
Std. Deviation	2.828	4.386	3.848	5.094	4.451	4.499	5.219	7.267	4.413
Minimum	7	6	12	8	6	10	10	6	14
Maximum	15	18	20	24	18	24	24	24	24

Note: Maximum score: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Table 10.

Responding to requests FE: Sociopragmatic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
<i>N</i> = 7	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	14.71	21.43	15.00	17.43	24.71	20.57	23.29	22.86	21.57
Std. Deviation	3.302	3.910	3.512	6.321	5.090	5.094	3.546	6.094	4.860
Minimum	11	15	11	10	18	15	17	14	16
Maximum	19	25	20	25	30	30	29	30	29

Note: Maximum score: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

6.1.2. AR Group

The group's mean scores for the pragmalinguistic component of the rubric obtained from the judges in each target speech event are presented in Tables 11, 13, 15, and 17. The group's mean scores for the sociopragmatic component of the rubric obtained from the judges in each target speech event are presented in Tables 12, 14, 16, and 18.

According to the results of the judgement in the speech event of *Extending invitations*, the AR group students' pragmalinguistic ability improved only slightly on average, whereas the results of the assessment of the sociopragmatic ability revealed considerable improvements. As shown in Table 11, the students' pre-test pragmalinguistic ability was evaluated as average (as per Judges' 1 and 3 assessment) and low (as per Judge's 2 assessment), while the students' post-test performance slightly improved and was evaluated at a high-average range by all three judges. In the delayed post-test, however, the group's mean scores decreased to low-average again, according to the assessment of Judges 1 and 2. The level of internal consistency between the judges in the pragmalinguistic component was acceptable ($\alpha = .69$). As shown in Table 12, the overall sociopragmatic ability in the pre-test was evaluated as low by Judges 1 and 3 and as average by Judge 3. In the post- and delayed post-test, Judges 1 and 3 evaluated the group's overall sociopragmatic performance as average, whereas only Judge 2 evaluated the students'

performance as high. The level of internal consistency between the judges in the sociopragmatic component was lower compared to the pragmalinguistic component ($\alpha = .57$).

Table 11.

Invitations AR group: Pragmalinguistic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
N= 6	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	11.50	9.33	13.83	16.71	14.67	15.83	13.00	9.67	16.50
Std. Deviation	3.564	3.777	3.371	3.251	5.125	4.750	5.657	3.777	2.665
Minimum	8	5	10	12	9	11	9	5	13
Maximum	16	14	18	20	22	22	24	14	20

Note: Maximum score: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Table 12.

Invitations AR group: Sociopragmatic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
N= 6	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	11.50	18.17	14.00	18.33	23.00	17.17	15.67	21.83	17.50
Std. Deviation	1.975	7.441	2.000	4.367	5.441	2.137	7.257	5.345	1.517
Minimum	10	6	12	14	16	15	11	17	16
Maximum	14	25	17	25	30	20	30	30	20

Note: Maximum score: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

The analysis of the results of the judgement in the speech event of *Cancelling/rescheduling appointments* revealed a similar pattern to that observed in the FE group. Both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities were evaluated as high by all three judges before as well as after the teaching intervention ($\alpha = .85$ in the pragmalinguistic component and $\alpha = .77$ in the sociopragmatic component). It is worth noting, however, that there were greater gains in the sociopragmatic component, as can be seen from the post- and delayed post-test mean scores presented in Table 14. The pragmalinguistic scores did not drastically change after the teaching intervention and remained at approximately the same level, as shown in

Table 13. This particular speech event was also found the least problematic/challenging during the qualitative utterance analysis since it was found that the students in both groups produced the highest number of target-like formulas, with fewer violations.

Table 13.

Appointments AR: Pragmalinguistic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
N= 6	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	18.67	16.67	18.83	18.67	16.000	20.17	17.00	17.17	18.67
Std. Deviation	4.502	6.055	2.483	2.805	3.847	1.602	4.382	5.845	6.408
Minimum	10	11	15	15	12	18	11	7	6
Maximum	23	24	22	22	22	22	21	24	24

Note: Maximum score: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Table 14.

Appointments AR: Sociopragmatic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
N= 6	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	20.00	25.83	18.17	22.67	27.00	18.67	22.33	27.33	19.33
Std. Deviation	4.561	3.545	2.639	4.274	3.688	4.179	3.615	3.445	6.593
Minimum	15	21	16	14	20	14	16	21	9
Maximum	25	30	22	25	30	25	25	30	27

Note: Maximum score: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

According to the results of the judgement in the speech event of *Resolving issues*, both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities of the students in the AR group improved on average after the teaching intervention. It is worth noting, however, that the judgement of the pragmalinguistic component ($\alpha = .77$) was less consistent compared to the judgement of the sociopragmatic component ($\alpha = .81$). As shown in Table 15, the post-test pragmalinguistic ability was evaluated as high by Judge 1 (17 marks), as low by Judge 2 (8.5 marks), and as average by

Judge 3 (14.5 marks). On the other hand, there was a steady improvement in the mean scores in the sociopragmatic component (see Table 16), and the scores increased from low in the pre-test to average in the post-test and high (Judges 1 and 2) and high-average (Judge 3) in the delayed post-test.

Table 15.

Resolving issues AR group: Pragmalinguistic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
N= 6	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	10.17	6.33	12.50	17.00	8.50	14.50	17.83	12.67	16.50
Std. Deviation	5.879	3.011	2.665	4.858	2.665	4.231	2.787	3.327	4.278
Minimum	4	4	8	10	5	10	15	9	10
Maximum	18	12	16	22	13	20	22	18	22

Note: Maximum score: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Table 16.

Resolving issues AR group: Sociopragmatic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
N= 6	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	12.50	14.50	13.33	18.17	16.17	16.67	22.83	26.00	18.00
Std. Deviation	4.593	5.468	3.327	5.672	7.111	4.033	5.037	6.229	4.000
Minimum	8	5	11	11	8	11	17	17	15
Maximum	21	21	20	25	25	22	30	30	25

Note: Maximum score: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

The analysis of the results of the judgement in the speech event of *Responding to requests* showed almost no visible improvement in the pragmalinguistic ability of the AR group students, as can be seen from the overall mean scores in Table 17. In the pre-test, it was evaluated as low-average by Judges 1 and 3 and as low by Judge 2; the evaluation remained at approximately the same level with a very slight increase in the mean scores in the post-test and delayed post-test. As for sociopragmatic ability (see Table 18), the results of the post-test

assessment showed a slight improvement with the mean scores increasing from low to average (Judges 1 and 3) and from low-average to high-average (Judge 2). In the delayed post-test, however, there were several discrepancies in the judgement. While Judge 1 evaluated the overall sociopragmatic ability of the students as low (14.33 marks), Judge 2 evaluated it as high (22.83 marks), and Judge 3 as average (16.67 marks). It is important to note that the levels of internal consistency between the judges were the lowest in this speech event for both pragmalinguistic ($\alpha = .58$) and sociopragmatic ($\alpha = .29$) components.

Table 17.

Responding to requests AR group: Pragmalinguistic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
N= 6	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	11.83	9.50	13.67	16.17	10.17	16.33	13.17	9.67	15.50
Std. Deviation	4.622	3.564	2.251	3.971	4.579	3.670	3.125	3.204	5.718
Minimum	4	6	10	12	14	10	8	5	8
Maximum	17	15	16	21	16	20	16	14	22

Note: Maximum score: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Table 18.

Responding to requests AR group: Sociopragmatic component

	Pre-test			Post-test			Delayed post-test		
N= 6	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Mean	11.33	16.33	14.33	16.17	17.67	18.67	14.33	22.83	16.67
Std. Deviation	1.966	7.312	3.266	4.916	6.501	3.933	3.445	4.792	2.805
Minimum	9	6	11	10	13	14	10	17	13
Maximum	14	25	19	25	30	25	18	30	20

Note: Maximum score: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

The first cycle of analysis of the group mean scores was conducted to highlight some general trends in the evolution of the students' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities after the teaching intervention in both treatment groups. Overall, the first cycle of analysis of the

expert judgements showed that the FE group students demonstrated higher gains in both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects after the teaching intervention. Moreover, the FE group participants showed stronger potential for the long-term retention of the target pragmatic formulas, as confirmed by the high mean scores earned in the delayed post-test for the majority of the target speech events. In contrast, the results of the expert evaluation of the AR group students' performance showed slight improvements only in the sociopragmatic component and solely in the immediate post-test. However, this analysis did not capture some important differences in the speech act realization patterns at the individual level. As can be seen from the descriptive statistics presented above, the standard deviations were quite large for almost every speech event in the evaluation of both FE and AR groups. In addition, there were big differences between minimum and maximum scores within the same judge's evaluation across three tests. It was, therefore, important to consider these individual differences to better align the results of the expert judgements with the findings that emerged from the qualitative utterance analysis. The need for a more robust qualitative analysis of individual students' scores was also justified by the small sample size of the student participants ($n=13$), which made it unreasonable for the researcher to do inferential statistical analysis.

6.2. Second Cycle of Analysis: Prominent Individual Cases

In this sub-section, the results of the second cycle of analysis of the expert judgements are presented alongside the judges' qualitative comments related to both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of students' performance in both treatment groups. In order to make the presentation of the results more concise, three prominent individual student cases were selected from each treatment group and for each speech event. In the FE group, these individual students were considered prominent because they received very low evaluations in the pre-test, but their

pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic scores dramatically improved after the teaching intervention, with some exceptions. The prominent individual student cases in the AR group were selected based on the criteria that their individual scores remained at a very low level after the teaching intervention or improved only in the short-term (in the immediate post-test) or only for one of the components of the diagnostic rubric.

6.2.1. Invitations

6.2.1.1. FE Group

Three prominent individual student cases selected from the FE group in this speech event are: Student 3, Student 5, and Student 6. Table 19 contains individual scores earned by each student for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of the diagnostic rubric before and after the teaching intervention. The pre-, post-, and delayed post-test verbal responses produced by these students are presented in Table 20. As shown in Table 19, these three students received the lowest scores in the FE group for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components from all three expert judges in the pre-test, but their scores for both components increased after the teaching intervention, with several exceptions.

Table 19.

Individual scores in the FE group: Invitations

Student	Pre-test score			Post-test score			Delayed post-test score			Component
	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	
Student 3	4	7	12	24	18	16	24	16	20	Pragmalinguistic
Student 3	10	14	11	18	14	18	24	30	18	Sociopragmatic
Student 5	6	4	12	21	21	20	15	13	18	Pragmalinguistic
Student 5	9	12	15	21	30	20	11	27	17	Sociopragmatic
Student 6	11	4	16	22	18	20	15	4	12	Pragmalinguistic
Student 6	9	5	12	22	30	14	16	18	16	Sociopragmatic

Note: Maximum score for pragmalinguistic component: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Maximum score for sociopragmatic component: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

When assessing the pragmalinguistic component of the rubric (24 marks maximum), Judge 1 and Judge 2 completely agreed that the responses produced by these three students in the pre-test contained inaccurate lexical and grammatical choices that could negatively affect the pragmatic meaning and impede comprehension³⁹. According to Judge 1, for instance, the verb tense choice in the utterance produced by Student 5 ‘I have birthday party’ was inaccurate and should have been ‘I am having birthday party’ instead. Student 5 received only 6 marks from Judge 1 and only 4 marks from Judge 2 in the pre-test. As for Student 6, Judges 1 and 3 were in agreement that the pre-test response produced by Student 6 was only somewhat accurate grammatically (it should have been ‘would you like to...’ instead of ‘do you want to...’, as per the comments of Judge 1); Judge 2, on the other hand, evaluated this student’s response as very low in the pre-test (4 marks) and noted that it was very difficult to understand what the student

³⁹ See criteria 1 and 2 in the pragmalinguistic component of the diagnostic assessment rubric in Figure 9, Chapter 4.

was trying to say due to inaccurate word choices (e.g., ‘take my invitation to be part of my organization’).

Table 20.

Verbal responses in the FE group: Invitations

Student	Pre-test response	Post-test response	Delayed post-test response
Student 3	Excuse me, can you join us for a barbecue this time if in the evening or night	Hi, I have my birthday. Would you like to come to join with me?	Hi, we have a birthday party to my kids. Would you like to join us?
Student 5	I’m inviting you for I have birthday party today. Can you inviting me you enjoy with me is good	Hi, how are you? I have a birthday party next Saturday. Can you come with family?	Hi, how are you? I have next Saturday birthday party, can you come with kids at that. Could you come please? Could you come with kids?
Student 6	Do you like to participate for my to take my invitation to be part of my organization?	We are having a birthday party for my son. It will be great if you come.	You know my son, it will have 10 years next week, and it will party at home. Could you and your family bring the child for celebrate? And feel free to bring salad or lemonade.

The pragmalinguistic scores of these three students increased substantially after the teaching intervention, especially in the immediate post-test; however, Student 3 was the only student who managed to maintain very high scores in the delayed post-test. Students 5 and 6 received high scores from all three judges in the post-test; however, their delayed post-tests scores were lower, especially for Student 6, who received a very low score (4 marks) from Judge 2 and average scores from Judges 1 (15 marks) and 3 (12 marks) for his delayed post-test response. While the post-test utterances produced by Students 5 and 6 contained nativelike slot-and-frame formulas like ‘It will be great if you come’ (Student 6), in their delayed post-test

responses these students switched back to overusing formulas containing the modal verb ‘could’, which were, however, misapplied in this context, this led to inappropriate speech acts (‘Could you come please? Could you come with kids?’; ‘Could you and your family bring the child for celebrate?’).

In terms of the sociopragmatic component of the rubric, all five criteria of the diagnostic rubric (i.e., the level of formality; the level of directness; the level of politeness; whether or not the speech act used is appropriate for this context; and whether or not the amount of information given is appropriate for this context) were evaluated as ‘very inappropriate’ by Judge 1 and Judge 2 and as ‘somewhat appropriate’ by Judge 3 in the pre-test (see individual scores assigned by each judge in Table 19). The scores increased for all three students in the post- and delayed post-tests.

6.2.1.2. AR Group

Three prominent individual student cases selected for analysis from the AR group are: Student 10, Student 8, and Student 11. Table 21 contains individual scores earned by each student for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of the diagnostic rubric before and after the teaching intervention. The pre-, post, and delayed post-test verbal responses produced by these students are presented in Table 22.

Table 21.

Individual scores in the AR group: Invitations

Student	Pre-test score			Post-test score			Delayed post-test score			Component
	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	
Student 10	10	5	10	12	9	12	11	14	14	Pragmalinguistic
Student 10	10	19	12	14	20	15	15	17	16	Sociopragmatic
Student 8	8	7	13	14	12	11	10	7	16	Pragmalinguistic
Student 8	14	25	15	15	19	15	15	30	18	Sociopragmatic
Student 11	10	6	16	20	10	12	9	5	13	Pragmalinguistic
Student 11	14	13	17	15	16	16	11	20	20	Sociopragmatic

Note: Maximum score for pragmalinguistic component: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Maximum score for sociopragmatic component: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

As shown in Table 21, all three students received low or low average pragmalinguistic scores in the pre-test. All three judges agreed that these students' responses contained inaccurate lexical and grammatical choices that had a negative impact on the functional meanings of the produced speech acts. The pragmalinguistic scores in the post- and delayed post-test, in most cases, increased from very low to average. For example, according to the evaluation of Judge 1, Student 10 was able to increase her score from 10 marks in the pre-test only to 12 marks in the post-test and 11 marks in the delayed post-test. Likewise, according to the evaluation of Judge 3, the same student was only able to increase her pragmalinguistic score by 2 marks in the post-test and by 2 marks again in the delayed post-test. In her feedback on the pragmalinguistic component of the assessment rubric Judge 1 repeatedly pointed out the fact that the students used 'can instead of *would* statements'. For example, the judge noted that the utterance produced by Student 10 to extend an invitation ('You can come') should have been 'Would you like to come?' or 'Can you come?' to make sure the meaning of the speech act is clearly expressed.

Similarly, according to Judge 1, the utterance produced by Student 11 ('Can you and your husband, you child can come?') would have sounded more natural if 'can' had been replaced by 'would like' as in 'Would you and your husband like to come?'.

Interestingly, Student 11 was the only student who received a high score for his post-test response from Judge 1 (20 out of 24 marks). When marking diagnostic criterion 5 of the pragmalinguistic rubric ('Does the response contain a target-like slot-and-frame pattern?'), Judge 1 replied 'Somewhat agree' and noted that the student's utterance 'Please you and your family... I like you come to my home' reminded her of the target formula 'Please feel free to come on ____ + [date]'. In the delayed post-test, however, Student 11 received a low score again (9 out of 24 marks) from the same judge. According to her, the inaccurate use of the word 'like' in the student's utterance 'I like invited you and your family', as opposed to 'I *would like to* invite you and your family', impeded the communicative meaning of this speech act. The same lexico-grammatical discrepancies were observed in the post- and delayed post-test responses of Students 10 and 8, who also struggled with appropriate use of the 'would like' structure (e.g., 'I like to come... if you can, you come' Student 10, post-test; 'I would like coming in the... with my party', Student 8, post-test).

Table 22.

Verbal responses in the AR group: Invitations

Student	Pre-test response	Post-test response	Delayed post-test response
Student 10	Hello, you can come tomorrow for... You can come tomorrow at house because we make BBQ for outside. You can come?	Hello my neighbours. Next week I have birthday for my children, I like to come... if you can, you come. Tell me if you can come and you can give anything for the party.	Hi, how are you? I hope tell you for I will make a party for my daughter, Nur, next week. I hope send your daughter... if you can send, I will make more things enjoy for the children.
Student 8	Hi, I have a party next weekend. Do you come an invite me? I have some food and listen music.	Hi, how are you? I would like coming in the... with my party. Is tomorrow. Can you come?	I would like to invite my house because I have a party for my kids.
Student 11	We have party in my home. My wife birthday today. Sorry, tomorrow. Can you and your husband, you child can come? You can come my home... Tomorrow we have party.	I love to come you my children birthday, we have party on Monday, 15 November at my home. Please you and your family... I like you come to my home and we have together very good party.	We have Christmas party in my home. I like invited you and your family and also your kids on Saturday, this Saturday. And I like to see this day in my home and have a Christmas party. And I like to come there to my home.

As for the assessment of these students' sociopragmatic ability in the pre-test, it was evaluated as low by Judges 1 and 3 for all three students, which was also consistent with their evaluation of the pragmalinguistic ability of these students. Judge 2, on the contrary, gave very high scores for this component to Student 10 (19 out of 30 marks) and Student 8 (25 out of 30 marks), despite the fact that she gave very low pragmalinguistic scores to these students in the pre-test (Student 10 gained 5 out of 24 marks, and Student 8 gained 7 out of 24 marks).

However, when Judge 2's assessment of the sociopragmatic component was considered in each

individual criterion of the rubric, the analysis revealed that even though this Judge evaluated criteria 1 ('Is the level of formality appropriate for this context?'), 2 ('Is the level of directness appropriate for this context?'), 3 ('Is the level of politeness appropriate for this context?'), and 5 ('Is the amount of information given appropriate for this context?') as 'somewhat appropriate' or 'completely appropriate', the assessment criterion 4 ('Is the speech act used by the speaker appropriate for this context?'), the central criterion in this component of the rubric, was still evaluated as 'very inappropriate'⁴⁰ for both Student 10 and Student 8 by Judge 2.

The results of the post-intervention assessment showed that these students did not show any dramatic improvements in their sociopragmatic ability in the post- and delayed post-test, as can be seen from students' individual scores presented in Table 21. The two exceptional cases were Students 8 and 11. While Student 8 received a maximum sociopragmatic score from Judge 2 in the delayed post-test (30 marks), Student's 11 sociopragmatic performance was evaluated as high by both Judges 2 (20 marks) and 3 (20 marks). It is worth noting, however, that the key sociopragmatic assessment criterion 4 ('Is the speech act used by the speaker appropriate for this context?') was still evaluated by these judges as 'very inappropriate' for both Students 8 and 11.

6.2.2. Appointments

6.2.2.1. FE Group

Three prominent individual student cases selected from the FE group in this speech event are: Student 2, Student 5, and Student 6. Table 23 contains individual scores earned by each student for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of the diagnostic rubric before

⁴⁰ The judge gave 1 point on a 6-point Likert scale for this criterion.

and after the teaching intervention. The pre-, post-, and delayed post-test verbal responses produced by these students are presented in Table 24.

Table 23.

Individual scores in the FE group: Appointments

Student	Pre-test score			Post-test score			Delayed post-test score			Component
	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	
Student 2	11	5	9	21	20	20	21	24	20	Pragmalinguistic
Student 2	20	18	17	23	25	14	22	30	16	Sociopragmatic
Student 5	14	7	18	20	23	20	22	23	20	Pragmalinguistic
Student 5	22	19	18	10	17	17	25	30	24	Sociopragmatic
Student 6	18	13	12	18	20	19	22	14	19	Pragmalinguistic
Student 6	23	17	12	22	26	17	23	29	15	Sociopragmatic

Note: Maximum score for pragmalinguistic component: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Maximum score for sociopragmatic component: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

The results of the diagnostic assessment of the pragmalinguistic ability of these three individual student cases showed that each of the students was able to substantially improve their performance after the teaching intervention, as can be seen from the individual scores presented in Table 23. While the students' pre-test pragmalinguistic ability was evaluated as average by the majority of the judges (except for Judge's 1 evaluation of Student 6's response), the students' scores in the post- and delayed post-test increased dramatically, especially in case of Student 2 and Student 5. For example, Student 2's score increased from very low in the pre-test (e.g., 5 marks out of 24, as per the evaluation of Judge 2) to very high in the post-test (20 marks out of 24, as per the evaluation of Judge 2) and in the delayed post-test (24 marks out of 24, as per the evaluation of Judge 2).

When analyzing the judges' pre-test assessment of the diagnostic criteria responsible for the pragmalinguistic component of the rubric, it became apparent that these students received the lowest scores for criteria 1 and 2 (i.e., lexical and grammatical choices). The main source of difficulties for the students in this speech event was a lack of precise vocabulary (e.g., reschedule, availability) for expressing ideas with more clarity. In some cases, the judges pointed out that some students produced utterances that would somewhat resemble the target formulas. For example, when evaluating the pre-test response of Student 5, Judge 2 noted that his utterance 'Can you change the time' sounded similar to the target pragmatic formula 'Can/could you reschedule', but the students' utterance lacked precise vocabulary to fully achieve the speech act of rescheduling an appointment. Similarly, when evaluating the response of Student 6, Judge 1 pointed out that his utterance 'I will not be available for this appointment' somewhat resembles the target formula 'I will not be able to make it'. As a result, these students' responses received higher scores from these two judges for their pre-test pragmalinguistic ability; nevertheless, since the students did not utilize any of the purely nativelike formulas, their performance was evaluated as average. In the post- and delayed post-test, however, all three students started using more nativelike formulas instead of their own non-nativelike interpretations (e.g., 'Do you have availability next week?', Student 5, post-test; 'I want to cancel my appointment on Wednesday', Student 2, delayed post-test), which resulted in bigger gains in their pragmalinguistic ability and, consequently, in higher scores received from the judges.

As for sociopragmatic ability, the results of the diagnostic assessment showed that the students' scores were relatively high even before the teaching intervention. Their scores increased even further after the intervention, with several exceptions. For example, Judge 3 evaluated Student's 2 sociopragmatic performance as average in the post-test (14 marks out of

30) as well as in the delayed post-test (16 marks out of 30), despite the fact that her assessment of the pragmalinguistic ability of this student was very high (20 marks out of 24 in both post- and delayed post-test). As was reflected in the diagnostic assessment of individual criteria of the sociopragmatic component of the rubric, Judge 3 considered the levels of politeness and directness to be only somewhat appropriate. A reverse picture was observed in the assessment of Judge 2, who evaluated Student's 6 sociopragmatic performance in the delayed post-test as very high (29 marks out of 30), but his pragmalinguistic performance was evaluated as average (14 marks out of 24). As noted during the first cycle of analysis of the expert judgements of this speech event, the level of internal consistency in the sociopragmatic component ($\alpha = .62$) was lower than in the pragmalinguistic component ($\alpha = .81$) in this speech event.

Table 24.

Verbal responses in the FE group: Appointments

Student	Pre-test response	Post-test response	Delayed post-test response
Student 2	Dr. Wu, we dated next Wednesday morning for my appointment. But I have some personal things to do next Saturday morning, so I want to change time. The time will be next Wednesday. Is it ok?	Hi, I want to cancel my appointment, I want to reschedule it. This week I will be available on Friday afternoon. If you are available at that time?	<p><i>Student:</i> Oh, hi! I want to cancel my appointment on Wednesday. My name is ____.</p> <p><i>Researcher:</i> Ok let me see in my system here... Ok, yes, I see you have an appointment at 9 am. So, you want to cancel that one?</p> <p><i>Student:</i> Yeah, I want to cancel it. And I will reschedule when I'm available.</p> <p><i>Researcher:</i> Sure, sounds good.</p> <p><i>Student:</i> I will call you back, ok?</p>
Student 5	Hello doctor, how are you doing? Can you... I have something problem today, can you change the day please?	My name is ____ . I have appointment I need cancel... I need another reschedule. Do you have availability next week?	This is ____ . I have appointment today, but I need reschedule for next Thursday. Can you reschedule me?
Student 6	Hi, my name is ____, my telephone number is 613-.... and I'm gonna cancel my appointment because I was having another appointment so I will be not available for this appointment because gonna take another appointment. But if is possible, I can have another time, another appointment in future?	Hi, my name is ____. I calling for reschedule my appointment about my credit application. So, do you have any availability next week?	Hi, my name is ____. I have appointment with my family doctor and I like to reschedule my appointment on Tuesday at 3.

6.2.2.2. AR Group

Three prominent individual student cases selected from the AR group in this speech event are: Student 10, Student 8, and Student 11. Table 25 contains individual scores earned by each student for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of the diagnostic rubric before and after the teaching intervention. The pre-, post-, and delayed post-test verbal responses produced by these students are presented in Table 26.

Table 25.

Individual scores in the AR group: Appointments

Student	Pre-test score			Post-test score			Delayed post-test score			Component
	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	
Student 10	10	12	15	22	22	22	11	7	6	Pragmalinguistic
Student 10	16	24	16	24	30	20	16	21	9	Sociopragmatic
Student 8	20	17	19	18	17	20	21	24	22	Pragmalinguistic
Student 8	15	21	16	24	28	19	24	30	25	Sociopragmatic
Student 11	19	12	18	15	12	18	18	15	20	Pragmalinguistic
Student 11	17	25	17	24	29	14	20	26	20	Sociopragmatic

Note: Maximum score for pragmalinguistic component: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high. Maximum score for sociopragmatic component: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

The results of the diagnostic assessment of the sociopragmatic ability of these three students' performance showed that most students demonstrated greater gains in the sociopragmatic aspect, compared to the pragmalinguistic one, as suggested by the individual scores presented in Table 25. In other words, the pragmalinguistic aspect posed a bigger challenge for the students in this speech event.

As can be seen from the individual scores, only Student 10 was able to improve her pragmalinguistic ability immediately after the teaching intervention. However, this student's

scores dropped to the pre-test level in the delayed post-test. In her response to the immediate post-test, this student used a target-like formula with just a minor deviation from the norm ('I want reschedule my appointment'), which resulted in her receiving very high scores from all three judges (22 marks out of 24). In the delayed post-test, however, this student's speech act was not fully realized due to the confusion with the verbs 'schedule' and 'reschedule'. As pointed out by Judge 2 in her comments on the pragmalinguistic component of the rubric, "I'm assuming she meant to say re-schedule". The other two judges also assigned very low scores to this student for criterion 2 of the diagnostic rubric (i.e., 'Does the response contain inaccurate lexical choices that negatively affect the meaning/impede comprehension?'). In addition, this pragmalinguistic discrepancy negatively affected this students' sociopragmatic performance, which resulted in very low scores given by two out of three judges.

As for Student 8 and Student 11, their scores remained at approximately the same level in all three tests. It is worth noting, however, that these two students received relatively high scores from all three judges for the pragmalinguistic component in all three tests. In the post- and delayed post-test, the situation improved even further for Student 8 since she started using target-like formulas with only occasional deviations from the norm (e.g., 'I need cancel please', Student 8, post-test; 'Can you reschedule?', Student 8, delayed post-test), which led to more tangible pragmalinguistic gains, as suggested by the increase in her scores.

Table 26.

Verbal responses in the AR group: Appointments

Student	Pre-test response	Post-test response	Delayed post-test response
Student 10	Hello, I'm __. Today I have an appointment. I don't...I will don't come because I am busy, I have another appointment. I am sorry not come today. Cancel please the appointment.	Hello, my name is __. I want reschedule my appointment today at 11 pm because I have another appointment. And I will call again.	<i>Student:</i> Hi, my name is __. Today I have an appointment with Dr. Somath. I want to schedule the appointment because I have another appointment for my son. <i>Researcher:</i> So, did you say you wanted to reschedule? <i>Student:</i> No, what you have? What have you time?
Student 8	<i>Student:</i> Hello, my name is __. I have appointment for 2018. I need cancel please. Can you? <i>Researcher:</i> Of course. Let me find your file here... <i>Student:</i> Ok, bye.	<i>Student:</i> Hi, how are you? Today I have appointment with my daughter. I need cancel please... I need cancel appointment today, I have another appointment. Sorry for that. <i>Researcher:</i> Sure. Would you like to reschedule? <i>Student:</i> No, thank you.	<i>Researcher:</i> Hello, how can I help you? <i>Student:</i> Hi, how are you? I have an appointment today for my daughter, but I need cancel please. Can you reschedule? <i>Researcher:</i> Sure. The doctor is also available next week on Friday at 10 am. Can you make it? <i>Student:</i> Yeah, this ok.
Student 11	Hello, I am __. I have appointment for today, but I cannot come there today. Please, if you can give me next appointment for Saturday?	Hello, I am __ speaking. I have appointment for today, 4 o'clock pm. Sorry, I cannot come today. Please, can you give me next appointment for tomorrow?	<i>Student:</i> Hello, good morning. I am __ speaking. I had an appointment for today at 4 o'clock pm. I'm sorry, I can't come today. Could you please give me another time? <i>Researcher:</i> Which time do you prefer? <i>Student:</i> For Wednesday, if you can, if you have time.

6.2.3. Resolving Issues

6.2.3.1. FE Group

Three prominent individual student cases selected from the FE group in this speech event are: Student 3, Student 1, and Student 7. Table 27 contains individual scores earned by each student for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of the diagnostic rubric before and after the teaching intervention. The pre-, post-, and delayed post-test verbal responses produced by these students are presented in Table 28.

Table 27.

Individual scores in the FE group: Resolving issues

Student	Pre-test score			Post-test score			Delayed post-test score			Component
	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	
Student 3	14	5	12	22	18	24	22	21	20	Pragmalinguistic
Student 3	15	26	17	21	26	25	25	30	23	Sociopragmatic
Student 1	9	11	16	23	11	19	24	17	22	Pragmalinguistic
Student 1	14	16	12	15	9	13	24	30	24	Sociopragmatic
Student 7	14	6	16	21	24	20	15	6	12	Pragmalinguistic
Student 7	13	13	10	25	21	19	24	26	20	Sociopragmatic

Note: Maximum score for pragmalinguistic component: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Maximum score for sociopragmatic component: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

The results of the diagnostic assessment of the pragmatic ability of these three individual student cases suggest that, overall, there was a general increase in both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic scores after the teaching intervention. However, there were some differences in the students' individual scores.

First, Student's 3 pragmalinguistic scores increased dramatically after the teaching intervention and changed from very low (according to Judge 2) or average (according to Judges

1 and 3) in the pre-test to high or very high in the post- and delayed post-test (according to all three judges). As for the assessment of the sociopragmatic component, the judges seemed to agree that this student's sociopragmatic performance was quite high in all three tests, although his scores increased even further after the teaching intervention due to the fact that the student started using target-like formulas which made his responses sound more conventionally indirect ('I was wondering what happened', post-test; Can you check for me what happened', delayed post-test).

Second, Student 1 was also able to improve his pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic performance after the teaching intervention, especially in the delayed post-test, where all three judges unanimously evaluated his performance as high. In the immediate post-test, however, Judge 2 evaluated his response as low average (11 marks out of 24) in the pragmalinguistic component and very low (9 marks out of 30) in the sociopragmatic component. The analysis of the qualitative comments made by the judges on this student's performance revealed that the low scores on both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components were caused by the fact that he provided a very lengthy explanation as part of his request, which was considered inappropriate. As a result, all three judges chose 'very inappropriate' when marking criterion 5 of the rubric (i.e., 'Is the amount of information given appropriate for this context?').

Third, the results of the diagnostic assessment of Student 7 showed an immense improvement in this student's pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic ability in the post-test. As pointed out by Judges 1 and 2, the student's utterance 'Please could you check to tell me why he didn't come?' contained a target-like slot-and-frame pattern similar to the one in the target formula 'Can you please check if + ___ [any meaningful completion of the phrase]'. In the delayed post-test, however, this student received lower scores for the pragmalinguistic

component. According to the judges' qualitative comments, his utterance 'I call you to check if you can do something' only somewhat resembled the target formula 'Could you check and see if + __ [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?' and contained several grammatical discrepancies that had impeded comprehension to a certain degree. These discrepancies, however, did not impact the judges' assessment of the sociopragmatic component, and they unanimously evaluated this student's performance as high in the delayed post-test.

Table 28.

Verbal responses in the FE group: Resolving issues

Student	Pre-test response	Post-test response	Delayed post-test response
Student 3	My name is __, my address is __. Please, can I [you] help me? I cancelled my insurance last month or last week, then I went to the bank and they still take my money. What happened?	Hi, I'm __. I have appointment today with technician. They didn't show up. I was wondering what happened?	Hi, my name is __, I'm your customer the internet... My internet is going slow. Can you check for me what happened?
Student 1	Hello, I have cancelled my insurance last month, but my account is ...the money. Why do you withdraw my money from my checking account? Please give me a reason.	Yes, I want to know why no person come here for installing my cable? Do you know, the World Cup will be start. I very like it! Who could I speak about it?	Yes, good morning. I use your internet, but several days your internet is very slowly. I can't open the browser. I can't receive the e-mail. So, I can't do anything. So, who should speak to about these things?
Student 7	Why do you take some money in my account? So, I cancelled your insurance, and you take the money for this month in my account. Why?	Hello, I'm __. I have an appointment with one of your technician to... Please could you check to tell me why he didn't come?	Good morning, my name is __. I live in Ottawa. So, I call your agency before next week about my internet, so it is very slow. I call you to check if you can do something.

6.2.3.2. AR Group

Three prominent individual student cases selected from the AR group in this speech event are: Student 10, Student 8, and Student 11. Table 29 contains individual scores earned by each student for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of the diagnostic rubric before and after the teaching intervention. The pre-, post-, and delayed post-test verbal responses produced by these students are presented in Table 30.

Table 29.

Individual scores in the AR group: Resolving issues

Student	Pre-test score			Post-test score			Delayed post-test score			Component
	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	
Student 10	5	4	8	10	5	11	20	15	14	Pragmalinguistic
Student 10	13	13	12	11	8	13	24	30	18	Sociopragmatic
Student 8	4	4	13	12	9	10	22	12	10	Pragmalinguistic
Student 8	8	5	12	15	13	11	24	19	15	Sociopragmatic
Student 11	6	5	12	18	8	15	17	12	20	Pragmalinguistic
Student 11	10	18	11	17	21	17	30	30	20	Sociopragmatic

Note: Maximum score for pragmalinguistic component: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high. Maximum score for sociopragmatic component: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

The results of the diagnostic assessment of the pragmatic ability of these three individual student cases showed no tangible improvement in the pragmalinguistic component after the teaching intervention. As for the assessment of the sociopragmatic component, some visible improvements were observed only in the delayed post-test, especially for Student 8. Overall, the students' scores slightly increased from very low in the pre-test to low average in the post- and delayed post-test, and, in some cases, remained at a low level, as can be seen from the individual scores presented in Table 29. The only exceptions were the delayed post-test assessment of

Judge 1, who evaluated the pragmalinguistic ability of all three students as high, and the assessment of Student's 11 pragmalinguistic ability by Judge 3, who assigned a high score to this student in the delayed post-test.

As can be seen from the students' verbal responses provided in Table 30, all three students used very similar formulas to achieve the target speech acts. For instance, Students 8 and 11 produced utterances that were almost identical to each other and both contained the 'could you please' downgrader at the beginning of the head act in the delayed post-test. At the same time, Student 10, produced the utterance 'If you can send someone fix it or check it' in her delayed post-test response, which, according to Judge 1, slightly resembled the target formulas 'Can you look into it?' or 'Could you check and see if + __[any meaningful completion of the phrase]. This could have contributed to the higher pragmalinguistic score in this case. The other two judges, however, evaluated this student's performance as average since, based on the individual criteria analysis of the pragmalinguistic component of the rubric, Student 10's speech act was not fully realized and lacked clarity of expression.

Table 30.

Verbal responses in the AR group: Resolving issues

Student	Pre-test response	Post-test response	Delayed post-test response
Student 10	Hi, I am ___. I last month cancel for my car insurance. Now, I check for bank money, you sent money. Why? Because I cancel insurance. Now I come and looking for this problem.	Hi, my name is ___. How about the technician? Late.... Not here yet... Why? I wait a lot time.	Hello, my name is ___. I have a problem for internet. Slowly, not work good. If you can send someone fix it or check it because I need internet faster, not slowly.
Student 8	Hi, my name is ___, I check with insurance, I cancel direct. Why?	Hi, how are you? I have appointment today for my internet at 10 o'clock, but not come early. Why?	Hi, how are you? My internet is not work in my home. Can you send me someone fix it?
Student 11	This is ___. I cancelled before my car insurance, but I check my accounting bank, it more money for this month, but before I cancelled this plan. Why?	Hello. I am ___ speaking. I had appointment with your company. You want send fix cable man to my home to fix cable. And I wait here more than 2 hours and he is not come now. Maybe late. What happened? Can you talk me about time? If you haven't now worker, can send me tomorrow?	Hello, good morning. I am ___ speaking. You know, my internet at home is work very slow. I don't know why. Could you send someone to fix it?

6.2.4. Responding to Requests**6.2.4.1. FE Group**

Three prominent individual student cases selected from the FE group in this speech event are: Student 2, Student 4, and Student 7. Table 31 contains individual scores earned by each student for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of the diagnostic rubric before and after the teaching intervention. The pre-, post-, and delayed post-test verbal responses produced by these students are presented in Table 32.

Table 31.

Individual scores in the FE group: Responding to requests

Student	Pre-test score			Post-test score			Delayed post-test score			Component
	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	
Student 2	14	6	13	17	12	16	23	24	24	Pragmalinguistic
Student 2	17	15	17	24	29	24	23	25	26	Sociopragmatic
Student 4	11	14	20	24	18	24	24	22	24	Pragmalinguistic
Student 4	17	25	15	23	30	30	29	30	29	Sociopragmatic
Student 7	14	10	16	18	12	20	21	17	20	Pragmalinguistic
Student 7	12	19	11	14	18	15	23	30	24	Sociopragmatic

Note: Maximum score for pragmalinguistic component: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Maximum score for sociopragmatic component: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

The results of the diagnostic assessment of the pragmatic ability of these three individual student cases suggest that the students were able to increase their scores from low or low average to high average or high, with several exceptions. As for the assessment of the sociopragmatic ability, the judges did not always completely agree when assessing individual students' sociopragmatic ability, as can be seen from the individual scores presented in Table 31⁴¹. The overall results, however, suggest an improvement of the students' sociopragmatic ability after the teaching intervention, with their scores increasing from average to high. As can be seen from the students' verbal response presented in Table 32, their pre-test utterances were grammatically and lexically accurate, but lacked adequate hedging devices that could make their speech acts more conventionally indirect. As a result, all three judges concluded that the students were not able to successfully achieve the target speech acts in the pre-test and assigned low scores for diagnostic

⁴¹ It is important bear in mind that the level of internal consistency between the judges in the sociopragmatic aspect ($\alpha = .78$) was lower than in the pragmalinguistic aspect.

criterion 4 in the sociopragmatic component of the rubric (i.e., Is the speech act used by the speaker appropriate for this context?). By contrast, the results of the post-test assessment revealed that the students used the target-like formulas in their post- and delayed post-test responses, which had a positive impact on both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic assessment.

The fact that the students offered alternative help options by using different variants of the target formulas in their post-intervention responses had a positive impact on the evaluation of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components. For example, Judge 1 commented on the response of Student 4 by pointing out that this student applied a nativelike semantic formula in her post- and delayed post-test response (*apology + explanation + offer to do at another time*) by using a semi-fixed formula ‘I’m unable to + [verb], but I would be happy to + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]’. Similarly, Student 2 used the softener ‘unfortunately’ as part of the target formula ‘Unfortunately, I’m unable to ___ [do something] in his delayed post-test response, which gained him very high scores for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components from all three judges. His post-test response, however, received lower scores for the pragmalinguistic component due to the fact that the formula he utilized in his response contained some grammatical discrepancies (‘I am very sorry. I would... I can come on Sunday if it will be help’). Nevertheless, this did not negatively affect the evaluation of his sociopragmatic ability, as suggested by the high scores assigned by all three judges.

Student 7, on the other hand, received the lowest scores for the pragmalinguistic component from all three judges in the post- and delayed post-test; he also received the lowest scores for the sociopragmatic component in the post-test. Based on the analysis of the judges’ qualitative comments, two possible factors contributed to the lower scores in Student 7’s case. First, according to all three judges, the student should have provided a more solid explanation as

to why he was unable to work extra hours (as per criterion 5 of the sociopragmatic rubric, ‘Is the amount of information given appropriate for this context?’). Second, despite the fact that this student did offer an alternative option to work on a different day, his response did not contain any of the target-like formulas. As noted by Judge 1, the student’s utterance ‘but I can do this project if you give me two days’ should have been replaced with a target pragmatic formula ‘I could + [offer to do something] if that would help’. The results of the post-test assessment revealed that the students used the target-like formulas in their post- and delayed post-test responses, which had a positive impact not only on their pragmalinguistic assessment but also on their sociopragmatic assessment.

Table 32.

Verbal responses in the FE group: Responding to requests

Student	Pre-test response	Post-test response	Delayed post-test response
Student 2	Oh, sorry manager... Today I have the... I have very important thing to do so I can't... I can't do work after working. The work may be... We can do the work tomorrow? Tomorrow longer.	Oh, I would come on Saturday, but I have a function to attend. So, I am very sorry. I would... I can come on Sunday if it will be help.	Oh, unfortunately, I'm unable to take part in your project because I have another project right now, so I must finish my project immediately. I'm sorry.
Student 4	I'm sorry, I can't stay more hours because I have important appointment. Sorry, if you want in future to stay more hours, please tell me before 2 days or 3 days.	Hi, I'm sorry, I'm not able to work this Saturday, but I would be happy to work next Saturday. Next Saturday would be great.	<i>Student:</i> Oh sorry, I'm not able to do this week, but I would be happy to do next week. <i>Researcher:</i> Oh, for sure. How about we talk about it on Monday? <i>Student:</i> Monday is great for me.
Student 7	Please, today I can't because I'm very busy. I have something very important. Can you try for another solution? You can ask another colleague if he can do it, because me, I am very busy. Please, I can't do that.	Excuse me, I have another thing to do on Saturday, so if you want, I can work overtime another day.	Oh sorry, I'm very busy now because I have a project you gave me last week, I'm not finish it. But I can do this new project if you give me two days.

6.2.4.2. AR Group

Three prominent individual student cases selected from the AR group in this speech event are: Student 10, Student 8, and Student 11. Table 33 contains individual scores earned by each student for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of the diagnostic rubric before and after the teaching intervention. The pre-, post-, and delayed post-test verbal responses produced by these students are presented in Table 34.

Table 33.

Individual scores in the AR group: Responding to requests

Student	Pre-test score			Post-test score			Delayed post-test score			Component
	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	J1	J2	J3	
Student 10	10	15	13	13	7	14	11	7	10	Pragmalinguistic
Student 10	10	21	17	17	14	15	10	24	16	Sociopragmatic
Student 8	11	10	13	21	16	10	8	5	8	Pragmalinguistic
Student 8	14	21	15	15	30	14	11	18	13	Sociopragmatic
Student 11	4	6	16	12	4	18	14	11	14	Pragmalinguistic
Student 11	10	10	11	15	17	19	17	17	20	Sociopragmatic

Note: Maximum score for pragmalinguistic component: 24. 0-8- low; 9-16- average; 17-24- high.

Maximum score for sociopragmatic component: 30. 0-14- low; 15- 20- average; 21-30- high.

The results of the diagnostic assessment of the pragmalinguistic ability of these three individual student cases showed no visible gains after the teaching intervention, with some rare exceptions in the individual assessment of the judges. In addition, the analysis of the qualitative comments provided by the judges showed that, while the students received relatively adequate scores for the criteria focusing on grammatical and lexical accuracy, they received very low scores for the formulaic component of the diagnostic rubric (i.e., Criterion 3, ‘Does the response contain a target-like pragmatic formula?’).

Similarly, the results of the assessment of the sociopragmatic component yielded no visible improvements in the AR group students’ performance, except for some rare instances. The only visible improvement from the sociopragmatic perspective was the fact that after the teaching intervention some students attempted to incorporate ‘promise of future action’ component into their responses (e.g., ‘Maybe next day I can’, Student 10, post-test; ‘Could you give me work on Sunday? I can come on Sunday’, Student 11, post-test). However, as suggested

by relatively low sociopragmatic scores these students received in the post- and delayed post-test, these attempts did not have any measurable impact on the judgement.

Table 34.

Verbal responses in the AR group: Responding to requests

Student	Pre-test response	Post-test response	Delayed post-test response
Student 10	I'm sorry, no I can't stay because I have five children. All time busy. I came... my children at school and I cooking. I am sorry, I not... I cannot stay.	Oh, I am sorry, all Saturday I go with my children for shopping. I am busy all Saturday. I am sorry. Maybe next day I can.	<i>Researcher:</i> Hi __, how are you? I was wondering if you could start this new project early next week? <i>Student:</i> Oh, I hope that, but I have not finish my project yet. <i>Researcher:</i> Oh, I see. How much time do you think you'll need to finish? <i>Student:</i> Maybe next week, I don't know what happened, I will finish or no.
Student 8	<i>Researcher:</i> Do you think you could stay until 7 today? <i>Student:</i> No, I don't can seven. I have appointment for my daughter.	<i>Researcher:</i> You know, we really need some extra help this Saturday. Do you think you could to office and finish that project? <i>Student:</i> Sorry, I would, but I have appointment for my son. Sorry for that.	<i>Student:</i> Oh, I am sorry, but I don't complete that. <i>Researcher:</i> When do you think you can start because we need to finish this project by the end of next week? <i>Student:</i> Yeah... Can you... Can Monday?
Student 11	<i>Researcher:</i> Hi, I was wondering if you could stay for a couple of hours today, we really need to finish that report. <i>Student:</i> Hi, sorry, I cannot, I have appointment at this time. I cannot wait.	I am sorry, so sorry, I cannot come in Saturday because I have guest in home... my guest coming Saturday. I am so sorry. If you can... could you give me for I can.. Could you give me work on Sunday? I can come on Sunday.	<i>Student:</i> I'm so sorry, I can't do this new project because I haven't time and I have an appointment with my family doctor this time. <i>Researcher:</i> Oh, I see. When do you think you can start working on it? It's top priority. <i>Student:</i> Ok, could you give me second day for I make this project? <i>Researcher:</i> Sure.

6.3. Discussion

The diagnostic assessment carried out by the expert judges yielded similar results to those of the qualitative utterance analysis and, for the most part, confirmed its findings. Similar to the findings of the utterance analysis, which revealed that both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic violations in student-produced speech acts were caused by the lack of appropriate pragmatic formula(s) needed to perform a given speech act, the results of the expert judgements suggest that, in the majority of cases, high scores given by the judges for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of the diagnostic rubric were associated with the usage of the target-like pragmatic formulas. The results of the assessment of the prominent individual student cases in the FE group revealed that those students who managed to use the target pragmatic formulas or utterances containing target-like slot-and-frame formulaic patterns in their speech acts received higher scores from the judges on both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of the diagnostic rubric (see individual scores in Tables 19, 23, 27, and 31). On the other hand, the results of the assessment of the prominent individual student cases in the AR group showed that most students in this treatment group received low scores for their pragmatic ability mainly because the utterances they produced did not contain any pragmatic formulas appropriate for the target contexts or contained utterances with pragmalinguistic violations that negatively impacted the judges' assessment of these students' sociopragmatic performance (see individual scores in Tables 21, 25, 29, and 33).

The discussion below is dedicated to some key observations made during the second cycle of analysis of the results of the expert judgements (i.e., prominent individual cases) in each target speech event that point to the key role of formulas in the development of L2 pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities. In addition, the researcher explains how these

results resonate with the key findings of the qualitative utterance analysis as well as with previous research literature on formulaic language and L2 pragmatic competence.

6.3.1. The Role of Formulas in the Development of Students' Pragmalinguistic Ability

The results of the expert judgements provide additional evidence to support the claim that pragmatic formulas are key to successful speech act realization since formulas can put L2 learners in the 'zone of safety' by equipping them with accurate and contextually appropriate linguistic structures that help L2 users come across as proficient language speakers and allow acceptance into the target language speech community (House, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig, 2006, 2012; Boers et al, 2006; N. Ellis, 1996, 2012; Wood, 2015).

At the same time, the findings of the present study have mirrored the well-established belief that L2 learners' insufficient control of pragmalinguistic knowledge becomes particularly obvious when L2 learners are unable to use appropriate pragmatic formulas when performing speech acts in the target language (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993). The analysis of the results of individual students' pre- and post-intervention assessment in both treatment groups yielded several key observations suggesting that pragmatic formulas can boost L2 grammatical competence and help 'cure' inaccurate lexical and grammatical choices and prevent negative transfer from L1 or overreliance on the same formula when producing various speech acts, which can impede L2 pragmalinguistic ability. These observations are discussed below for each target speech event.

6.3.1.1. Invitations

The results of the diagnostic assessment of individual students' pragmalinguistic ability in the speech event of *Extending invitations* showed that the low pragmalinguistic scores in the pre-test were associated with pragmalinguistic violations related to the verb tenses and modal

verbs; at the same time, the improvement in the pragmalinguistic aspect was stimulated by the formula usage. For example, as noted by Judge 1, the verb tense choice in the utterance produced by Student 5 in his pre-test response, ‘I *have* birthday party’ (Present Simple), was inaccurate and should have been ‘I *am having* birthday party’ (Present Progressive) instead. As a result, Student 5 received only 6 marks from Judge 1 and only 4 marks from Judge 2 in the pre-test. Similarly, the pre-test response produced by Student 6 was only somewhat accurate grammatically, and, according to Judge 1’s comments, it should have been ‘would you like to...’ instead of ‘do you want to...’. While the post-test utterances produced by Students 5 and 6 contained nativelike slot-and-frame formulas (e.g., ‘It will be great if you come’, Student 6), in their delayed post-test responses these students switched back to overusing formulas containing the modal verb ‘could’:

- ‘Could you come please? Could you come with kids?’, Student 5, delayed post-test
- ‘Could you and your family bring the child for celebrate?’, Student 6, delayed post-test

Student 3, on the other hand, earned very high scores for the pragmalinguistic aspect after the teaching intervention (see Table 19) and managed to maintain very high pragmalinguistic performance in the delayed post-test. When the pre-test response produced by Student 3 is compared to his post- and delayed post-test response (see Table 20), major qualitative improvements related to pragmatic formulas can be observed. In particular, an utterance containing the verb ‘can’ (Can you join us for a barbecue’) was replaced by a target-like slot-and-frame formula with modal verb ‘would’ (‘Would you like to come to join with me?’) in the post-test and by a purely nativelike formula (‘Would you like to join us?’) in the delayed post-test.

As for the AR group students' pragmlinguistic performance, only Student 11 received a higher post-test pragmlinguistic score and only from Judge 1. As noted by the judge, the student's utterance 'Please you and your family... I like you come to my home' reminded her of the target formula 'Please feel free to come on ____ + [date]'; in the delayed post-test, however, Student 11 received a low pragmlinguistic score from the same judge due to the confusion with the 'would like' structure as part of the invitation speech act. While it was clear that AR group students' responses produced after the teaching intervention contained certain signs of a shift towards the nativelike norm, those improvements were not substantial and were maintained only in the short term.

6.3.1.2. Appointments

The results of the diagnostic assessment of the pragmlinguistic ability in this speech event suggest that the main reason why the students received low scores for their pre-test performance was the fact that they lacked precise vocabulary (e.g., reschedule, availability) to express their communicative goals with more clarity. For example, Students 2 and 5 used the utterance 'change time' in their pre-test responses to express the idea of 'rescheduling' an appointment, which was probably a result of a negative L1 transfer:

- 'I have some personal things to do next Saturday morning, so I want to change time', Student 2, pre-test
- 'I have something problem today, can you change the day please?', Student 5, pre-test

However, these students received higher pragmlinguistic scores for their post-intervention performance, which can be explained by the fact that they started using target pragmatic formulas instead of their own non-nativelike interpretations:

- ‘Do you have availability next week?’, Student 5, post-test
- ‘I want to cancel my appointment on Wednesday’, Student 2, delayed post-test

Furthermore, the analysis of individual students’ responses in the FE group revealed that the students tended to provide lengthy explanations or excuses to explain reasons as to why they could not attend their appointments. Consider the following examples recorded during the pre-intervention stage:

- ‘I have appointment tomorrow, but I’m sorry, *my friend will come from China. I need to take them to the airport*’, Student 1, pre-test
- ‘*I have something problem today, can you change the day please?*’, Student 5, pre-test

The analysis revealed that the longer the students’ explanations were, the more grammatical or lexical errors they contained due to limited linguistic resources; consequently, such lengthy explanations contributed to lower scores for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic⁴² components of the diagnostic rubric. Interestingly, none of the students in the FE group used the target pragmatic formula ‘Something has come up’ to formulate their excuses in their responses neither before nor after the teaching intervention. On the bright side, the number of attempts to explain the reasons for cancelling appointments decreased in the post-tests, and their responses became much shorter and to the point mainly due to the fact that the students started to use the target pragmatic formula ‘I can’t make it’⁴³. This also reflected in the higher scores assigned by

⁴² The sociopragmatic aspect will be discussed in more detail in the following subsection.

⁴³ This was the most frequent target formula recorded in the students’ responses after the teaching intervention.

the expert judges for the students' post-intervention pragmalinguistic performance (see Table 23 for students' individual scores).

Previous research on interlanguage pragmatics established that deviations from native speaker norms in terms of utterance length might be a potential cause for pragmatic failure since L2 learners are not always aware of the socio-cultural and socio-linguistic conventions of the target language. As a result, non-native speakers use more grounders (i.e., reasons and justifications) when formulating requests as opposed to English native speakers (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986). The present study yielded similar results; the findings suggest that pragmatic formulas, if used appropriately, can help L2 learners formulate concise and error-free utterances when performing target language requests, which contributes to the efficacy of the interaction. Due to multiple processing advantages formulaic sequences may bring to L2 learners, formulas have been referred to as 'effort-savers', 'time-buyers' or 'short-cuts' in the research literature as it is believed that formulas lead to increased speech production and can help L2 speakers save effort in spontaneous speech processing which facilitates fluency of expression (Wray, 2000; Wray & Perkins, 2000; Wood, 2006).

In the AR group, only Student 10 was able to improve her pragmalinguistic ability immediately after the teaching intervention. However, this student's scores dropped to the pre-test level in the delayed post-test. In her response to the immediate post-test, this student used a target-like formula with just a minor deviation from the norm ('I want reschedule my appointment'), which resulted in her receiving very high scores from all three judges. In the delayed post-test, however, this student's speech act was not fully realized due to the confusion with the verbs 'schedule' and 'reschedule'. On the other hand, Student 11's pragmalinguistic scores remained at the same average level; the reason why this student was unable to improve

her pragmalinguistic performance was the fact that, when responding to the role-plays in all three tests, he repetitively used the utterance ‘I can’t come’ but was unable to produce the target pragmatic formula ‘I can’t make it’, which would sound more natural in this context, as noted by all three judges in their qualitative comments to the rubric (see Table 26 for these students’ verbal responses). The results of the diagnostic assessment of the AR group students’ pragmalinguistic ability suggest that the students in this group were unable to enhance their pragmalinguistic knowledge after the teaching intervention, which resulted in low pragmalinguistic scores assigned by the judges.

6.3.1.3. Resolving Issues

Just like the utterance analysis, the results of the expert judgements of this speech event suggest that the FE group students started producing utterances that somewhat resembled the target formulas after the teaching intervention; this resulted in higher pragmalinguistic scores for their post- and delayed post-test performance. Nevertheless, the students experienced difficulty with the acquisition of the semi-fixed pragmatic formulas typical for this speech act (e.g., ‘Could you check and see if + ___ [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?’); therefore, not all FE group students were able to retain the purely nativelike forms of these formulas in the long-term and produced formulas that somewhat deviated from the target forms, for example:

- ‘Please could you check to tell me why he didn’t come?’, Student 7, post-test
- ‘Who could I speak about it?’ Student 1, post-test
- ‘Can you check for me what happened’, Student 3, delayed post-test

However, the judges did not consider such deviations to be detrimental to the functional meanings of the student-produced speech acts and still evaluated the FE group students’ pragmalinguistic post-intervention performance at a higher level, compared to their pre-test

results. These results are consistent with the findings obtained from the qualitative utterance analysis; namely, the semi-fixed target pragmatic formulas with fillable slots were more challenging for the students to retain in the long-term, which resulted in more pragmalinguistic violations recorded in the delayed post-tests. Such findings are not surprising since, in addition to having to deal with the complexity of grammar, L2 learners need to first retain and then produce long sequences of words and possibly fillable slots (discontinuous formulas), which adds to the acquisitional burden (D. Wood, personal communication, May 2020).

In the AR group, most students seemed to rely on the formulas which they had most likely acquired previously; the students did not use many new target pragmatic formulas after the teaching intervention. While in the pre-test the students in this group tended to produce conventionally indirect speech acts, the most popular request strategy used by the students after the teaching intervention was the utilization of the ‘can you/could you [please]’ downgrader at the beginning of a head act, like in the examples below:

- ‘Can you send me someone fix it?’, Student 8, delayed post-test
- ‘Could you send someone to fix it?’, Student 11, delayed post-test

The fact that these utterances are considered nativelike could have contributed to the higher pragmalinguistic scores assigned by Judges 1 and 3 in the delayed post-test (see Table 29). However, the qualitative utterance analysis showed that the majority of the AR students tended to overuse formulas containing the ‘could you/can you [please]’ downgrader across all six target speech events, which suggests that these students were not able to use a variety of target formulas in their speech acts neither before nor after the teaching intervention. The expert judges could not capture these nuances since they evaluated a random set of tests and were unable to

compare the pre-test responses of the same student with their or post- and delayed post-test responses. In contrast, the FE group students tried, with relative success, to utilize several target semi-fixed formulas in their post-intervention responses, which resulted in them gaining higher scores for the pragmalinguistic component.

6.3.2. The Role of Formulas in the Development of Students' Sociopragmatic Ability

The results of the expert judgements suggest that pragmatic formulas, if used appropriately, can enhance the acquisition of the sociopragmatic aspect of L2 pragmatic competence; at the same time, the lack of appropriate formulas or their misapplication in a given interaction context can impede the sociopragmatic aspect and, consequently, lead to pragmatic failures. The analysis of the results of the individual students' assessment revealed that the right choice of pragmatic formulas in a given speech act was almost always associated with higher scores assigned by the judges for the sociopragmatic component of the diagnostic rubric. The two speech events which provided particularly good illustrations of how pragmatic formulas can either enhance or impede the sociopragmatic aspect of students' performance are the speech events of *Resolving issues* and *Responding to requests*. The key findings related to the role of formulas in the development of the students' sociopragmatic ability that emerged from the analysis of the expert judgements in these two speech events are discussed below.

6.3.2.1. Resolving Issues

The results of the diagnostic assessment of individual students' performance in this speech event highlight the key role pragmatic formulas play in making the face-threatening request speech acts more conventionally indirect and, consequently, more polite from the perspective of the English language. As shown in Table 27, The FE group students were able to increase their scores not only for the pragmalinguistic but also for the sociopragmatic component

of the rubric. The judges' qualitative comments provide possible explanations as to why these students' scores increased after the teaching intervention. Judge 1, for example, noted that the utterance 'what happened' produced by Student 3 in the pre-test only somewhat resembled the target formula 'I was wondering what happened'; however, since it lacked the mitigator 'I was wondering', the judge answered 'somewhat agree' to criterion 4 of the diagnostic rubric ('Does the response contain a target-like pragmatic formula?'). However, in their comments on this student's post- and delayed post-test performance, all three judges noticed an improvement in this particular criterion of the pragmalinguistic component of the rubric and mentioned that the student's response contained utterances that either directly matched the target norm ('I was wondering what happened', post-test) or contained a target-like slot-and-frame pattern ('Can you check for me what happened', delayed post-test). According to the comments of Judge 1, the latter response was somewhat similar to the target formula 'Can you please check if + ____ [any meaningful completion of the phrase] or 'Could you check and see if + ____ [any meaningful completion of the phrase]'. The fact that FE group students started using various target-like mitigators or other internal modifications as part of the formulaic frames of the target pragmatic formulas had a positive impact on the assessment of their sociopragmatic performance.

Another noteworthy finding that emerged from the analysis of the judges' assessment of the sociopragmatic component of the diagnostic rubric was the fact that those students, who provided lengthy justifications as part of their speech acts, tended to receive lower scores specifically on the diagnostic criterion 5 (i.e., 'Is the amount of information given appropriate for this context?'). For example, the results of the individual assessment of Student 1 revealed that this student received very low scores for the sociopragmatic component in the immediate post-test from Judge 2 (see Table 27). In her qualitative comments on the assessment rubric Judge 2

noted that a reference to the World Cup made by Student 1 in his request was a distractor (see Table 28 for the full verbal response); consequently, this prevented this student from effectively achieving the communicative goal of the target speech act. In the delayed post-test, however, the student was able to produce a more precise equivalent of the target formula, with only a slight deviation from the norm ('Who should speak to about these things?'), which resulted in high scores he received from all three judges for both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components. This finding once again highlights the key role of pragmatic formulas in successful sociopragmatic performance and suggests that, if used appropriately, such formulas can contribute to the efficacy of interaction since they can serve as 'short-cuts' or 'effort-savers' (Wray, 2000; Wray & Perkins, 2000) and help L2 learners formulate utterances that adhere to the sociopragmatic conventions of the English language.

6.3.2.2. Responding to Requests

The analysis of the results of the individual students' assessment in this speech event revealed that the FE group students were able to suggest alternative help options as part of their refusals by using different variants of the target pragmatic formulas in their post-intervention responses (see Table 32); consequently, this had a positive impact on the judges' assessment of their sociopragmatic ability. For example, if the performance of Student 2 is analyzed in more detail, the analysis reveals that in his pre-test response, this student tried to incorporate a semantic formula of *Refusal + offer to do it tomorrow* (see his verbal response in Table 32). However, as pointed out by Judge 1, his response was unclear due to inaccurate lexical choices; at the same time, all three judges answered 'absolutely inappropriate' when evaluating diagnostic criterion 4 of the sociopragmatic rubric for this student (i.e., 'Is the speech act used by the speaker appropriate for this context?').

On the other hand, the results provided a good illustration of how the lack of appropriate pragmatic formula(s) can negatively affect the sociopragmatic performance in L2. The evaluation of Student 4's sociopragmatic ability by Judge 1 serves as a good example. When evaluating criterion 3 of the sociopragmatic rubric (i.e., 'Is the level of politeness appropriate for this context?'), Judge 1 commented that this student's pre-test response was "somewhat polite but with an imperative statement at end". As can be seen from her verbal response presented in Table 32, the student's utterances were grammatically and lexically accurate, but lacked appropriate hedging devices ('Sorry, if you want in future to stay more hours, please tell me before 2 days or 3 days'). Similarly, all three judges agreed that the pre-test response of Student 7 did not contain any major grammatical or lexical errors; nevertheless, all three judges concluded that this student was not able to successfully achieve the target speech act (based on the evaluation of diagnostic criterion 4 of the sociopragmatic rubric, 'Is the speech act used by the speaker appropriate for this context?'). All judges agreed that this was caused by the fact that this student's response did not contain any target-like formulas or patterns, which could have helped him to better achieve the target speech act of refusal.

As for the AR group students, the results of the expert judgements revealed that the students in this group were unable to provide alternative help options even after the teaching intervention since they did not use any of the target pragmatic formulas, and, as a result, their sociopragmatic performance suffered. Those rare instances when the students attempted to reproduce one of the target formulas were unsuccessful since the students used their own words, which were, most likely, negative transfers from their L1s, to express the functional meanings of the target speech acts. For example, Student 11 in his post-test response ('If you can... could you give me for I can..') clearly attempted to reproduce the target formula 'I would be happy to [do it

next time]’; his utterance, however, sounded more like a polite request rather than a refusal. Next, Student 10 used an utterance ‘I hope that, but...’ to express regret that was mostly likely a negative transfer from her L1 (Arabic), which does not sound natural in English. Lastly, Student 8 was able to reproduce the target formula element involving the modal auxiliary ‘would’ in her post-test response (‘Sorry, I would, but I have appointment for my son’), which could explain the high pragmalinguistic score assigned by Judge 1 (21 marks out of 24). However, in her delayed post-test response, Student 8 was not able to reproduce the same formula and went back to using a more comfortable formula ‘I’m sorry, but...’. Furthermore, the fact that the student was not able to offer an alternative solution in a pragmalinguistically appropriate manner (‘Yeah... Can you... Can Monday?’) suggests that the target formula was not internalized in her long-term memory. These factors could have contributed to the low evaluation of this student’s performance on both components of the rubric by all three judges.

6.3.2.3. The Differences in the Judges’ Evaluation of Sociopragmatic Criteria

It is also important to acknowledge that the inter-rater reliability analysis revealed that the levels of internal consistency between the judges were lower in the sociopragmatic component of the diagnostic rubric compared to the pragmalinguistic component in all four target speech events and in both treatment groups, except for the speech event of *Resolving issues* in the AR group, where there was less agreement on the pragmalinguistic aspect. Furthermore, the judges tended to agree less when evaluating intrinsically face threatening speech acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987) as part of such speech events as *Extending invitations* (FE group: $\alpha = .65$; AR group: $\alpha = .57$) and *Responding to requests* (FE group: $\alpha = .78$; AR group: $\alpha = .29$). Such discrepancies in the judgement may have been caused by the differences in individual judges’ perceptions of the notions of politeness and directness, which were the main

diagnostic criteria of the sociopragmatic rubric (see criteria 2 and 3 in Figure 10). As a result, in some cases, the same student received a high pragmalinguistic score and a low sociopragmatic score, or vice versa, from the same judge.

Judge 1 and Judge 2 were native speakers of Canadian English, while Judge 3 was a native speaker of Brazilian Portuguese who immigrated to Canada to do her graduate studies. The fact that Judge 3 was not raised in the Canadian culture could have had an impact on her perception of directness and politeness in the speech act realization, which was sometimes different from the perceptions of Judge 1 and Judge 2. Nevertheless, Judge 1 did not always agree with Judge 2, despite the fact that both of them were born and raised in Canada and spoke Canadian English as their first language. Interestingly, the levels of inter-rater agreement between Judges 1 and 3 were at times higher than between Judges 1 and 2. These findings suggest that speakers' perceptions of the notions of politeness and indirectness are not only culture- or first language-specific (Trosborg, 1995; Wierzbicka, 2003), but may also depend on 'individual cultures' of the speakers, and, therefore, may be highly subjective.

Chapter 7: Results and Discussion of Analysis of Classroom Episodes

This chapter reports on the results of the qualitative content analysis of the classroom episodes recorded during eight observed sessions (four sessions per treatment group). This analysis was carried out in order to determine which pedagogical features of the FE approach make it more effective than the AR approach from both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic perspectives and whether there were any observable differences in teachers' implementation of the FE approach as compared to the AR approach.

The content analysis of the recorded classroom episodes has revealed three major trends that have emerged during the instructional treatment in both AR and FE treatment groups. These trends are as follows:

- Noticing pragmatic formulas in the input and interpreting their semantically ambiguous meanings
- Discovering the relationship between linguistic form, functional meaning, and applicable context (Schmidt, 1993)⁴⁴
- Discovering the target notions of directness, politeness, contextual appropriateness and other cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences in the speech act realization patterns.

In the following sub-sections, each trend is described in detail by presenting a collection of narrative reports illustrating the development of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities of the student participants in both treatment groups. These narrative reports also explain how the same trend was realized differently in each treatment group and how the instructional

⁴⁴ Note that no episodes pertaining to this trend were recorded during the AR instructional treatment.

techniques and methods contributed to the learning processes of the student participants and affected the classroom behaviour and teaching styles of the participating teachers. When necessary, the relevant findings from both qualitative utterance analysis and expert judgements were re-incorporated into the narrative reports to enhance the validity of the results of the classroom observation analysis. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the comparison of the efficacy of the FE and AR teaching approaches by drawing on the evidence collected during the classroom observation which contains various signs of the cognitive engagement levels demonstrated by the student participants.

7.1. Trends Recorded during the FE Instructional Treatment

7.1.1. Noticing Pragmatic Formulas in the Input

Episodes in Lesson 1 (Extending Invitations). This was the very first lesson out of four in the pedagogical intervention sequence designed for the FE group. Therefore, the students were not yet familiar or comfortable with the proposed format of the formula-enhanced lesson. For this reason, the students had difficulty recognizing the target pragmatic formulas during Phase 1 ('Guided Noticing') (see Appendix E, Lesson 1). For example, the target pragmatic formula 'I'm having a [barbeque]' was not initially recognized as a formula by the majority of the student participants. However, as the students continued reviewing more examples from the written input presented in Exercise 2 (*Exploration through written contextualized input*), with the FE group teacher's help, they started to gain a better understanding of what the concept of 'pragmatic formula' entails. The teacher's guidance was particularly crucial in facilitating the noticing as well as accurate interpretation of such semantically ambiguous formulas as 'Please feel free to come on ___ + [date]' and 'Hope you can make it'. During the completion of Exercise 2 in Phase 1, several students tried to translate some of the target formulas into their L1s but were not able

to find the exact equivalents. For example, Student 7 (L1 French) originally thought that the phrase ‘feel free’ referred to liberty or freedom in this context. This was later clarified by the FE group teacher, who explained that ‘feel free’ does not refer to the notion of freedom in the literal sense in this context. This stimulated a whole-class discussion on whether the students had heard these formulas before outside of the classroom and had been able to understand their functional meanings. Most students confessed that they had never heard these formulas before or, even if they had, these expressions did not stand out to them as formulaic sequences that perform pragmatic functions.

Episodes in Lesson 2 (Cancelling/rescheduling Appointments). Later in the intervention, the FE group students started to realize that some pragmatic formulas they had reviewed in the previous lessons reoccurred in the written input in the subsequent lessons. This provided an additional noticing opportunity and reinforced the idea of pragmatic formulas serving as building blocks for speech act realization. For example, in Lesson 2, during Phase 1 (see Appendix E, Lesson 2), Student 4 commented that the formula containing the verb ‘make’ had also been used in Lesson 1 (i.e., ‘Hope you can make it’, Invitations). She said: “Some expressions repeat, that’s why they are formulas!”. Indeed, two target pragmatic formulas selected for Lesson 2 contained the verb ‘make’: ‘I won’t be able to make it’ and ‘I can’t make it’. Furthermore, Student 3 commented that he had been able to notice the formula containing ‘make’ outside of the classroom. This student, who worked at an auto body repair shop at the time of the study, had heard his supervisor say, “You made it!” to their clients on multiple occasions. However, the student had been unable to understand the functional meaning of this formula until it was explained in Lesson 2. Later in the same lesson, when one of the students arrived to class late, the FE group teacher said, “I am glad you made it!”, and the rest of the class

laughed and acknowledged that she had used the target formula with the verb ‘make’.

Interestingly, the utterance analysis has shown that Student 3 used several variants of the same formula on several occasions in his post-intervention responses (e.g., ‘I would like to let you know that I can’t make today’, Appointments, delayed post-test; ‘Can you finish as soon as possible because the customer is coming to pick it up after two hours. Can you make that?’, Making requests, delayed post-test).

It is also worth mentioning that Lesson 2 contained the lowest number of semantically opaque formulas, compared to the other lessons in the teaching intervention. However, several target formulas did pose comprehension difficulties for the students. Of note are the pragmatic formulas that contain semantically opaque elements such as ‘I’m afraid I need to reschedule my appointment’ and ‘Something has come up’ (the latter used as an excuse to cancel an appointment in this context). At first, the students could not understand the exact meanings of these formulas and attempted to translate them verbatim into their L1s. Later, in Phase 2 (‘Deep Cognitive Engagement’), these confusions were clarified when the students completed Exercise 2 (Review 1, *Understanding the implied meaning of the target formulas*).⁴⁵

Finally, the analysis of the classroom episodes recorded during this lesson revealed that the *Guided noticing* activity in Phase 1 prompted the students to pay attention to some key individual vocabulary items such as ‘opening,’ ‘availability’, ‘reschedule’, or ‘unfortunately’. The utterance analysis has shown that this later led to incidental vocabulary learning since some

⁴⁵ See the hints provided for the students to help them interpret the meanings of these formulas on in Appendix E, Lesson 2.

FE group students were able to use these vocabulary items in their post-intervention responses, as can be seen from the following examples:

- ‘Do you have *availability* next week?’ (Student 5, post-test, Appointments);
- ‘*Unfortunately*, I’m unable to take part in your project because I have another project right now’ (Student 2, delayed post-test, Responding to requests);
- Hi, I want to cancel my appointment, I want to *reschedule* it’ (Student 2, post-test, Appointments).

Episodes in Lesson 3 (Resolving Issues). By Lesson 3, the FE group students seemed to have developed a greater intuition for recognizing the pragmatic formulas in the written input. It is worth mentioning that Exercise 1 (warm-up and predicting) in Phase 1 (see Appendix E, Lesson 3) proved to be quite efficient in terms of activating students’ prior knowledge and preparing them for the *Guided noticing* activity in Exercise 2. Exercise 1 also stimulated lively discussions in each observed session when the students shared examples from their personal experiences with the target formulas outside of the classroom. In Lesson 3, for instance, Student 6 shared an example from his own life and described a situation when he had to call a bank to resolve an issue with his debit account. The student commented that at that time it was very difficult for him to express himself because he was under the pressure of real-time interaction; the student then added that he could now appreciate the communicative value of the target formula ‘who should I speak to about ___ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]’. He said: “It makes sense to use this expression in this context”. This prompted the FE group teacher to emphasize that such formulas can be used for many different situations where there is a need to resolve a certain issue. This reinforced the idea of recycling the pragmatic formulas for various speech acts as well as their versatile communicative nature.

Moreover, the students were able to notice those formulas which were not included in the target list for that lesson. For example, Student 1 asked if the utterance ‘Could you tell me why?’ (see Example 8 in Exercise 2 in Appendix E, Lesson 3) could be also considered a pragmatic formula. The researcher had to intervene and comment that this is also a formula, but it was not included on the target list due to feasibility concerns. On the other hand, semantically opaque formulas, such as ‘Can you look into it’ or ‘I was wondering what happened’ continued to pose comprehension challenges for the students and required additional explicit explanations from the FE group teacher. For example, when asked where he would use the formula ‘Can you look into it’, Student 1 speculated that this could be something you would hear from a magician in the circus when they prompt their audience to look inside a magic box. The teacher had to clarify his confusion and explain that the phrasal verb ‘look into’ in this particular context does not literally mean ‘look inside something’⁴⁶.

Episodes in Lesson 4 (Responding to Requests). Lesson 4 focused on the formal register (i.e., workplace interaction). The majority of the pragmatic formulas selected for the teaching intervention in this lesson were semi-fixed or discontinuous (e.g., ‘I could ____ + [promise of future action], if that would help’ or ‘I would usually ____ + [help], but ____ + [excuse]’). As was previously revealed by both utterance analysis and expert judgements, this category of formulas was the most difficult one for the students to reproduce in the post-tests as well as to retain in long-term memory. The analysis of the classroom episodes recorded during this lesson revealed that most students experienced difficulty noticing these formulas in the

⁴⁶ These concerns were later addressed more thoroughly in Phase 2 (‘Deep Cognitive Engagement’).

written input, unless they were explicitly highlighted by the FE group teacher; most students started noticing the formulaic structure of the target formulas only in Phase 3 ('Practice'). For instance, when the target formula 'I could ___+ [promise of future action], if that would help' was discussed again in Exercise 3 (*Speech act analysis*), Student 1 asked, "What does 'that' refer to in 'I could come in a bit earlier if that would help?'". On the other hand, several students were able to notice that the target formula 'I'm afraid I can't do it' was similar to one of the target formulas reviewed in Lesson 2 focusing on cancelling/rescheduling appointments (i.e., 'I'm afraid I need to reschedule') since both formulas contain the softener 'I'm afraid'. Finally, the activities in Lesson 4 prompted the students to pay explicit attention to some topic-related vocabulary, such as 'pressing errands', 'important matters', 'to attend to something'. Once again, the utterance analysis has shown that some of these vocabulary items were used by some FE group students in their post-intervention responses, which suggests that they were learnt incidentally (e.g., 'I would come to... come on Saturday, but I have a function to attend', Student 2, Responding to requests, post-test).

7.1.2. Discovering Form-Function-Context Relationship

Episodes in Lesson 1 (Extending Invitations). The majority of the target pragmatic formulas selected for the teaching intervention in Lesson 1 contained the modal auxiliary 'would' (e.g., 'Would you and your family like to come?'; 'Would love it if you could ____ + [verb]'; 'It would be great to have you there'). This modal verb provoked numerous questions about its functions and the relationship between meaning and form as the students were completing Exercise 2 in Phase 2 ('Deep Cognitive Engagement'). An excerpt from this exercise (both Review 1 and 2) is shown in Figure 13 below. For example, as the students were analyzing the target formulas as part of Review 2 to evaluate the degrees of directness/indirectness, Student

7 asked whether the verb ‘would’ made a speech act sound more direct. The FE group teacher explained that ‘would’ is normally used in English in polite requests; therefore, it normally makes utterances sound more indirect/soft and polite. In addition, the students needed additional explanation about the verb tense in the formula ‘I’m/We’re having a ____ + [noun: barbeque party]’.

Exercise 2. Understanding the implied meaning of the target formulas and explicit metapragmatic explanation

Review 1. Match the pragmatic formulas with their best paraphrased versions. Pay careful attention to the hints provided for you.

- Hope you can make it!
Hint: the verb ‘make’ doesn’t mean ‘make something with your hands’ in this context
- Would love it if you could ____ + [verb: join]
Hint: the phrase ‘would love it’ doesn’t mean ‘have romantic feelings for somebody’ in this context
- It would be great to have you there!
Hint: the verb ‘have’ doesn’t mean ‘own/possess’ in this context
- Please feel free to come on ____ + [date]!
Hint: the phrase ‘feel free’ doesn’t refer to freedom in the literal/direct sense in this context
 - It would be a great pleasure for me if you come
 - It would be great if you are going to be present at my party
 - I hope you are able to come to/join my party
 - Come to the party if you like

Review 2. Review each pragmatic formula again and decide whether each pragmatic formula is a direct or an indirect speech act.

In other words, how direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct	Somewhat direct	Somewhat indirect	Very indirect
-------------	-----------------	-------------------	---------------

Circle or underline the chosen answer.

Hint: Direct speech acts is when the speaker says exactly what he/she means. Indirect speech acts is when the speaker means more than he/she says in reality. Indirect speech acts are generally considered more polite in English.

1. I’m having a ____ + [noun: barbeque party]

How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct	Somewhat direct	Somewhat indirect	Very indirect
-------------	-----------------	-------------------	---------------

Figure 13. An excerpt from the ‘Deep Cognitive Engagement’ phase in the FE approach.

Episodes in Lesson 2 (Cancelling/Rescheduling Appointments). Several prominent signs of deep cognitive engagement with the pragmalinguistic forms were also observed in Lesson 2 (see Appendix E, Lesson 2). During Phase 1 ('Guided Noticing'), the students asked whether the target formulas 'I'm calling to reschedule/cancel my appointment' and 'I need to reschedule my appointment' had the same functional meanings. In particular, the students were wondering if the verbs used as part of these formulas were used in the same tense (present or future). This prompted the FE group teacher to explain the differences in the verb tenses between 'I am calling to...' (Present Progressive tense) and 'I need to...' (Present Simple tense). As the teacher was explaining these differences, Student 1 asked: "If my appointment is in the future, should I use 'I can't make it' or 'I won't be able to make it?'". Both of these formulas were included in the target list for Lesson 2; as for the formula 'I can't make it', it was dealt with more thoroughly in Phase 2 ('Deep Cognitive Engagement') when the students had to look for paraphrased versions of the select target formulas. The hint underneath 'I can't make it' read: "The verb 'make' doesn't mean 'make something with your hands' in this context". In other words, this hint aimed at helping the students to decode the semantic ambiguity of this formula; however, it did not touch upon the grammatical aspect. The formula 'I won't be able to make it', on the other hand, was not included in the matching exercise in Phase 2 since it was considered redundant.

Another example illustrating the need for more careful attention to the language form when dealing with complex semi-fixed pragmatic formulas was an episode when Student 3 asked about the difference between 'I was wondering', a typical English mitigator used as part of 'I was wondering if it would be possible to ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?' formula selected for Lesson 3, and 'I am wondering', another possible variant of the same

mitigator, which was not, however, included into the target list. The students wanted to know if both structures referred to past experiences or actions. The FE group teacher explained that, technically, the structure ‘was wondering’ is used in the Past Progressive tense, whereas ‘am wondering’ is used in the Present Progressive; the teacher further emphasized that, in this context, both structures are used to soften the request to cancel or reschedule an appointment, but the Past Progressive structure is more commonly used by native or proficient speakers of English. Even though the utterance analysis indicated that some FE students were able to retain the semantically ambiguous target formula ‘I can’t make’ as a result of the formula-enhanced treatment (e.g., ‘I’m sorry for my appointment- I can’t make it’, Student 1, post-test; ‘I have an appointment yesterday, but I didn’t make it’, Student 3, post-test), none of the students was able to retain the target formula containing the semi-modal ‘won’t be able to [make it]’.

Episodes in Lesson 3 (Resolving Issues). Two target pragmatic formulas selected for the teaching intervention in Lesson 3 contained mitigators involving the progressive aspect of the past tense (i.e., ‘I *was hoping* you can help me’ and ‘I *was wondering* why this happened’). It is important to note that mitigators containing the verb ‘wonder’ in the Past Progressive appeared to be challenging for the students to process and had previously provoked several form-focused discussions in Lesson 2. In this lesson (see Appendix E, Lesson 3), Student 3 wanted to know why the Past Progressive tense is used in the abovementioned formulas and whether or not it would make a difference in terms of the communicative meaning if the Present Progressive tense was used (as in ‘I *am hoping*’ or ‘I *am wondering*’). The FE group teacher explained that it would not make a big difference in terms of functional meaning of these formulas if the verb ‘to be’ was conjugated in the present tense, but it seems to be more common to use the Past Progressive in English when making polite requests.

Notably, Student 3 was the only participant who managed to retain the nativelike pattern of the target formula ‘I was wondering why this happened’ after the teaching intervention and used it in his response to the post-test scenario (‘I have appointment today with technician. They didn’t show up. I was wondering what happened?’). While the rest of the FE group students did use a variety of other target formulas in their post-intervention responses, nobody, except Student 3, was able to use the formulas containing the target mitigators in the Past Progressive (i.e., ‘I was wondering/hoping’). Student 2, for example, produced an utterance using the Present Simple tense in his delayed post-test response: ‘I can’t get my internet. I want to know... *I hope* that you can help me’. During the second cycle of the qualitative utterance analysis, this utterance was coded as the one that contains minor deviations from the native speaker norm since the student had used the Present Simple tense instead of the Past Progressive.

Episodes in Lesson 4 (Responding to Requests). Several prominent signs of the FE group students’ deep cognitive engagement with meanings, forms, and uses of the target pragmatic formulas were also observed in Lesson 4. Five out of eight target pragmatic formulas selected for the teaching intervention in Lesson 4 contained modal verbs ‘could’ or ‘would’. These verbs and their functional meanings posed apparent difficulties for the students in Lesson 4. In addition, the semi-modal ‘able/unable’ as well as the structure ‘I wish I could’ used to express regret in English caused confusion during the initial phase of the lesson. This was particularly noticeable during the completion of Exercise 2 (Review 1) in Phase 2 of the lesson (see Appendix E, Lesson 4). In this exercise, most students struggled to match the selected pragmatic formulas with their paraphrased versions due to confusions around the exact communicative functions of the modal verbs. For instance, the students had difficulty understanding the functional meaning of the verb pattern ‘would love’ in the target formula ‘I

would love to help, but ____ + [excuse]’, even though the hint provided in the exercise explained it⁴⁷. As a result, the FE group teacher had to provide form-focused explanations regarding the typical functions of the structures ‘would love to do something’ or ‘I wish I could’ to ensure the students clearly understood the meaning of the formulas as they were doing the exercise. After she had finished providing the explanations, the teacher asked the students to share their answers in Exercise 2 (Review 1).

7.1.3. Discovering the Target Notions of Directness, Politeness, and Appropriateness

Episodes in Lesson 1 (Extending Invitations). Another important episode recorded in this lesson pertains to the notions of directness and indirectness in the speech act realization patterns. In Review 2 of Exercise 2 in the ‘Deep Cognitive Engagement’ phase the students were asked to review each pragmatic formula again and decide whether each formula performed a direct or an indirect speech act. In other words, the students were to evaluate how direct the speaker was when they invited their neighbours to the party, on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from very direct to very indirect (see Appendix E, Lesson 1). During the completion of Review 2, the semi-fixed pragmatic formulas containing sophisticated grammatical structures posed more difficulties for the students; therefore, the FE group teacher had to explicitly explain which components of the formulas contributed to the degree of directness or indirectness of the speech acts performed to facilitate the completion of the exercise. In particular, the teacher explained that the longer the phrase is, the more likely it is meant to be indirect, as in the formula ‘Would love it if you could ____ + [verb: join]’. As she explained, such formulas do not imply any

⁴⁷ The hint reads as follows: “The phrase ‘would love it’ doesn’t mean ‘have romantic feelings for somebody’ in this context”.

mandatory actions; on the contrary, they provide the hearer with a choice of accepting or declining an invitation. “It’s the idea of possibility, not necessity”, she commented, and added that the verb ‘would’ makes an invitation “more polite, and *more Canadian*”. As a result, formulas with underlying conditional or hypothetical aspects expressed by the modal ‘would’ (e.g., ‘It would be great to have you there’; ‘Would be happy if you could ____ + [verb: come]’; ‘Would love it if you could ____ + [verb: join]’) were evaluated as somewhat or very indirect by the majority of the students.

It must be noted, however, that the students’ perceptions of directness and politeness did not always coincide with the FE group teacher’s perception; thus, it was not always easy to reach a consensus. Similarly, the inter-rater reliability analysis conducted as part of the expert judgement procedures showed that the level of inter-rater agreement between the judges was lower for the sociopragmatic component of the evaluation rubric, with lower levels of mutual agreement achieved for assessment criteria related to levels of politeness and directness. During this lesson, the formula ‘Hope you can make it’ received mixed responses, with some students evaluating it as ‘very direct’ and others as ‘very indirect’.

Episodes in Lesson 2 (Cancelling/Rescheduling Appointments). Another prominent episode recorded during this lesson was triggered by the notions of degrees of appropriateness, politeness, and amount of the information provided by the speaker in a given speech act. In particular, the target pragmatic formula ‘Something’s come up [and I won’t be able to make my appointment]’ typically used by native or proficient English speakers as an excuse when cancelling or postponing social arrangements such as appointments and meetings, immediately stood out to the students due to its semantically ambiguous nature. In the context of this lesson, this formula carried the function of making an excuse to cancel or reschedule a doctor’s

appointment without mentioning the true reason. This formula was also selected for the matching activity in Exercise 2 (Review 1) in the ‘Deep Cognitive Engagement’ phase. The hint underneath the formula read: “The phrasal verb ‘*come up*’ doesn’t refer to the action of coming in the literal/direct sense in this context”. The FE group teacher explained that this is a typical way of ‘coming up with an excuse not to do something’ in English, and that it is especially valuable from the pragmalinguistic perspective since it provides the L2 learners with the ‘zone of safety’, meaning that if one lacks linguistic resources to formulate an excuse, they can simply use this formula to effectively achieve their communicative goals⁴⁸.

However, the idea of using such an expression to make an excuse seemed to be somewhat unusual for the majority of the students. Initially, the whole class discussion had been centered around decoding the communicative meaning of this formula, but then gradually evolved into a discussion about the cross-cultural differences in the speech act realization patterns. For example, Student 3, who was originally from the Democratic Republic of the Congo and spoke Swahili as his L1, commented that in his culture it is considered uncommon and even impolite to simply say that ‘something has come up’; one must provide a concrete explanation as to why they cannot attend the appointment or any other commitment if they want to save face. Two other students from China (Students 1 and 2) also agreed that in their culture it is more common to provide detailed explanations about the reason behind cancelling an appointment. The utterance analysis of these students’ pre- as well as post-test responses showed that many students indeed attempted to explain the actual reasons behind cancelling an appointment by

⁴⁸ Note that the teacher used simplified language when providing her explanations during the lesson. The author uses formal language when reporting the results of the study and describing the classroom episodes.

using their own creative constructions, sometimes successfully and other time not, to express similar meanings to the ones expressed by the formula ‘Something has come up’.

Episodes in Lesson 3 (Resolving Issues). Two target pragmatic formulas selected for the teaching intervention in Lesson 3 contained mitigators involving the progressive aspect of the past tense (i.e., ‘I *was hoping* you can help me’ and ‘I *was wondering* why this happened’). It is important to note that mitigators containing the verb ‘wonder’ in the Past Progressive appeared to be challenging for the students to process and had previously provoked several form-focused discussions. One prominent exchange was recorded between the FE group teacher and Student 3 during the completion of Exercise 3 (*Speech act analysis*) in Phase 2 (see Appendix E, Lesson 3). In the following conversation, the teacher tries to help the student interpret the communicative functions of the abovementioned mitigators:

FE group teacher: Why do you think that is?

Student 3: It’s more *polite*.

FE group teacher: How do you know it’s more polite?

Student 3: You wanna be nice to them, *you want them to do what you want*.

The comments made by Student 3 in response to the teacher’s questions signal an emerging ability of this student to make a form-function-context connection as well as his increased awareness of what kind of language is needed to make a polite request or inquiry in English. As mentioned earlier, this student was the only participant who managed to retain the nativelike pattern of the target formula ‘I was wondering why this happened’ after the teaching intervention and used it in his response to the post-test scenario (‘I have appointment today with technician. They didn’t show up. *I was wondering* what happened?’).

Episodes in Lesson 4 (Responding to Requests). When reviewing ways of how to refuse managerial requests to work overtime, the FE group students noticed that the native speakers would either formulate their refusals in a firm, but polite manner by using hedges like ‘unfortunately’ or ‘I’m afraid’ preceding the head act (e.g., ‘Unfortunately, I am unable to stay’; ‘I’m afraid I can’t do it’) or offer an alternative option using a corresponding pragmatic formula for that purpose (e.g., ‘I could ____ + [promise of future action], if that would help’). Some Chinese students in the class commented that it is not very common in China to say ‘no’ to your boss because it is considered inappropriate or even rude. For example, Student 1 commented that “If you refuse your boss in China, you can lose your end-of-the-year bonus, but if you always say yes, you can get a promotion”. Indeed, this student’s workplace culture is reflected in his delayed post-test response, which highlights his approach to handling managerial requests: “If you think this project is emergency, I can cancel my holiday and after I finish this project, I will continue to do new project”. The FE group teacher explained that it is not considered rude to refuse your manager’s requests in Canada, as long as one has a good reason for it. This incident transformed into a vibrant whole class discussion in which the students shared some examples from their own professional experiences and compared Canadian workplace culture with that in their home countries.

7.2. Trends Recorded during the AR Instructional Treatment

7.2.1. Noticing Pragmatic Formulas in the Input

Episodes in Lesson 1 (Extending Invitations). Similar to the FE group students, the students in the AR group experienced difficulty following the instructional prompts in their booklets during the very first lesson of the pedagogical sequence (see Appendix F, Lesson 1) and needed some time to become familiar with the suggested format of the lesson. In Phase 1

(‘Exploration and awareness-raising’), Exercise 1 (*Brainstorming and metapragmatic explanation*) prompted the students to brainstorm their possible responses to the scenario of that week⁴⁹ first in their native languages, and then think of how they would respond to the same scenario in English. The majority of the English versions of the students’ responses to the invitation scenario contained utterances like ‘Can you come’ or ‘Please, can you come’. It is worth mentioning that the utterance analysis confirmed that the speech event of *Extending invitations* had produced one of the highest numbers of repetitive uses of the modal verb ‘can’ (see Appendix K for examples of students’ utterances). Plenty of such repetitive utterances were recorded in the AR students’ responses to the pre-test scenario as well as in their responses to the post- and delayed post-tests, which suggests that due to the lack of pragmalinguistic resources, the students were constantly resorting to the same formulas when performing the target speech act.

After the students had read the native speaker responses to the same scenario in Exercise 2 (*Lay cross-cultural analysis*), they were asked to compare those responses with their own answers and identify any similarities or differences. Surprisingly, most students reported that they did not find their responses different from those of the native speakers, even though none of the responses provided by the students contained the semantically ambiguous target pragmatic formulas like ‘Hope you can make it’, ‘It would be great to have you’, or ‘Would love it if you could __ + [join us]’. Furthermore, the students’ versions of the invitations, for the most part, sounded more formal (e.g., ‘Hello, I would like to invite you because my daughter has birthday party’, Student 5), whereas the native speaker responses were more casual (e.g., ‘Come by if you

⁴⁹ In Lesson 1- Inviting one’s neighbours to a barbeque party.

are free'; 'Feel free to come on ____ + [date]!'). When the AR group teacher asked if the students understood their meanings, most students nodded their heads in agreement. However, it later became obvious that the students, in fact, had a very superficial understanding of these formulas' functional meanings. At the end of Exercise 2 the students were asked to reflect on how different the native speaker responses were from their own L1s (see Appendix F for the questions), but the students were unable to properly reflect on the cross-linguistic differences between the responses since they misinterpreted the meaning of the abovementioned non-transparent formulas.

Episodes in Lesson 2 (Cancelling/rescheduling Appointments). In Lesson 2, when asked to provide their own potential responses to this lesson's scenario in Exercise 1 (*Brainstorming and metapragmatic explanation*), most students either directly copied the native speaker responses from the written input in Exercise 2 (see Appendix F, Lesson 2) or provided their own versions, which were, for the most part, repetitive instances of utterances like 'I'm sorry, I can't come' or 'Can you give me another appointment, please?'. Moreover, when the students were reviewing the native speaker responses in Exercise 2, several participants noticed that it was not common for the native speakers to explicitly state the reason for cancelling or rescheduling their appointments; instead, an overwhelming majority of the native speaker respondents used the pragmatic formulas 'Something has come up' or 'I can't/won't be able to make it' (see Appendix A). On the contrary, many AR group students did provide their reasons very explicitly when they brainstormed their own responses, such as 'My child is sick' or 'I have to take my daughter to her appointment'. When Student 11 asked the teacher if it was necessary to provide a reason every time one cancels or reschedules an appointment in English, the AR group teacher replied: "It is not absolutely necessary in this context, but maybe it's more polite to give your reasons... Sometimes it's nicer to give your reasons".

However, given the pedagogical nature of Exercise 2, the students were not explicitly prompted to notice the pragmatic formulas in the written input; as a result, the AR students were unable to consciously engage with the native speaker responses provided in Exercise 2, they could not appreciate the variety of pragmalinguistic forms available to perform the same speech act. In the Practice phase, when asked to do the role-play task, the students kept relying on their ‘comfort zone’ formulas, such as ‘I can’t come’, and this tendency was maintained even after the teaching intervention (see the detailed analysis of the AR group students post-intervention responses in the previous sections of this chapter). Moreover, attention to individual vocabulary items was lost during the AR lesson. No instances of student-generated questions about the meanings of such topic-related vocabulary as ‘reschedule’, ‘opening’, or ‘availability’ were recorded during this lesson, as opposed to the same lesson in the FE group. Unless the AR group teacher herself initiated explicit explanations, the students did not seem to be fully engaged with the content of the lesson.

Episodes in Lesson 3 (Resolving Issues). In Lesson 3, most AR group students directly copied the responses to the suggested scenario (see Appendix F, Lesson 3) from the written input in Exercise 2 when brainstorming their own potential answers in Phase 1; the previously observed tendency was, therefore, maintained. Examples of possible responses provided by the students at this stage were almost identical to their responses to the oral DCRPs both before and after the teaching intervention, which has also been confirmed by the utterance analysis (e.g., ‘Please, return back the money’; ‘Please help me’; ‘Please, I want my money’; ‘I hope you help me, please’). The same tendency was observed during the Practice phase, when the students tried to sound similar to the native speaker model and, essentially, ended up reproducing the target formulas using their own language (see more examples in the previous sections of this chapter).

It became apparent during the observation of this lesson that the AR group students, especially the lower-level ones, experienced confusion when encountering the formulas as they read the native speaker responses in Exercise 2. For instance, when the AR group teacher asked them to read the native speaker responses out loud, the students had difficulty reading the sentences containing the semantically opaque formula ‘Can you look into it’ or the formulas containing mitigators in the Past Progressive tense, such as ‘I was wondering why this happened’ or ‘I was hoping you could help me’; at times, some students even paused in order to process the meanings.

One critical incident recorded during Lesson 3 especially highlights the fact that the students’ noticing of how the same speech act can be performed by means of different formulas occurred at a very superficial level, if at all, during the instructional treatment in the AR group. When the class was discussing the questions aimed at enhancing the cross-cultural awareness in Exercise 2, most students, just like during the two previous lessons, said that they did not find any major differences between their own responses and the native speaker responses they had reviewed. To respond to these comments, the AR group teacher rightfully pointed out that during the brainstorming stage many of the students simply used the question word ‘*why*’ when resolving imaginary issues with their home insurance (as per the scenario of that week), as opposed to most native speakers, who inquired about a possible resolution of the issue in a more indirect way using mitigators ‘I was wondering/hoping’. When the teacher pointed that out, one of the students commented: “We said the only word ‘*why*’ *because it’s difficult for us to say the full sentence*”.

Episodes in Lesson 4 (Responding to Requests). Since Lesson 4 focused on a formal register, the students needed more time and teacher’s guidance to make sense of the scenario of

that week and understand what exactly they were required to do (see Appendix F, Lesson 4). According to the instructional prompt in Exercise 2, the students had to imagine themselves in a workplace situation during a potential interaction with their manager who is asking them to stay for several extra hours after work. Since many of the students did not have any Canadian work experience or any previous office work experience at the time of the teaching intervention, it was challenging for them to brainstorm their potential answers first in their language and later in English. Some students simply sat quietly and did not write anything in their booklets⁵⁰. During the lesson, one of the students raised her hand and said: “Teacher, everybody is quiet because we don’t understand”. The atmosphere in the classroom became more tense, which created extra pressure for the AR group teacher who had to spend a sufficient chunk of classroom time explaining the scenario to the students to help them brainstorm their own answers. When the class was finally able to share their responses, the most popular response to manager’s request to work extra hours was the phrase ‘Sorry, I can’t stay’, which has also been recorded multiple times during the utterance analysis both before and after the teaching intervention (see previous sections of this chapter).

Moreover, none of the students offered an alternative option or used any hedging devices to make their refusals more diplomatic/polite⁵¹. Apparently, those native speaker responses that contained the ‘alternative help option’ component were opaque to the AR group students, so they

⁵⁰ On the contrary, in the FE approach, the students were given several examples of pragmatic formulas from the NS corpus and asked to predict some possible situations in which they could encounter or use such ‘phrases’, which proved to be more pedagogically feasible.

⁵¹ Offering an alternative help option was a common pragmatic strategy used by the native speaker respondents (see Appendix A).

did not recognize them as formulaic responses; in addition, the ‘alternative help option’ component was typically expressed by the semi-fixed pragmatic formulas, which have proven to be the most challenging to notice and process for the students in both treatment groups. Since no scaffolding was provided in the AR approach to help the students decode these formulas and elicit them from the written input, they remained invisible to the students.

7.2.2. Discovering the Target Notions of Directness, Politeness, and Appropriateness

It is important to bear in mind that the researcher had originally planned to replicate the 6R approach to teaching pragmatics designed by Martinez-Flor and Uso-Juan (2006); however, since the 6R approach was designed primarily for university-level students, it had been decided that it would not be feasible to implement this approach in the LINC classroom given the nature of the LINC program as well as its unique student population. Consequently, a more suitable, hybrid version of the awareness-raising instructional sequence was designed for the teaching intervention in the AR group. This approach has incorporated some common features of major pedagogical approaches to speech acts teaching reported in the literature on instructional pragmatics (e.g., Usó-Juan & Martínez-Flor, 2007; Cohen, 2005, 2008; Cruz, 2013, 2015)⁵². As opposed to the FE approach, which included Phase 2 aimed at stimulating deep cognitive engagement with explicit instruction of the target pragmatic formulas before the Practice phase, in the AR approach the pragmatic formulas were not explicitly taught since it is assumed in this approach that L2 should be able to notice formulas in the input by means of the awareness-raising activities.

⁵² See a detailed overview of the hybrid version of the AR pedagogical sequence in Chapter 4.

Model Lesson Episode (Modifying the Original Versions of the Booklets). After the model lesson had been piloted⁵³, the AR group teacher insisted that the learner version of the booklet be modified since the students struggled with understanding metalanguage as well as abstract terms. In addition, the metapragmatic explanation took an extensive amount of class time, which was risky given the fact that only two hours were allocated for the purpose of the teaching intervention each week. Therefore, the AR group teacher asked for several exercises to be excluded from the booklet or simplified; other exercises had been merged or their order of appearance in the booklet had changed. As a result, the finalized version of the instructional sequence used in the AR approach included two main phases: ‘Awareness-raising’ and ‘Practice’. The main pedagogical objective of Exercise 2 (*Awareness-raising and group discussion*) in the original version of the learner’s booklet was to help the students realize how such factors as social distance as well as degrees of power and imposition can affect language choices made by the speakers. Nevertheless, the students were clearly overwhelmed by these theoretical explanations and did not seem to understand the purpose of this activity. As one of the students pointed out during the pilot lesson, “Not everybody *studied enough* to understand these things”.

Episodes in Lesson 1 (Extending Invitations). As part of Exercise 1 (*Brainstorming and metapragmatic explanation*) in Phase 1 (‘Exploration and awareness-raising’) of the modified version of the instructional sequence in the AR approach, the students were also asked to think about the degrees of social distance, power, and imposition (i.e., potential risks or consequences) involved in the proposed social interaction scenario. The AR group teacher was

⁵³ The model lesson focused on the speech event of rejecting a sales offer at a shopping mall.

provided with a script to help her explain these notions to the students as they were completing this activity (see Appendix F, Lesson 1). Two major challenges were observed at this stage of the lesson.

First, the students kept wondering why they had been asked to write their responses in their L1s; clearly, the students lacked motivation to do this activity since they could not understand the rationale behind it. This put the AR group teacher under additional pressure of trying to explain the objective of this activity, which was to promote the students' awareness of the cross-linguistic differences in the speech act realization patterns. Second, the teacher did not have a full control of this activity since she did not speak the students' L1s (i.e., Arabic, Nepali, Somali, and Farsi) and, therefore, could not be certain of whether their responses to the scenario made sense. After the students had finished brainstorming their native language responses, the AR group teacher asked what their English language equivalents would be. The majority of the students took out their phones and started looking for answers on Google translate; others prematurely turned to Exercise 2 (*Lay cross-cultural analysis*), in which the native speaker responses were provided for them, and started to randomly copy the answers from it.

Episodes in Lesson 2 (Cancelling/rescheduling Appointments). As mentioned previously, one of the major observations made during the teaching intervention in the AR group was the fact that the students did not seem to be able to notice and accurately interpret the formulas containing mitigators such as 'I'm afraid [I can't make my appointment]' as well as other semantically ambiguous formulas (e.g., 'Something has come up'). This once again became evident during the completion of Exercise 3 (*Speech act analysis*) when the students had difficulty distinguishing between direct and indirect speech acts. When evaluating the speech acts containing formulas with the mitigator 'I'm afraid' (e.g., 'I am afraid I can't make it'; 'I am

afraid I need to reschedule my appointment’), the majority of the students answered ‘direct’ or ‘very direct’, despite the AR group teacher’s effort to explain that the mitigator ‘I’m afraid’ makes this speech act more indirect and, consequently, more polite. The students did not seem to be able to make conscious choices when evaluating the degrees of directness of the target speech acts and continued to randomly guess the answers since they did not fully understand the functional meanings of the formulas. When the teacher asked them to explain the rationale behind their choices, none of the students was able to provide a reasonable explanation.

Episodes in Lesson 3 (Resolving Issues). Similar to Lesson 2, in this lesson the AR group students experienced major difficulties during the completion of Exercise 3 (*Speech act analysis*) when evaluating the target speech acts containing semantically ambiguous formulas in terms of their degrees of politeness. In Lesson 3, these formulas were ‘Can you look into it?’, ‘I was hoping you can help me’, and ‘I was wondering why this happened?’. As mentioned earlier, most students preferred to use the question word ‘why’ when brainstorming their possible answers. A typical student’s response would have the following underlying semantic formula (i.e., pragmatic pattern): (1) explain the issue/provide contextual information; (2) directly inquire about the reason using the question word ‘why’ (e.g., ‘I check with insurance, I cancel direct. Why?’, Student 8, pre-test; ‘I cancelled before my car insurance, but I check my accounting bank, it take more money for this month, but before I cancelled this plan. Why?’, Student 11, pre-test). When the students were reviewing some typical native speaker pragmatic patterns in Exercise 3, they did not seem to comprehend that the native speakers tended to use a variety of mitigators to make their requests sound more diplomatic (hence, more polite). In other words, the students would evaluate the utterance/formulas such as ‘I was wondering why this happened?’ or ‘Why would that be’ as ‘very direct’ simply because they recognized the word ‘why’ in it.

On the other hand, most AR group students did not have difficulty analyzing such formulas as ‘Can you please check if ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?’ or ‘Could you tell me why?’. The students seemed to be familiar with formulas starting with ‘can you’ or ‘could you’ and were able to recognize that the modal verb ‘could’ or the intensifier ‘please’ normally make requests or inquiries more polite in English. As has also been confirmed by the utterance analysis, these were the most commonly used structures by the AR group students both before and after the teaching intervention, which resulted in multiple instances of formula overuse⁵⁴ as well as stabilized non-target uses recorded in this particular speech even both before and after the teaching intervention (see previous sections of this chapter). However, while the FE group students have managed to reduce the number of repetitive formulas and used a bigger variety of the target-like formulas after the pedagogical treatment, most AR group participants continued using the structures they were familiar with. The tendency to overly use the question word ‘why’ when formulating inquiries the AR group has continued after the teaching intervention, as was illustrated by the utterance analysis (e.g., ‘Hi, my name is ____, I check with insurance, I cancel direct. *Why?*’, Student 8, pre-test; ‘I have appointment today for my internet at 10 o’clock, but not come early. *Why?*’, Student 8, post-test; ‘I last month cancel for my car insurance. Now, I check for bank money, you sent money. *Why?*’, Student 10, pre-test; ‘Hi, my name is _____. How about the technician? Late...Not here yet. *Why?* I wait a lot time’, Student 10, post-test).

⁵⁴ According to the results of the qualitative utterance analysis, the biggest number of repetitive formulas was recorded in the speech event of *Resolving issues*.

Episodes in Lesson 4 (Responding to Requests). As noted previously, the written input selected for Lesson 4 and presented in Exercise 2 (*Lay cross-cultural analysis*) contained many semi-fixed or discontinuous pragmatic formulas which remained invisible to the AR group students due to their semantically opaque nature. When the students were reviewing the responses provided by the native speakers in Exercise 2, one of the participants, who seemed to be quite frustrated from the very beginning of the lesson, asked: “Why are we talking about the same situation all the time?”. The student was referring to the eight different responses to the same scenario collected from eight different native speakers provided as part of the written input in Exercise 2. Since she was unable to recognize that there could be multiple ways to express the same speech act, she felt like this exercise was redundant, or even pointless. Such superficial engagement with the pragmalinguistic forms has impacted the AR students’ ability to capture the sociopragmatic nuances of the target speech acts during the completion of Exercise 3. The observational evidence suggests that the students did not seem to recognize which part of the response (i.e., pragmatic pattern) stood for making an excuse, expressing regret, offering help, or refusing manager’s request and whether the responses varied in terms of the degrees of directness.

7.3. Discussion

The content analysis of the classroom episodes revealed different trajectories in the development of the student participants’ pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities over the course of the 4-week instructional treatment. The FE group participants showed multiple signs of deep cognitive engagement with the input on both sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic levels, which led to the long-term retention of the target pragmatic formulas in the students’ memory as well as students’ own discovery of the target pragmatic conventions (Takahashi, 2013). This was

also confirmed by the qualitative utterance analysis of the FE group students' post-intervention responses as well as higher pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic scores assigned by the expert judges for these students' post-intervention responses. In contrast, the AR group participants showed signs of superficial cognitive engagement with the input, which impeded their ability to properly notice and accurately interpret the functional meanings of the target pragmatic formulas as well comprehend abstract metapragmatic notions of directness, politeness, and contextual appropriateness.

The abovementioned qualitative differences between the learning outcomes may be explained by the *different levels of comprehension* or *depth of cognitive processing of input* achieved by the participants in each treatment group (Gass, 1997; Leow, 2015)⁵⁵. The fact that multiple episodes pertaining to the students' discovery of form-function-context relationship were recorded during the classroom observation of the FE instructional treatment suggests that the FE approach to speech act teaching can be considered more effective from both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic perspectives since it led to a *high level of cognitive processing*, which, in turn, resulted in *conscious* awareness or awareness at the level of *understanding* (Leow, 2015; Takahashi, 2013). In contrast, no episodes pertaining to the students' discovery of form-function-context relationship were recorded during the classroom observation of the AR instructional treatment, which suggests that the AR approach to speech act teaching can be considered less effective for enhancing both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of pragmatic competence since it led to a *low level of cognitive*

⁵⁵ The depth of processing is understood here as the amount of cognitive effort and level of analysis involved in the process of decoding grammatical or lexical items in the input (Leow, 2015).

processing, which, in turn, resulted in *awareness at the level of noticing* (Leow, 2015).

Takahashi (2013) maintains that “[Pragmatic] awareness at the level of understanding is a must but should be considered as the *minimal* condition for substantial pragmatic development” (p. 3, emphasis in the original). While the FE group participants demonstrated signs of high level of cognitive effort when processing target items (Leow, 2015), the AR group participants seemed to remain at the level of noticing, which implies weak potential for processing target grammatical and pragmatic forms and does not guarantee successful acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence (Leow, 2015; Bardovi-Harlig, 2009).

7.3.1. Signs of Deep Cognitive Engagement during the FE Instructional Treatment

The results of the content analysis of the classroom episodes recorded during the FE instructional treatment suggest that the major pedagogical advantage of the FE approach is that it places equal emphasis on both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of the L2 pragmatic ability during the lesson. The collected observational evidence suggests that the activities aimed at stimulating deep cognitive engagement with and retention of the target pragmatic formulas used in the FE approach (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009) created multiple opportunities for the student participants in this group to build appropriate form-function-context connections (Schmidt, 1993) and to discover the target pragmatic conventions by engaging in the active cognitive comparison of their own pragmatic performance with the target-like norm (Takahashi, 2013).

Noticing Pragmatic Formulas in the Input. Since the pragmatic formulas were placed at the centre of each FE lesson, the students in this treatment group had an opportunity to notice that there could be multiple verbal ways of performing the same speech act. In Phase 1 of the FE instructional sequence, the students engaged in various activities grouped under the umbrella of

‘Guided Noticing’, the concept borrowed from Bardovi-Harlig and Vellenga (2012). These activities involved predicting the situations in which target pragmatic formulas can occur as well as identifying and underlying target formulas in written input under the teacher’s supervision. This approach can be considered similar to the ‘Guided Induction’ method of explicit instruction in which teachers help learners co-construct rules by directing their attention to relevant aspects of the input and asking guiding questions and is believed to lead to greater levels of awareness of the L2 structure (Cerezo, Caras, & Leow, 2016).

The observational evidence reported earlier suggests that the ‘Guided Noticing’ phase helped the FE group students to develop an ability to recognize the target pragmatic formulas in the written input. Moreover, the fact that several students reported that they had encountered and were able to recognize some of the target pragmatic formulas during interactions with native speakers outside of the classroom (see episodes recorded in Lesson 1) suggests that the FE approach to speech act teaching can help L2 learners become more strategic users of the target language and has potential for training L2 learners to become collectors of authentic language samples (Cohen, 2005, 2008). Finally, the explicit explanations provided by the FE group teacher during the ‘Guided Noticing’ phase helped clarify confusions the students initially had about the functional meanings of such semantically ambiguous formulas as ‘Feel free to + ____’, ‘I can’t make it’ or ‘Can you look into it?’ (see episodes recorded in Lesson 1, 2, and 3). Such explicit explanations are believed to be helpful in preventing negative L1 transfer since they can help learners analyze their own pragmatic deficiencies and prompt them to engage in the cognitive comparison of their own performance with that of the native speakers (House, 1996; Takahashi, 2005, 2013; Takimoto, 2007).

Discovering Form-Function-Context Relationship. Multiple instances of student-generated questions about the form, meaning, and contextual use of the target formulas recorded during the FE instructional treatment indicate high levels of cognitive engagement with both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of the target speech events among the FE group participants. The carefully designed exercises in the FE instructional sequence prompted the students to engage in ‘conscious problem solving’ (Schmidt, 1993) and operate at a higher level of cognitive effort when trying to process and retain the target formulas (Leow, 2015). The results of the analysis of the classroom episodes recorded during Phase 2 (‘Deep Cognitive Engagement’) in the FE treatment group suggest that the main signs of the deep cognitive engagement with the input were associated with the numerous questions posed by the FE group students about the grammatical structures which were part of the formulaic frame of the target pragmatic formulas (see episodes reported under *Discovering form-function-context relationship* trend). Notably, the students needed additional form-focused explanations when dealing with semi-fixed pragmatic formulas containing fillable slots as part of their complex grammatical structures (e.g., ‘I would love to help, but ____ + [excuse]’; ‘I am not able to make it/I won’t be able to make it’; ‘I was wondering if + ____/I am wondering if + ____’). While these grammar-related explanations were unplanned and took considerable chunks of classroom time, they turned out to be essential to the students’ overall ability to cope with the activities in Phase 2 (see, for example, episodes recorded in Lesson 3).

The fact that the students faced additional challenges when dealing with the semi-fixed pragmatic formulas containing fillable slots as part of their sophisticated grammatical structures (e.g., ‘I could ____ + [promise of future action], if that would help’) suggests that it might not be enough to focus solely on the semantic aspect of the pragmatic formulas in order to ensure their

successful acquisition as well as long-term retention. While the vocabulary teaching techniques aimed at stimulating deep cognitive engagement and retention in memory borrowed from Boers and Lindstromberg (2009)⁵⁶ proved to be quite effective when dealing with semantically ambiguous pragmatic formulas (e.g., ‘I can’t make it’), the FE approach did not include any specific form-focused activities that could have helped the students to better process the complex underlying grammatical structures of the target formulas since this aspect was beyond the scope of the present study’s intervention. These observations suggest that more fine-tuned, form-focused instruction techniques are needed when dealing with pragmatic formulas containing grammatically complex structures as part of their slot-and-frame patterns. This could be achieved by ‘reuniting’ grammar and pragmatics, as has been suggested in the number of previous studies (Kasper, 2001; Bardovi-Harlig, 2003; Rose, 2012; Félix-Brasdefer & Cohen, 2012), and integrating the state-of-the-art principles of form-focused instruction (Ranta & Lyster, 2018) into the existing models of speech act teaching.

Discovering the Target Notions of Directness, Politeness, and Appropriateness.

Despite the fact that no explicit explanations about the social distance, power, or imposition values were included in the design of the FE lessons, the students in this treatment group were able to notice the differences between speech act realization patterns in English and their own L1s by studying and analyzing the target pragmatic formulas. The FE group teacher provided clarifications and explicit explanations when the need arose, as opposed to dictating them to the students in a top-down fashion. For example, several episodes⁵⁷ recorded during the FE

⁵⁶ The author refers to the hints provided in Review 1 of Exercise 2 in the ‘Deep Cognitive Engagement’ phase.

⁵⁷ See, for example, episodes recorded in Lessons 1, 2, and 4.

instructional treatment showed that the students' perceptions of the target norms of directness or indirectness varied and were not always consistent with the FE teacher's perceptions when evaluating the relevant degrees of directness or indirectness of the speech acts expressed by the target pragmatic formulas in Exercise 2 of the 'Deep Cognitive Engagement' phase⁵⁸. However, the students were reminded that objective of this exercise was not to look for crystal clear answers on whether or not a certain speech act was direct or indirect, but to provide the learners with another opportunity to review the target formulas in order to facilitate their retention in the long-term memory, enhance the students' understanding of form-function-context connections, and help promote the idea of having multiple verbal means to express degrees of directness, depending on the contextual factors. Based on this observation, it can be concluded that the speech act teaching model put forth in the FE approach is a good illustration of how "the learning about pragmatic norms can be [and probably should be] viewed as being co-constructed by both teachers and learners, rather than purely inductive or deductive" (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010, p. 117).

7.3.2. Signs of Superficial Cognitive Engagement during the AR Instructional Treatment

As opposed to the instructional treatment in the FE group, no episodes pertaining to 'discovery of the form-function-context relationship' trend were recorded during the instructional treatment in the AR group. The results of the analysis of the classroom observation suggests that the awareness-raising activities implemented in the AR approach failed to create opportunities for building conscious form-function-context connections (Schmidt, 1993) and did

⁵⁸ The author refers to Review 2 of Exercise 2 (*Understanding the implied meaning of the target formulas*) in the FE instructional sequence.

not facilitate the learning of the target pragmalinguistic forms (i.e., target pragmatic formulas) necessary for successful speech act performance. Moreover, the deductive (i.e., explicit) instruction method used in the AR approach emphasized metapragmatic information over functional meaning of the target speech acts and led to ‘false illusions of understanding’ (Shaffer, 1989, as cited in Cerezo, Caras, & Leow, 2016).

Noticing and Interpreting Semantically Ambiguous Formulas. The observational evidence suggests that the AR group participants were unable to notice and accurately interpret the semantically ambiguous pragmatic formulas in the written input since insufficient attention to the pragmalinguistic form was provided during the AR instructional treatment. It seems reasonable to conclude that the AR students were unable to notice alternative ways of performing the same speech act expressed by means of the target pragmatic formulas most likely because they were both distracted and overwhelmed by trying to compare their own L1 answers to those provided by the native speakers during the completion of the first two exercises in Phase 1⁵⁹ (‘Exploration and Awareness-raising’). Since the format of the AR instructional treatment did not require the teacher to pay specific attention to the pragmatic formulas, it was left to the students to decode the functional meanings of the target pragmatic formulas. In the FE approach, on the contrary, target pragmatic formulas, such as ‘Something has come up’ or ‘I can’t make it’, were considered semantically ambiguous and were dealt with in a rigorous manner by providing the students with hints and other explicit explanations to help ensure they can properly acquire them as well as retain in the long-term.

⁵⁹ The author refers to Exercise 1 (*Brainstorming and metapragmatic explanation*) and Exercise 2 (*Lay cross-cultural analysis*).

Discovering Form-Function Context Relationship. The analysis of the AR lessons' audio recording as well as field notes and other observational evidence revealed that, when reviewing the native speaker answers in Exercise 2 (*Lay cross-cultural analysis*) and Exercise 3 (*Speech act analysis*), the students could only grasp the general meanings of those responses which enabled them to notice that the pragmatic patterns (i.e., semantic formulas) used by the native speakers were similar to the semantic formulas used in their own L1s. In Lesson 1, for example, both students and the native speakers would base their invitations on a similar semantic formula: (1) provide some background information about the event (i.e., place, time, number of guests, etc.); (2) extend an invitation (the head speech act); (3) express hopes that a potential guest will be there. Thus, from the sociopragmatic perspective, the students' answers were similar to those of the native speakers. On the contrary, from the pragmalinguistic perspective, the students' answers did not contain any of the target pragmatic formulas, nor did the students recognize those formulas in the written input provided in Exercise 2. This became even more obvious in Phase 2 ('Practice'), when the students did not seem to understand that they could use the written input containing the pragmatic formulas from Exercise 2 in Phase 1 to help them with the role-play task.

The analysis of the classroom episodes showed that the AR group students mostly relied on their L1s when performing their role-plays in the Practice phase, which led to multiple instances of negative transfer, and used expressions similar to those they had brainstormed in Exercise 1 of Phase 1. As for Exercise 3 (*Speech act analysis*), the evidence collected during the classroom observation in this treatment group showed that this exercise appeared to be too sophisticated for the students since no previous scaffolding was provided. As a result, the students kept relying on the AR group teacher who was dictating the correct answers to the

students. Since there was very little engagement from the students, they could not fully benefit from this exercise. The FE group students, on the contrary, did not seem to have any major challenges with the *Speech act analysis* exercise since the preceding activities in the ‘Deep Cognitive Engagement’ phase had adequately prepared them to deal with it.

Discovering the Target Notions of Directness, Politeness, and Appropriateness.

Literature on instructional pragmatics suggests that providing L2 learners with explicit metapragmatic information does not always guarantee pragmatic fluency (House, 1996; Takahashi, 2010). The observational evidence gathered during the AR instructional treatment in the current study suggests that explicit metapragmatic explanations provided as part of the AR treatment to raise the students’ awareness about the metapragmatic notions of social distance, power, and imposition did not seem to help the participants in this treatment group notice the link between these factors and how they may affect language choices during social interaction. Moreover, while the AR group students experienced multiple challenges with comprehending complex metalinguistic concepts, the AR group teacher had a hard time explaining these concepts to the students using plain language. The extensive amount of explicit metapragmatic explanations confused the students and, having had no control over the pragmalinguistic aspect of the target speech acts, the students were unable to consciously reflect on cross-cultural/linguistic differences in the speech act realization patterns; nor were the students able to fully benefit from the *Speech act analysis* exercise since they could not capture the nuances of the pragmatic patterns (i.e., semantic formulas) common for the English language speech act realization. This placed an additional burden on the AR group teacher, who was constantly faced with the students’ resistance to following the suggested lesson format.

The results of the classroom observation analysis suggest that in order to be able to evaluate the degrees of directness or indirectness in a given speech act and adjust the verbal choices accordingly, the students need to have full control over the pragmalinguistic aspect; in other words, the L2 learners need to be able to recognize the pragmatic formulas in the input as well as accurately interpret their functional meanings before they can make appropriate sociopragmatic judgements. Despite the fact that even the new simplified version of the AR learners' booklet was not well received by the students, it was impossible for the researcher to make more adjustments to it without risking to alter the quasi-experimental nature of the study. It is important to bear in mind that the main purpose of the teaching intervention in the AR group was to put the currently available approaches to speech act teaching to the test and see if they are effective when implemented in the LINC classroom.

Chapter 8: Conclusions, Implications, and Future Directions

In this concluding chapter the author provides a recap of major findings of the present study, comments on its theoretical and practical implications, acknowledges the study's limitations, and outlines potential directions for future research.

8.1. Major Findings: Research Questions 1 and 2

1. Is a formula-enhanced approach to speech act teaching more effective than the awareness-raising approach in terms of enhancing both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities of L2 learners?

2. What signs of interlanguage formula development are observed in the formula-enhanced treatment group and in the awareness-raising treatment group before and after the pedagogical intervention and are these signs different?

The first research objective of the present study was to investigate whether the innovative FE approach to speech act teaching is more effective than the traditional AR approach in terms of enhancing both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities of L2 learners. In order to measure and compare the efficacy of both approaches and determine how pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities of the student participants in both treatment groups evolved after the instructional intervention, the researcher conducted the two-cycle qualitative utterance analysis of the transcript data collected from the student participants in response to four oral DCRPs based on the four target speech events (i.e., social interaction; customer service interaction; workplace interaction) to record any signs of interlanguage formula development that could be observed in both treatment groups before and after the pedagogical intervention. In addition, three trained expert judges were employed to diagnostically assess each student's sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic ability in order to complement the findings of the qualitative utterance

analysis and obtain more robust evidence to support the claim that the FE approach to speech act teaching can be more effective than the AR approach in terms of enhancing both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities of the L2 learners.

All in all, the findings have highlighted the value of pragmatic formulas for successful speech act realization. The key functions of pragmatic formulas in enhancing L2 pragmatic competence can be summarized as follows:

- pragmatic formulas can contribute to lexical richness and nativelikeness of expression when performing target speech acts
- pragmatic formulas can boost L2 grammatical competence and help ‘cure’ inaccurate lexical and grammatical choices, which can impede L2 pragmalinguistic ability
- pragmatic formulas can prevent negative transfer from L1 or overreliance on the same formula when producing various speech acts
- pragmatic formulas, if used appropriately, can help L2 learners formulate concise and error-free utterances when performing target speech acts, which contributes to the efficacy of interaction
- the lack of appropriate formulas or their misapplication in a given speech act can impede sociopragmatic performance and, consequently, lead to pragmatic failures.

The results of both qualitative utterance analysis and expert judgements suggest that the FE approach to speech act teaching can be considered more effective in terms of enhancing both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of L2 pragmatic competence. As for the pragmalinguistic aspect, the FE group students not only produced a higher number of targetlike pragmatic formulas after the instructional treatment but also demonstrated an ability to utilize the

target formulas in a creative and flexible manner, whereas the AR group students continued relying on the same formulas, most of which were stabilized non-nativelike overuses of the same formula. The fact that creatively nativelike utterances were recorded in the FE group after the teaching intervention in three out of four target speech events suggests that the formula-enhanced instruction had triggered those interlanguage developmental processes responsible for the acquisition of the target syntactical structures. In addition, the shift towards production of nativelike formulas with only minor grammatical discrepancies observed in the FE group after the instructional treatment suggests that focused instruction of pragmatic formulas can not only enhance L2 learners' pragmatic competence, but also improve their grammatical competence.

As for the sociopragmatic aspect, the results showed that the FE group participants utilized a higher number of the target pragmatic formulas containing various hedges and other mitigation devices as part of their formulaic frames in such speech events as *Resolving Issues* or *Responding to requests*, which led to the improvement of these students' sociopragmatic ability after the instructional treatment. On the contrary, most students in the AR treatment group produced conventionally indirect speech acts without any hedging or other mitigation devices normally used by native or proficient English speakers to express politeness in requests; this was explained by the lack of adequate pragmalinguistic resources needed for performing the target speech acts. As a result, the AR group students' sociopragmatic ability was evaluated as low or low-medium by the expert judges even after the instructional treatment.

Finally, the results revealed that the target pragmatic formulas of the semi-fixed (discontinuous) type with complex grammatical and syntactic structures as part of their formulaic frames (e.g., 'I would love to help, but ____ + [excuse]'; 'I am not able to make it/I won't be able to make it'; 'I was wondering if + ____/I am wondering if + ____') presented the biggest challenge

for the students in both treatment groups in terms of the pragmalinguistic aspect, and none of the participants was able to retain such formulas in a purely target-like form even after the teaching intervention. This was explained by the fact that the accurate production of complex semi-fixed formulas typical for these speech events would require an advanced level of grammatical proficiency. At the same time, the results of the present study suggest that the FE approach may expedite L2 learners' progression to higher levels of both pragmatic and grammatical proficiency; in other words, L2 learners may achieve pragmatic fluency by acquiring a sufficient repertoire of pragmatic formulas and using such formulas when performing target speech acts.

8.2. Major Findings: Research Questions 3 and 4

3. Which pedagogical features of the formula-enhanced approach make it more effective from both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic perspectives?

4. Are there any observable differences in teachers' implementation of the formula-enhanced approach as compared to the awareness-raising approach?

The second research objective of the present study was to determine which pedagogical features of the FE approach make it more effective than the traditional, AR approach from both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic perspectives and whether there were any observable differences in the host teachers' implementation of these two approaches. To this end, the researcher recorded classroom episodes pertaining to either pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic aspects and coded these episodes into themes, which were later categorized under three major trends: (1) noticing pragmatic formulas in the input; (2) discovering form-function-context relationship; (3) discovering the target notions of directness, politeness, and contextual appropriateness.

The results of the classroom observation analysis showed that the FE approach to speech act teaching used during the teaching intervention in the present study has multiple pedagogical features that make it more effective compared to the traditional, AR approach. The main pedagogical features of the FE approach that point to its greater effectiveness can be summarized as follows:

- The FE approach to speech act teaching can facilitate higher levels of cognitive processing of input, which results in conscious pragmatic awareness or awareness at the level of understanding (Leow, 2015; Takahashi, 2013)
- The FE approach to speech act teaching provides L2 learners with multiple opportunities to build appropriate form-function-context connections (Schmidt, 1993)
- The FE approach to speech act teaching can lead to the long-term retention of the target pragmatic formulas in the students' memory
- The FE approach to speech act teaching can facilitate bottom-up discovery of the target pragmatic conventions (Takahashi, 2013).

The main pedagogical advantage of the FE approach is that it places equal emphasis on both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic components of L2 pragmatic ability during the lesson. Since the pragmatic formulas were placed at the centre of each FE lesson, the students in this treatment group had an opportunity to notice that there could be multiple verbal ways of performing the same speech act. During the 'Guided Noticing' phase, the FE group teacher drew the students' attention to relevant aspects of the input and helped clarify confusions the students initially had about the functional meanings of semantically ambiguous formulas; consequently, this led to greater levels of awareness of the L2 structure. The teaching activities in the 'Deep Cognitive Engagement' phase further stimulated the students' cognitive processing with the

target pragmatic formulas, which helped build appropriate form-function-contexts mappings necessary for successful acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence. Finally, in spite of the fact that no explicit metapragmatic explanations about the social distance, power, or imposition values were included in the design of the FE lessons, the students in this treatment group were able to reflect on the differences between speech act realization patterns in English and their own L1s by studying and analyzing the target pragmatic formulas.

In contrast, the AR instructional treatment promoted superficial cognitive engagement with the input (Leow, 2015), which impeded the participating students' ability to properly notice and accurately interpret the functional meanings of the target pragmatic formulas as well comprehend abstract metapragmatic notions of directness, politeness, and contextual appropriateness. The main pedagogical weaknesses of the AR approach to speech act teaching can be summarized as follows:

- the AR approach to speech act teaching provides insufficient attention to the pragmalinguistic form and does not facilitate memorization and long-term retention of pragmatic formulas
- awareness-raising activities used in the AR approach fail to create opportunities for building meaningful form-function-context connections
- deductive instructional method used in the AR approach emphasizes metapragmatic information over functional meaning.

The results of the classroom observation analysis revealed that L2 learners need to have full control over the pragmalinguistic aspect in order to be able to evaluate the degrees of directness or indirectness in a given speech act and adjust the verbal choices accordingly. Furthermore, the results suggest that explicit metapragmatic explanations about the abstract

theoretical notions of social distance, power, and imposition do not seem to assist L2 learners in noticing the link between these factors and how they may affect language choices during social interaction. While such abstract theoretical constructs as social distance, power, and imposition are important from the perspective of pragmatics theory, when applied in a real-world classroom, these concepts appear to be too complicated for the students, especially in the LINC instructional setting.

8.3. Theoretical and Practical Implications

There are several important theoretical as well as practical areas where the present study makes an original contribution. The discussion below touches upon these areas and explains the implications of this research for the areas of interlanguage and instructional pragmatics, formulaic language pedagogy, L2 teaching, assessment, teacher professional development, and curriculum design.

8.3.1. Interlanguage and Instructional Pragmatics

The present study has contributed to the existing body of interlanguage pragmatics research on developmental patterns in learners' acquisition of pragmatic competence (i.e., interlanguage formula development) and provided additional insights into the emergence of the target formulas in L2 speech (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig, 2006; 2009; Taguchi et al., 2013).

The results of the present research mirror previous research which claimed that an underdeveloped grammatical competence may impede successful realization of speech acts in L2 (Pearson, 2006); at the same time, the findings suggest that the acquisition of pragmatic competence does not seem to coincide with the acquisition of grammatical competence in L2 (Niezgoda & Roever, 2001), and that L2 learners most likely need to first develop solid

grammatical foundation before they are ready to acquire L2 pragmatic norms. However, the present study provides evidence that shows that the formula-enhanced instruction can trigger those interlanguage developmental processes responsible for the acquisition of the target syntactical structures and help expedite the development of both grammatical and pragmatic proficiencies by equipping L2 learners with accurate and contextually appropriate linguistic structures (i.e., pragmatic formulas) that can help them come across as proficient language speakers and allow acceptance into the target language speech community (House, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig, 2006, 2012; Boers et al., 2006; N.C. Ellis, 1996, 2012; Wood, 2015).

Furthermore, the present study represents a comprehensive investigation into the nature of the ‘pragmatic formula’ construct by generating an operational definition and formula selection and judgement criteria which could be used in future studies of a similar nature. Moreover, this work has expanded the current understanding of the speech act functions of pragmatic formulas and emphasized the key role of these formulaic sequences for speech act realization drawing on the evidence from both process and product of instruction. As a result, an alternative approach to speech act teaching which places equal emphasis on both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of L2 pragmatic competence through focused instruction of pragmatic formulas has been put forth.

8.3.2. L2 Teaching, Curricular Development, Assessment, and Teacher Professional Development

Limited theoretical support for curricular development, *lack of authentic input* in teaching materials, and *lack of instructor knowledge* are just some of the present-day challenges for pragmatics instruction (Sykes, 2013, as cited in Bardovi-Harlig, 2017). To these three challenges Bardvodi-Harlig (2017) adds one more: *the lack of reference books and resources*. By

creating the innovative FE approach presented in this study, I have attempted to address these four challenges.

The results of the present study provide multiple implications for L2 teaching, particularly in the context of LINC. Despite the fact that a recent government LINC evaluation report states that “good quality curriculum guidelines exist for all levels of LINC” (p. vi) (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2010), these curriculum guidelines lack efficient models for speech act teaching, especially when it comes to teaching pragmatic formulas. Pragmatics lesson plans offered in the LINC 5-7 Curriculum Guidelines (Hajer et al., 2007) do not go beyond providing a list of ‘stock phrases’ that L2 learners are supposed to use when performing various target speech acts. The present study is the first research project that offers materials specifically designed for LINC students using authentic examples of pragmatic formulas based on the data elicited from Canadian English native speakers. Furthermore, the study offers ready-to-use as well as teacher-friendly resources for teaching L2 pragmatics informed by recent research on instructed SLA that have been empirically tested in the LINC classroom and led to positive learning outcomes.

Moreover, this study has established a foundation for LINC teacher training and professional development which should be built on the synergy between teachers and researchers as well as by persuading teachers of the relevance of research (Lyster, 2019; Ortega, 2012, as cited in Larsen-Freeman, 2015). In an effort to communicate my research findings “in a straightforward and respectful way to teachers” (Larsen-Freeman, 2015, p. 274), I donated 12

ready-to-use lesson plans based on the FE approach⁶⁰ to the two LINC schools and their teachers who volunteered to participate in the study and assisted with the data collection. Furthermore, in November 2019, I delivered a two-hour workshop based on the results of this study for teachers and administrators at the LINC school where the FE instructional treatment took place. In her follow-up e-mail after the workshop, one of the LINC teachers who attended the workshop made the following comment: “Thank you so much for taking the time to present your work to us. I really enjoyed it and found it a *refreshing change* from the usual academic research. Your research is so *practical*”.

It is also worth mentioning that the FE group teacher, when asked what she liked the most about using the FE materials with her students, said that she thinks “it helps the students improve their language because at least they have a sense of what to use in which context. This approach is much more comprehensive, because the textbook just gives the language to the students, but there are no specific activities that would help engage with the language”. She also mentioned that she mainly uses her native speaker intuition when teaching speech acts and pointed to the limitations of the traditional language textbooks when it comes to teaching pragmatics:

I had a textbook about idioms in Canada, but that was last year. This year I mainly focus on grammar... I am using the *Topnotch*. The *Topnotch* is kind of good because they do have a lot of different expressions...well, the *Topnotch 3* for the intermediate level. Some of them are expressions... but I don't think it covers the breadth

⁶⁰ 12 FE lessons were originally designed for the teaching intervention, but due to practical constraints, it was decided to limit the number of lessons to four.

of it like in your materials, especially in the workplace context. I think the textbooks I've used mostly cover social expressions, more idioms, but less about work or making doctor's appointments.

By engaging the actual LINC teachers in the study intervention and giving them an opportunity to try using the researcher-developed materials in their own classrooms, the two participating teachers had an opportunity to expand their theoretical knowledge on both pragmatics and formulaic language, the two very complex and challenging areas of language to teach in any language classroom. In their comments during a follow-up debriefing session, both FE and AR group teachers reflected on how their experience in participating in this project had impacted their approach to teaching. The FE group teacher commented:

It gave me a good idea based on research, so it's good to know that the research backs up these methods and the way you designed them. Like first doing the noticing, and then doing the matching with the meaning and then other phases. So I guess I can see that it's really important to work with the phrases too [pragmatic formulas] because of course with the language teaching students can just memorize something and then forget it the next day, so I think I can see how it's really important for the deeper learning.

Finally, the present study has emphasized the role of the pragmalinguistic aspect of L2 pragmatic competence when assessing pragmatic ability in L2. The pragmalinguistic component of the diagnostic assessment rubric created for the expert judges (see Figure 9) included a range of criteria pertaining to pragmatic formulas informed by formulaic language theory and interlanguage formula development patterns that had emerged from the qualitative utterance analysis conducted as part of the present study. Roever (2011a) observes that assessment instruments used for testing pragmatic ability have traditionally focused on measuring degrees of

politeness and other contextual variables such as power, social distance, and imposition in speech acts following Hudson, Detmer, and Brown (1995) tradition. According to Roever (2011a), pragmatic tests that include assessment items informed by research on implicature and routine [pragmatic] formulas have only recently been added. Such instruments normally include assessing interpretation of idiosyncratic and formulaic implicature, recognition of situational routine formula, and production of formulas in various speech acts (Roever, 2006).

8.4. Limitations of the Study

The present study was an attempt to combine confirmatory and descriptive research traditions (R. Ellis, 2012) and focus on both product and process of instructions; the main strength of this study is that it has ecological validity (M. P. H. Rodgers, personal communication, June 2019) and takes into account the complex reality of the classroom (Mitchell, 2000, as cited in Larsen-Freeman, 2015). Nevertheless, the study had a number of limitations.

To begin, the study employed a relatively small number of student participants ($n=13$), which eliminated the possibility to perform inferential statistical analyses and draw more generalizable conclusions based on the study's findings. Moreover, the length of the teaching intervention was limited to two hours per session in both treatment groups due to practical constraints, which created certain restrictions in terms of how much time was allocated for each of the phases during the instructional treatment. In addition, the teaching intervention in the present study employed only one type of input mode (i.e., written); aural input sources, such as audio-visual materials, could have contributed to the efficacy of instruction in both FE and AR treatment groups; this could also have had a different effect on the noticing and cognitive processing of the target pragmatic formulas. Aural input can also provide students with a “model

for production that includes tone of voice, stress, intonation, rhythm, and pronunciation of words” (Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012, p. 87).

I also acknowledge that, due to the uncertainty surrounding the phenomenon of formulaic language, precision in definition of key terms, issues of saliency and frequency, ‘fuzzy’ borders of formulaicity, and vague empirical evidence on mental processing of formulas (Wray, 2012; Wood, 2015), all claims made about how the participants of this study processed and acquired the target pragmatic formulas are subject to debate. More longitudinal studies employing psycholinguistic research tools such as response latencies, or eye-tracking are needed to better uncover formula mental processing and interlanguage development patterns. In addition, retrospective methods such as think-aloud protocols or stimulated recalls could be utilized to collect verbalized data related to L2 learners’ cognitive processes during formula-enhanced treatment. Due to the exploratory nature of the present study, I did not follow a strict observational protocol during the classroom observation sessions and simply coded classroom episodes pertaining to either pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic development. There is a need to create a more comprehensive coding scheme to document signs of deep cognitive processing as well as gain a better understanding of what such cognitive processing involves and how it differs from the superficial cognitive engagement.

Finally, it is important to use several assessment measures to test how much control of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of pragmatic formulas L2 learners have. The present study used oral multiple-turn DCRPs as both pre-test and post-test measure; however, using only one test format is not very reliable. Specialists recommend using both production type (e.g., written or oral single-turn or multiple-turn DCTs, role-plays) and comprehension-type (e.g. multiple-choice tests, picture or video prompts) tests to assess interlanguage pragmatic ability

(Liu, 2010). Moreover, learners' participation in both monologic and dialogic discourse needs to be assessed (Roever, 2011a).

8.5. Future Research Directions

Several directions for future research can be outlined based on the findings of the present study. Firstly, the potential of 'reuniting' grammar and pragmatics (Bardovi-Harlig, 2003) and integrating the state-of-the-art principles of form-focused instruction (Ranta & Lyster, 2018) as well as task-based language teaching principles into the existing models of speech act teaching should be explored further. The results of this study revealed that more fine-tuned, form-focused instruction techniques are needed when dealing with pragmatic formulas containing grammatically complex structures as part of their slot-and-frame patterns. While this study explored the potential of the cognitive approaches to SLA and pragmatics (Takimoto, 2020) by applying the deep cognitive engagement approach to vocabulary teaching (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009) to teaching pragmatic formulas, this method needs to be modified and reinforced even further in the future updated version of the formula-enhanced instructional sequence. While the vocabulary teaching techniques aimed at stimulating deep cognitive engagement and retention in memory borrowed from Boers and Lindstromberg (2009) proved to be quite effective when dealing with semantically ambiguous pragmatic formulas (e.g., 'I can't make it'), the current version of the FE approach does not include any specific form-focused activities that could facilitate the acquisition of semi-fixed (i.e., discontinuous) pragmatic formulas by taking into account their complex syntactical structure.

Secondly, future research may consider exploring other possibilities of enhancing the authenticity of elicited pragmatic formulas, in addition to the classic oral or written single-turn DTCs. Multiple-turn oral DCRPs may improve the interactional aspect of the elicitation tools

used. Furthermore, more research needs to be devoted to developing more innovative methods of building corpora of pragmatic formulas collected from a wider range of target speech events. While DCTs clearly have limited capacity for this scope of data collection in real time, a digital multimedia environment seems to be one promising direction to look for authentic language input. With thousands of speakers interacting online on a daily basis on social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram, these platforms contain vast amounts of authentic formulaic sequences, including pragmatic formulas interlocutors use to achieve their communicative goals when interacting with each other in the comments section, replying to other people's comments, selling their products, or inviting subscribers to participate in social events.

In addition to having potential for authentic pragmatic formula corpora building, the feasibility of using technology for *teaching* speech acts should be further investigated. Taguchi (2011) points out that some of the key instructional features endorsed by technology, such as input, interaction, simulation, and a multimedia environment are key conditions for pragmatics learning, especially in the midst of the global COVID-19 pandemic with schools and universities forced to shut down and move online (Taguchi, 2020). According to Taguchi and Sykes (2013), technology (e.g., blogs, social media, commentary sections) can promote autonomous learning and strategy training; enhance learners' motivation and interest, as well as expand learners' participation in authentic discourse communities.

It has to be noted, however, that it is not an easy task to find relevant print, audio or video materials containing authentic pragmatic formula exemplars relevant to the target speech acts. One way of doing it would be to use transcripts or clips containing relevant pragmatic formulas from sitcoms like *Friends*, which are found to be very similar to naturally occurring conversations (Quaglio, 2004, 2005, as cited in Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012). This,

however, could be quite a laborious process. The potential of extensive watching of television shows and social dramas for incidental learning of individual vocabulary items has been investigated quite extensively, with studies showing positive relationships between frequency of occurrence and vocabulary learning as long as L2 learners experience repeated encounters with unknown words in context (P.H. Rodgers & Webb, 2019). Another ambitious future research direction could be exploring the potential of television viewing or watching shows on streaming platforms like Netflix or Amazon Prime for pragmatic formula learning. However, since pragmatic formulas, especially semantically ambiguous ones, are not likely to be noticed by L2 learners through simple exposure, or, if noticed, L2 learners might misinterpret their functional meanings, researchers would first need to select and then transcribe relevant clips containing dialogic interactions between characters and create teaching activities based on these data using input enhancement methods to help learners to better notice and process the target formulas at the initial stages of the lesson.

Another potential future research direction could be to apply the principles of the formula-enhanced instruction suggested in this study for teaching academic or professional communication for international students or recent immigrants working in the public sector. Even though the FE approach used in the present study's intervention was designed for the LINC educational context, because of its versatile nature, it can be easily adapted for other formal language learning environments. In the EAP environment, for example, there is an increased need for explicit teaching of email etiquette to international students, especially when it comes to writing email requests. Research has shown that EAP students' lack of familiarity with native speaker norms when writing emails to their professors often leads to miscommunication (Nguyen, Do, Nguyen, & Pham, 2015). Using the formula-enhanced instruction model for

teaching common speech acts like requests and apologies in students' email to their instructor as part of regular EAP courses could help international students enhance their pragmatic and sociocultural competencies as well as build stronger rapport with their instructors.

Finally, the FE approach to teaching L2 pragmatics has potential pedagogical implications for study-abroad programs, also known in Canada as linguistic and cultural immersion programs. Such programs usually host international university-level students for a short period of time (somewhere between three to six weeks) and prioritize oral communication skills, fluency development, and socio-cultural activities such as field trips and cultural outings. Even though L2 learners may learn some pragmatic formulas through exposure to the target language community, the chances are quite slim. Previous research has shown that what matters during a study abroad experience is not the length of stay but the intensity of interaction with target-language speakers in a variety of social settings (Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011; Roever, 2011b). Since pragmatic formulas can equip L2 speakers with linguistically and socioculturally appropriate strings of language, focused instruction of such formulaic sequences as part of a study abroad program may help learners become part of the 'inner circle' speech community and maintain stronger social ties with people around them during their stay in a foreign country.

References

- AlHassan, L., & Wood, D. (2015). The effectiveness of focused instruction of formulaic sequences in augmenting L2 learners' academic writing skills: A quantitative research study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 17, 51-62.
- Allwright, D., & Bailey, K.M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F. & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bahns, J., & Eldaw, M. (1993). Should we teach EFL students collocations? *System*, 21(1), 101-114.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Griffin, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from the ESL classroom. *System*, 33(3), 401–415. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2005.06.004
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. In Bouton, Lawrence F. (Ed). *Pragmatics and Language Learning* (Monograph Series Vol. 7), pp. 21-39. Retrieved from the ERIC database. (ED400702)
- 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.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2002). A new starting point? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(02), 189-198.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2003). Understanding the role of grammar in the acquisition of L2 pragmatics. In A. M. Flor, A.F. Guerra, & E. U. Juan (Eds.), *Pragmatic competence and*

foreign language teaching (pp. 25-45). Castello de la Plana: Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I, D.L.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2006). On the role of formulas in the acquisition of L2 pragmatics. In: Bardovi-Harlig K, Félix-Brasdefer, C., & Omar, A. S. (Eds), *Pragmatics and language learning*: Volume 11. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center, pp. 1–28.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2006). On the role of formulas in the acquisition of L2 pragmatics. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, C. Felix-Brasdefer, & A. S. Omar (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning*: Vol. 11 (pp. 1–28). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2009). Conventional expressions as a pragmalinguistic resource: Recognition and production of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning*, 59(4), 755–795. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00525.x

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2012). Formulas, routines, and conventional expressions in pragmatics research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 32, 206–227. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000086>

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2014). Awareness of meaning of conventional expressions in second-language pragmatics. *Language Awareness*, 23(1-2), 41-56.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2017). Acquisition of L2 pragmatics. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Instructed Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 224-245). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315676968>

- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Bastos, M. T. (2011). Proficiency, length of stay, and intensity of interaction and the acquisition of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 8, 347–384.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). Teaching pragmatics. *Washington, DC: United States Department of State*. Retrieved from https://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource_files/03-41-3-h.pdf
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Stringer, D. (2016). Unconventional Expressions: Productive syntax in the L2 acquisition of formulaic language. *Second Language Research*, 1-30. doi: 10.1177/0267658316641725
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Vellenga, H. E. (2012). The effect of instruction on conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *System*, 40(1), 77-89.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Vellenga, H. E. (2015). The effect of instruction on pragmatic routines in academic discussion. *Language teaching research*, 19(3), 324-350.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Rose, M., & Nickels, E. L. (2008). The use of conventional expressions of thanking, apologizing, and refusing. *Proceedings from the 2007 Second Language Research Forum*. Cascadilla Proceedings Project. Somerville, MA.
- Bardovi-Harlig., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), 233-262.
- Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55–73). New York: Newbury House.

- Bialystok, E. (1994). Analysis and control in the development of second language proficiency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 157-168.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1980). Learning to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance in learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, 3, 29–59.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1986). Too many words: Length of utterance and pragmatic failure. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 8(2), 165-179.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing.
- Boers, F. & Lindstromberg, S. (2012). Experimental and intervention studies on formulaic sequences in a second language. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 32, 83–110. doi: 10.1017/S0267190512000050
- Boers, F., & Lindstromberg, S. (2009). *Optimizing a lexical approach to instructed second language acquisition*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boers, F., Eyckmans, J., & Stengers, H. (2006). Motivating multiword units: Rationale, mnemonic benefits, and cognitive style variables. *EUROSLA yearbook*, 6(1), 169-190.
- Boers, F., Eyckmans, J., Kappel, J., Stengers, H., & Demecheleer, H. (2006). Formulaic sequences and perceived oral proficiency: Putting a lexical approach to the test. *Language Teaching Research* 10(3), 245–261. doi: 10.1191/1362168806lr195oa
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.

- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language performance. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp.2-29). New York, NY: Longman.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E. A. Soler & M. P. S. Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 41-57). The Netherlands: Springer.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cerezo, L., Caras, A., & Leow, R. P. (2016). The effectiveness of guided induction versus deductive instruction on the development of complex Spanish gustar structures: An analysis of learning outcomes and processes. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 38(2), 265-291.
- Chomsky, N. (2006). *Language and mind* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2012). *Canadian Language Benchmarks: English as a second language for adults*. Ottawa, ON: Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks.
- Retrieved from <https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/ircc/migration/ircc/english/pdf/pub/language-benchmarks.pdf>
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2012). *CLB Support Kit*. Ottawa, ON: Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks. Retrieved from <https://www.language.ca/product/clb-support-kit-pdf-e/>

- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (March 2010). *Evaluation of the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) Program*. Research and Evaluation Division. R&E Ref. No.: ER201102_01E
- Cohen, A. D. (2005). Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(3), 275–301. doi: 10.1515/iprg.2005.2.3.275.
- Cohen, A. D. (2008). Teaching and assessing L2 pragmatics: What can we expect from learners? *Language Teaching*, 41(02), 213-235.
- Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 33-56.
- Cohen, A. D., & Weaver, S. J. (2006). *Styles-and strategies-based instruction: A teachers' guide*. Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. Retrieved from <https://stylesandstrategiesi.files.wordpress.com/2011/05/cohen-weaver.pdf>
- Cohen, A. D., Olshtain, E., & Rosenstein, D. S. (1986). Advanced EFL apologies: What remains to be learned? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 62, 51-74.
- Conklin, K., & Schmitt, N. (2008). Formulaic sequences: Are they processed more quickly than nonformulaic language by native and nonnative speakers? *Applied Linguistics*, 29(1), 72-89.
- Coulmas, F. (1979). On the sociolinguistic relevance of routine formulae. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 3(3), 239-266.
- Cruz, M. P. (2013). An integrative proposal to teach the pragmatics of phatic communion in ESL classes. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 10(1), 131-160. doi: 10.1515/ip-2013-0005
- Cruz, M. P. (2015). Fostering EF/SL learners' meta-pragmatic awareness of complaints and their interactive effects. *Language Awareness*, 24(2), 123-137.

- Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dempsey, C., Xue, L., & Kustec, S. (April 2009). *Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada: Client Profile and Performance Indicators*. Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Research and Evaluation. 978-1-100-15614-9
- Diepenbroek, L. G., & Derwing, T. M. (2014). To what extent do popular ESL textbooks incorporate oral fluency and pragmatic development. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30(7), 1-20.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edmonds, A. (2014). Conventional expressions: Investigating pragmatics and processing *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 36(1), 69-99. doi:10.1017/S0272263113000557
- Eisenstein, M. & Bodman, J. (1986). 'I very appreciate': Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics* 7(2), 167–185.
- Ellis, N. C. (1996). Sequencing in SLA: Phonological Memory, Chunking, and Points of Order. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(1), 91–126.
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/58320871/>
- Ellis, N. C. (2002). Reflections on frequency effects in language processing. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 297-339. DOI: 10.1017.S0272263102002140
- Ellis, N. C. (2012). Formulaic language and second language acquisition: Zipf and the phrasal teddy bear. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 32, 17-44.
- Ellis, N. C., Simpson-Vlach, R., & Maynard, C. (2008). Formulaic language in native and second language speakers: Psycholinguistics, corpus linguistics, and TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(3), 375–396. doi: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00137.x

- Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Eyckmans, J. (2007). Taking SLA research to interpreter training: Does knowledge of phrases foster fluency? In F. Boers, G. Darquennes, R. Temmerman (Eds.) *Multilingualism and applied comparative linguistics: Pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 89-104). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Eyckmans, J., Boers, F., & Lindstromberg, S. (2016). The impact of imposing processing strategies on L2 learners' deliberate study of lexical phrases. *System*, 56, 127-139.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. & Cohen, A. D. (2012). Teaching pragmatics in the foreign language classroom: Grammar as a communicative resource. *Hispania*, 95(4), 650–669. Retrieved from: <https://muse.jhu.edu/>
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2005). Indirectness and politeness in Mexican requests. In *Selected proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (Vol. 6678). Cascadilla Press Somerville, MA.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2012). Interlanguage pragmatics. In C.A. Chapelle (Ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Retrieved from: <https://doi-org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0562>
- Fetzer, A. (2004). *Recontextualizing context: Grammaticality meets appropriateness*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Fukuya, Y. J. & Clark, M. K. (2001). A comparison of input enhancement and explicit instruction of mitigators. In L. F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 10, pp. 111–130). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Division of English as

- an International Language Intensive English Institute: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Fukuya, Y. J., & Zhang, Y. (2002). Effects of recasts on EFL learners' acquisition of pragmalinguistic conventions of request. *Second Language Studies*, 21(1), 1-47.
- Gass, S. M. (1996). Introduction. In S. Gass, S. & J. Neu (Eds.). *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language* (pp. 1-21). Walter de Gruyter.
- Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, Interaction, and Second Language Learner*. Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gatbonton, E., & Segalowitz, N. (2005). Rethinking communicative language teaching: A focus on access to fluency. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61(3), 325-353.
- Granger, S., & Paquot, M. (2008). Disentangling the phraseological web. In S. Granger and F. Meunier (Eds.). *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 27-50). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, P. & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, Speech Acts), pp. 41-58. New York, NY: Academic Press. Retrieved from <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/lis/studypacks/Grice-Logic.pdf>
- Gries, S. T. (2008). Phraseology and linguistic theory: A brief survey. *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, 3-25.
- Grotjahn, R. (1987). On the methodological basis of introspective methods. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Introspection in second language research* (pp. 54-81). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hajer, A., Kaskens, A.-M., & Stasiak, M. (2007). Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada 5–7 curriculum guidelines. Toronto, ON: Toronto Catholic District School

- Board. Retrieved from
[http://atwork.settlement.org/downloads/linc/LINC Curriculum Guidelines 5-7.pdf](http://atwork.settlement.org/downloads/linc/LINC_Curriculum_Guidelines_5-7.pdf)
- Hakuta, K. (1974). Prefabricated patterns and the emergence of structure in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 24(2), 287-297.
- Han, X. (2013). A Contrastive Study of Chinese and British English Request Strategies Based on Open Roleplay. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 4(5), 1098-1105.
- Hatami, S. (2015). Teaching Formulaic Sequences in the ESL Classroom. *TESOL Journal*, 6(1), 112-129.
- Houle, R. (February 2019). Results from the 2016 census: Syrian refugees who resettled in Canada in 2015 and 2016. *Statistics Canada*. Retrieved from
<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/75-006-x/2019001/article/00001-eng.pdf?st=qrRVHsWd>
- House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 225–252. doi: 10.1017/S0272263100014893.
- Hudson, T., Detmer, E., & Brown J. D. (1995). *Developing prototypic measures of cross-cultural pragmatics: Technical Report #7*. Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Huth, T. (2013). Pragmatics and culture. In C.A. Chapelle (Ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/doi/full/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0934>

- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings* (pp.269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin. Retrieved from <http://www.homes.uni-bielefeld.de/sgramley/Hymes-2.pdf>
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics. An ethnographical approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ishida, M. (2013). Second Language Pragmatic Development. In C.A. Chapelle (Ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/doi/full/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1052>
- Ishihara, N. (2010). Instructional pragmatics: Bridging teaching, research, and teacher education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4(10), 938-953.
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. The UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Jiang, N. A. N., & Nekrasova, T. M. (2007). The processing of formulaic sequences by second language speakers. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(3), 433-445.
- Kasper, G. & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language teaching and learning* (Vol 1), pp. 317-334. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research*, 8(3), 203–231. doi: 10.1177/026765839200800303
- Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research in interlanguage pragmatics. In K. Rose, G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 33-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). Interlanguage pragmatics: An introduction. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 1–17). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13(2), 215-247.
- Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(2), 149-169.
- Kecskes, I. (2000a). Conceptual fluency and the use of situation-bound utterances in L2. *Links & Letters*, (7), 145-161.
- Kecskes, I. (2000b). A cognitive-pragmatic approach to situation-bound utterances. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(5), 605-625.
- Kecskes, I. (2010). Situation-bound utterances as pragmatic acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(11), 2889-2897.
- Kecskes, I. (2014). *Intercultural pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kiefer, F. (1996). Bound utterances. *Language Sciences*, 18(1), 575-587.
- Koike, D. A., & Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in the development of pragmatic competence. *System*, 33(3), 481-501.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.
- Krashen, S., & Scarcella, R. (1978). On routines and patterns in language acquisition and performance. *Language Learning*, 28(2), 283-300.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2015). Research into practice: Grammar learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 48(2), 263-280. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000408>

- Laughlin, V. T., Wain, J., & Schmidgall, J. (2015). Defining and Operationalizing the Construct of Pragmatic Competence: Review and Recommendations. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2015(1), 1–43. doi: 10.1002/ets2.12053
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman
- Leech, G., & Thomas, J. (1990). Language, meaning and context: pragmatics. In N.E. Collinge (Ed.), *An encyclopaedia of language* (pp. 173-243). Routledge.
- Leow, R. P. (2015). *Explicit learning in the L2 classroom: A student-centered approach*. Routledge.
- Lewis, M. (1997). Pedagogical implications of the lexical approach. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 255-270). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, M. (2008). *Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*. Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Lindstromberg, S., & Boers, F. (2008). The mnemonic effect of noticing alliteration in lexical chunks. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(2), 200-222.
- Liu, J. (2010). Testing interlanguage pragmatic knowledge. In Trosborg, A. (Ed.), *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (pp. 467-488). Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.
- Lyster, R. (2019). Making research on instructed SLA relevant for teachers through professional development. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(4), 494-513.

- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Martínez- Flor, A. & Usó Juan, E. (2010). The teaching of speech acts in second and foreign language instructional contexts. In Trosborg, A. (Ed.), *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (pp. 423-443). Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Fukuya, Y. J. (2005). The effects of instruction on learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *System*, 33(3), 463-480.
- 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(2), 39-63.
- Martynych, A. (2010). *On Research Methodology in Applied Linguistics in 2002-2008* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED514615)
- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational researcher*, 17(2), 13-17.
- Meunier, F. (2012). Formulaic language and language teaching. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 32, 111-129.
- Myles, F., Hooper, J., & Mitchell, R. (1998). Rote or rule? Exploring the role of formulaic language in classroom foreign language learning. *Language learning*, 48(3), 323-364.
- Nassaji, H. (2016). Research timeline: Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 49(1), 35-62.
- Nattinger, J. R. & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Nguyen, T. T. M., Do, T. T. H., Nguyen, A. T., & Pham, T. T. T. (2015). Teaching email requests in the academic context: A focus on the role of corrective feedback. *Language Awareness, 24*(2), 169-195.
- Niezgoda, K., & Roever, C. (2001). Pragmatic and grammatical awareness: A function of the learning environment? In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 63-79). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behaviour. *TESL Canada Journal, 7*(2), 45-65.
- Pawley, A. & Syder, F. H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 191–226). New York, NY: Longman.
- Pawley, A. (1986). On speech formulas and linguistic competence. In Fareh, S. & Howe, M. (Eds.), *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* (pp. 57-87). University of Kansas Linguistics Graduate Student Association.
- Pawley, A. (2007). Developments in the study of formulaic language since 1970: A personal view. In Skandera, P. (Eds.), *Phraseology and culture in English* (pp. 3-49). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pawley, A. (2009). Grammarians' languages versus humanists' languages and the place of speech act formulas in models of linguistic competence. In *Typological Studies in Language: Formulaic Language (Vol. 1). Distribution and Historical Change*. Edited by R. Corrigan, E. A. Moravcsik, O. Hamid, & K. M. Wheatley: John Benjamin Publishing Company

- Pearson, L. (2006). Patterns of development in Spanish L2 pragmatic acquisition: An analysis of novice learners' production of directives. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), 473-495.
- Peters, E. (2012). Learning German formulaic sequences: The effect of two attention-drawing techniques. *The Language Learning Journal*, 40(1), 65-79.
- Ranta, L., & Lyster, R. (2018). Form-Focused Instruction. In P. Garrett & J-M. Cots (Eds.), *Handbook of Language Awareness*, Routledge, pp. 40-56.
- Read, J. & Nation, P. (2004). Measurement of formulaic sequences. In Schmitt, N. (Ed.), *Formulaic sequences: Acquisition, processing, and use* (pp. 23-37). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Rodgers, M. P., & Webb, S. (2019). Incidental vocabulary learning through viewing television. *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics*.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.18034.rod>
- Roever, C. (2011a). Testing of second language pragmatics: Past and future. *Language Testing*, 28(4), 463-481. Retrieved from
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.840.999&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Roever, C. (2011b). What learners get for free: learning of routine formulae in ESL and EFL environments. *ELT journal*, 1-12. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccq090
- Roever, C., & Al-Gahtani, S. (2015). The development of ESL proficiency and pragmatic performance. *ELT Journal*, 69(4), 395-404.
- Rose, K. & Kwai-fun, C. N. (2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses. In K. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 145-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System*, 33(3), 385-399.
- Rose, K., & G. Kasper (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K. Rose, G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 1-9). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, M. (2012). Grammar in the real world: Enhancing grammar lessons with pragmatics. *Hispania*, 95(4), 670-680.
- Salsbury, T., & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2000). Oppositional talk and the acquisition of modality in L2 English. *Social and Cognitive Factors in Second Language Acquisition*, 57-76.
- Savignon, S. J. (1975). Teaching for communication. *Missouri Foreign Language Journal*, 1-14.
- Savignon, S. J. (1976, April). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. Paper presented at Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Detroit, Michigan. Retrieved from the ERIC database. (ED135245)
- Scarcella, R. C. (1979). Watch Up!: A Study of Verbal Routines in Adult Second Language Performance. *Working Papers on Bilingualism Toronto*, (19), 79-90.
- Schauer, G. A. & Adolphs, S. (2006). Expressions of gratitude in corpus and DCT data: Vocabulary, formulaic sequences, and pedagogy. *System*, 34(1), 119–134. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2005.09.003
- Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21- 43). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129-158. DOI: <https://doi-org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>

- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan, *Syntax and semantics*, (Vol. 3, Speech Acts), pp. 59-82. New York, NY: Academic Press. Retrieved from http://www.cs.uu.nl/docs/vakken/musy/searle_indirect.pdf
- Searle, J. (2002). *Speech acts, mind, and social reality*. In G. Grewendorf & G. Meggle (Eds.), *Speech acts, mind, and social reality: Discussions with John R. Searle* (Vol. 79), pp. 3-7. Springer Science + Business Media.
- Siyanova-Chanturia, A. (2015). On the 'holistic' nature of formulaic language. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 11(2), 285-301.
- Siyanova-Chanturia, A., Conklin, K., & Schmitt, N. (2011). Adding more fuel to the fire: An eye-tracking study of idiom processing by native and non-native speakers. *Second Language Research*, 27(2), 251-272.
- Soler, E. A. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System*, 33(3), 417-435.
- Spada, N. (1997). Form-focussed instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language Teaching*, 30(02), 73-87.
- Stengers, H. (2009). Putting the idiom principle to the test: An exercise in applied comparative linguistics. Unpublished PhD dissertation (Free University of Brussels).
- Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian modern language review*, 50(1), 158-164.

- Swain, M. (1996). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 245–256). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sykes, J. M. (2010). (In) Commensurable Discourse: Researchers and Practitioners Bring Pragmatics to Language Learning. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, 3(1), 253-264.
- Taguchi, N. (2007). Chunk learning and the development of spoken discourse in a Japanese as a foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(4), 433-457.
- Taguchi, N. (2008). Cognition, language contact, and the development of pragmatic comprehension in a study-abroad context. *Language Learning*, 58(1), 33-71.
- Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 289-310.
- Taguchi, N. (2012). *Context, individual differences, and pragmatic competence*. Multilingual Matters.
- Taguchi, N. (2013). Production of routines in L2 English: Effect of proficiency and study-abroad experience. *System*, 41(1), 109-121.
- Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching*, 48(1), 1-50. doi: 10.1017/S0261444814000263
- Taguchi, N. (2016). Contexts and pragmatics learning: Problems and opportunities of the study abroad research. *Language Teaching*, 1–14.
- Taguchi, N. (2020). Digitally mediated remote learning of pragmatics. *Foreign Language Annals*, 353-358. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12455>

- Taguchi, N., & Sykes, J. M. (Eds.). (2013). *Technology in interlanguage pragmatics research and teaching*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Taguchi, N., Li, S., & Xiao, F. (2013). Production of formulaic expressions in L2 Chinese: A developmental investigation in a study abroad context. *Chinese as a Second Language Research*, 2(1), 23-58. doi: 10.1515/caslar-2013-0021
- Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(2), 189–223. doi: 10.1017/S0272263100014881
- Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K. Rose, G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 171-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Takahashi, S. (2005). Noticing in task performance and learning outcomes: A qualitative analysis of instructional effects in interlanguage pragmatics. *System*, 33(3), 437-461.
- Takahashi, S. (2010). Assessing learnability in second language pragmatics. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 391-421). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Takahashi, S. (2013). Pragmatic Awareness in Second Language Learning. In C.A. Chapelle, (Ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/doi/full/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0926>
- Takimoto, M. (2007). The effects of input-based tasks on the development of learners' pragmatic proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 1-25.
- Takimoto, M. (2009). Exploring the effects of input-based treatment and test on the development of learners' pragmatic proficiency. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(5), 1029-1046.

- Takimoto, M. (2020). Investigating the effects of cognitive linguistic approach in developing EFL learners' pragmatic proficiency. *System*, 89,1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102213>
- Tateyama, Y. (2001). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines. In K. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 200–222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Trask, R. L. (1999). *Key concepts in language and linguistics*. New York: Routledge.
- Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints, and apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Usó-Juan, E., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2007). Teaching learners to appropriately mitigate requests. *ELT journal*, 62(4), 349-357.
- VanPatten, B. (2007). Input processing in adult second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), pp. 115-135. *Theories in Second Language Acquisition: An Introduction*. Routledge, New York.
- Vasquez, C., & Sharpless, D. (2009). The role of pragmatics in the master's TESOL curriculum: Findings from a nationwide survey. *TESOL Quarterly*, 5-28.
- Webb, S., & Kagimoto, E. (2010). Learning collocations: Do the number of collocates, position of the node word, and synonymy affect learning? *Applied Linguistics*, 32, 259–276.
- Weinert, R. (2010). Formulaicity and usage-based language: linguistic, psycholinguistic and acquisitional manifestations. In D. Wood (Ed.), *Perspectives on formulaic language: Acquisition and communication* (pp.1-20). London/New York: Continuum.

- Widdowson, G.H. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1989). Knowledge of language and ability for use. *Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 128-137.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*, 2nd ed. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Wood, D. (2006). Uses and functions of formulaic sequences in second language speech: An exploration of the foundations of fluency. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(1), 13-33.
- Wood, D. (2009). Effects of focused instruction of formulaic sequences on fluent expression in second language narratives: A case study. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 39–57. Retrieved from <http://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/216969938?accountid=9894>
- Wood, D. (2010). *Formulaic Language and Second Language Speech Fluency: Background, evidence and classroom applications*. London/New York: Continuum.
- Wood, D. (2015). *Fundamentals of Formulaic Language: An Introduction*. London/New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Wood, D., & Namba, K. (2013). Focused instruction of formulaic language: Use and awareness in a Japanese university class. *The Asian Conference on Language Learning Official Conference Proceedings 2013*, pp. 203-212.

- Wray, A. & Perkins, M. R. (2000). The functions of formulaic language: An integrated model. *Language & Communication*, 20(1), 1–28.
- Wray, A. (2000). Formulaic sequences in second language teaching: Principle and practice. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(4), 463-489.
- Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wray, A. (2008). *Formulaic language: Pushing the boundaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wray, A. (2012). What do we (think we) know about formulaic language? An evaluation of the current state of play. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 32(1), pp. 231-254.
[10.1017/S026719051200013X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051200013X)
- Wray, A., & Namba, K. (2003). Use of formulaic language by a Japanese-English bilingual child: a practical approach to data analysis. *Japan Journal for Multilingualism and Multiculturalism*, 9(1), pp. 24-51.
- Wyner, L., & Cohen, A. D. (2015). Second language pragmatic ability: Individual differences according to environment. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4, 519-556.
- Xu, W., Case, R. E., & Wang, Y. (2009). Pragmatic and grammatical competence, length of residence, and overall L2 proficiency. *System*, 37(2), 205-216.
- Yazdanfar, S., & Bonyadi, A. (2016). Request strategies in everyday interactions of Persian and English speakers. *SAGE Open*, 6(4), 2158244016679473.
- Yorio, C. A. (1980). Conventionalized language forms and the development of communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly*, 433-442.

- Yoshimi, D. R. (2001). Explicit instruction and JFL learners' use of interactional discourse markers. In K. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 223-244). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zavialova, A. (2015). *Explicit Instruction of Formulaic Expressions and Second Language Pragmatic Competence: A Collective Case Study*. Thesis (M.A.) - Carleton University, 2015.
- Zavialova, A. (2016). Explicit instruction of situation-specific formulaic expressions and second language pragmatic competence: A classroom intervention study. In H.M. McGarrell, & D. Wood, (Eds.). *Special Research Symposium Issue of CONTACT*. Refereed Proceedings of TESL Ontario Research Symposium, November 2015. Vol. 42, No. 2 (pp. 82-104). Retrieved from <http://www.teslontario.net/uploads/publications/researchsymposium/ResearchSymposium2016.pdf>
- Zavialova, A. (2017). An emerging pedagogical approach to teaching pragmatic formulas. *TESL Canada Journal*, 34(3), 192-204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v34i3.1279>

Appendices

Appendix A: Native Speaker Corpus (NSC)

A1. Social Interaction

Speech Event 1: Declining an Invitation to Go to the Movies

Sublist 1 (5/5)	Sublist 2 (4/5)	Sublist 3 (3/5)
1. <i>That sounds fun, but + ____</i> [excuse] 2. <i>That sounds great, but + ____</i> [excuse] 3. <i>Thank you for the invitation, but + ____</i> [excuse] 4. Sorry, I can't make it 5. <i>Sorry, I can't make it to the + ____</i> [noun] 6. <i>I wish I could, but + ____</i> [excuse] 7. Unfortunately, I'm busy 8. <i>Oh thanks, but + ____</i> [excuse] 9. Can we plan something for another day? 10. Maybe another time? 11. Maybe next week/month? 12. I hope you have fun! 13. Perhaps we could go another time? 14. Have fun though!	1. I can't, I've already made/got plans 2. <i>I'd love to, but + ____</i> [excuse] 3. <i>Thanks for the invite, but + ____</i> [excuse] 4. <i>I am actually already + ____</i> [gerund: doing something] 5. Maybe we can plan another time? 6. Let's hang out on another day instead 7. <i>Let me know how + ____</i> [noun: the movie] <i>is/was though</i> 8. Let's try to plan something soon!	1. <i>That is very nice of you to offer, but + ____</i> [excuse] 2. Sorry, I'm not able to come 3. <i>I'd really like that, however + ____</i> [excuse] 4. Let's make plans for another time! 5. Is there another/a different time we could go? 6. Wanna try a different day? 7. Thanks for thinking about me though!

Speech Event 2: Accepting an Invitation to Attend a Dinner

Sublist 1 (5/5)	Sublist 2 (4/5)	Sublist 3 (3/5)
1. Sure, I would love to come/join! 2. That would be lovely/great 3. That sounds great 4. I'll see you then 5. Is there anything I can bring? 6. Can I bring anything? 7. Should I bring anything?	1. That's/ It's really nice of you to invite me 2. I'll definitely be there 3. I'd be delighted to come 4. Sounds like fun 5. Would you like me to bring anything?	1. Thank you for thinking of me! 2. What can I bring? 3. What would you like me to bring? 4. I look forward to it 5. Let's do it 6. That'll be fun

Speech Event 3: Inviting Neighbours to a Party

Sublist 1 (5/5)	Sublist 2 (4/5)	Sublist 3 (3/5)
1. <i>I'm planning a ____ + [noun]</i> 2. <i>I'm hosting a ____ + [noun]</i> 3. <i>I'm having a ____ + [noun]</i> 4. <i>Would love it if you could ____ + [verb: join/come]</i> 5. <i>Would be happy if you could ____ + [verb]</i> 6. <i>Would you and your family like to come?</i> 7. <i>I wanted to invite you and the family</i> 8. <i>It would be great if you could ____ + [verb: come]</i> 9. <i>Can you make it?</i> 10. <i>Hope you can make it!</i> 11. <i>We're hoping you are able to come</i> 12. <i>We're hoping you can come</i> 13. <i>Come by if you're free</i>	1. <i>Would you like to come and bring your family?</i> 2. <i>It would be great to have ____ + [pronoun: you/everyone] there!</i> 3. <i>Are you able to come?</i> 4. <i>I was wondering if you would like to + ____ [verb-come]</i> 5. <i>Do you think you can make it?</i> 6. <i>Do you wanna come over to our place for a ____ + [noun: barbecue]?</i> 7. <i>I want to know if you would like to join</i> 8. <i>You and ____ [partner name if applicable] should come!</i> 9. <i>Just wanted to let you know we're having a ____ [noun- BBQ on Saturday] if you wanna to join</i>	1. <i>If you're not up to anything this weekend, I'm having a ____ + [noun]</i> 2. <i>Please feel free to come on ____ + [date]!</i> 3. <i>Are you free?</i> 4. <i>The whole family is invited too!</i> 5. <i>Feel free to bring a ____ + [noun- salad/dessert]</i>

Speech Event 4: Thanking a Colleague for Covering a Shift

Sublist 1 (5/5)	Sublist 2 (4/5)	Sublist 3 (3/5)
1. Thank you so much, you're a lifesaver! 2. Thank you so much, I really appreciate it! 3. Thanks a lot, I really appreciate it! 4. <i>If you ever need me to + ____ [do sth-cover your shift], I would be happy to</i> 5. Let me know if I can make it up to you 6. Let me know if you ever need help	1. Thanks very much, I owe you one! 2. <i>Anytime you need ____ [something done- a shift covered], all you have to do is ask</i> 3. <i>Thanks for ____ + [gerund-covering my shift]</i> 4. <i>I so appreciate you ____ + [gerund-taking my shift]</i> 5. I'll be happy to return the favour if I can 6. <i>I'd be happy to return the favour if you ever need someone to ____ + [verb- cover your shift]</i>	1. <i>If you ever need me to ____ + [do sth- return the favour], just let me know</i> 2. You are awesome, thank you 3. Thank you so much, you are the best 4. Thank you so much, I'll make it up to you 5. <i>Please don't hesitate if you need me to ____ + [do sth- cover for you]</i>

A2. Customer Service Interaction

Speech Event 1: Rejecting a Sales Offer at a Store

Sublist 1 (5/5)	Sublist 2 (4/5)	Sublist 3 (3/5)
1. No thank you 2. I'm not interested 3. <i>Thanks for the offer, but + ____ [excuse]</i>	1. <i>Sorry, not interested in ____ + [noun/pronoun]</i> 2. <i>No thank you, I already have a ____ + [noun]</i> 3. <i>Sorry, but I don't really need a ____ + [noun]</i>	1. <i>That sounds nice, but + ____ [excuse]</i> 2. Thanks, but no thanks 3. <i>I don't need + ____ [noun/pronoun] right now</i> 4. Oh no, thank you 5. <i>I am good for ____ + [noun]</i> 6. No thanks, not today 7. Sorry, but I'm really in a rush 8. Thanks though 9. Thanks anyways 10. I'd like to think about it

Speech Event 2: Cancelling/Rescheduling a Doctor's Appointment Over the Phone

Sublist 1 (5/5)	Sublist 2 (4/5)	Sublist 3 (3/5)
<p>1. I'm calling to cancel my appointment</p> <p>2. I need to reschedule my appointment</p> <p>3. <i>Is there an availability at ____ + [date/time]?</i></p> <p>4. <i>I would like to cancel/reschedule my appointment on ____ + [date-Wednesday]</i></p> <p>5. When is the next available appointment?</p> <p>6. <i>I was wondering if it would be possible to reschedule for ____ + [date- the following week]?</i></p> <p>7. I'm just calling to let you know I cannot make it to my appointment</p> <p>8. Could I reschedule my appointment for another date?</p> <p>9. I'm calling about my appointment</p> <p>10. I'm not able to make it that day</p>	<p>1. <i>Do you have any availabilities for ____ + [suggest date range]?</i></p> <p>2. Something has come up and I won't be able to make it</p> <p>3. Would I be able to reschedule?</p> <p>4. Unfortunately, I will have to reschedule this appointment, if possible</p> <p>5. <i>Does he/she have an opening ____ + [date- next week]?</i></p> <p>6. <i>Would it be possible to move the appointment to ____ + [suggest date range]?</i></p> <p>7. Do you have any availability next week?</p> <p>8. <i>Do you have any times on the week of ____ + [suggest date range]?</i></p> <p>9. Can/could we reschedule?</p>	<p>1. I'm afraid I need to reschedule my appointment</p> <p>2. <i>Do you have any appointments free for ____ + [doctor type- dentist] in the near future?</i></p> <p>3. <i>Unfortunately, I will not be able to make my appointment with ____ + [doctor's name-Dr. Smith] as something has come up</i></p> <p>4. Is there another time the doctor is available?</p> <p>5. My apologies, but something has come up</p> <p>6. Unfortunately, I'm going to need to reschedule</p> <p>7. Can you let me know what your next available opening is?</p>

Speech Event 3: Making Inquiries

Sublist 1 (5/5)	Sublist 2 (4/5)	Sublist 3 (3/5)
1. <i>Where do I go to</i> ____ + [do sth]? 2. <i>I would like to know where I can</i> ____ + [do sth] 3. <i>I'm not sure where to</i> ____ + [do sth] 4. <i>I was wondering where I go to</i> ____ + [do sth]	1. <i>I was hoping you could tell me where I can go to</i> ____ + [do sth]? 2. <i>Would you be able to tell me where I can</i> ____ + [do sth]? 3. <i>Would you be able to help me with that?</i> 4. <i>Could you please tell me where I can</i> ____ + [do sth]? 5. <i>Could you please let me know where I can go to</i> ____ + [do sth]?	n/a

Speech Event 4: Clarifying Discrepancies Over the Phone

Sublist 1 (5/5)	Sublist 2 (4/5)	Sublist 3 (3/5)
1. I would like this refunded 2. I'd like to have that refunded 3. <i>Please make sure that</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase- the policy is cancelled] 4. I'd like this corrected, please 5. Can you look into it? 6. Could you please take a look at that?	1. <i>Can you please check if</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase] 2. <i>Could you check</i> ____ + [noun/pronoun] <i>and see if</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]? 3. <i>Can you please ensure that</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase] 4. <i>Could you please confirm that</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]? 5. I was wondering why this happened? 6. I'm just wondering what's going on	1. <i>I was wondering who I should speak to about</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]? 2. <i>I would like to make sure</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase] 3. I'm hoping you can help me 4. Could you tell me why? 5. <i>Who should I speak to about</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?

A3. Workplace Interaction

Speech Event 1: Responding to Manager's Request

Sublist 1 (5/5)	Sublist 2 (4/5)	Sublist 3 (3/5)
<p>1. <i>I'm sorry/really sorry, but</i> ____ + [excuse]</p> <p>2. I am very sorry, but I have already made plans</p>	<p>1. Unfortunately, I am unable to stay</p> <p>2. <i>I wish I could stay and help out, but</i> ____ + [excuse]</p> <p>3. <i>I would love to help, but</i> ____ + [excuse]</p> <p>4. I'm sorry, I already have other previous commitments</p> <p>5. I'm so sorry, I just can't stay</p> <p>6. <i>I really want to help, but</i> ____ + [excuse]</p> <p>7. I can get to this first thing tomorrow though</p> <p>8. I could come in early tomorrow, if that would help</p>	<p>1. <i>I would be happy to</i> ____ + [do sth-work overtime] <i>another day</i></p> <p>2. <i>I won't be able to</i> ____ + [do sth- stay late tonight] <i>as I have a prior commitment</i></p> <p>3. <i>Normally, I would be happy to</i> ____ + [do sth], <i>but</i> ____ + [excuse]</p> <p>4. I'm afraid I can't do it</p> <p>5. I'm awfully sorry, today just isn't possible</p> <p>6. <i>I would usually</i> ____ + [do sth], <i>but</i> ____ + [excuse]</p> <p>7. <i>Is there any way I could/can</i> ____ + [offer help]</p>

Speech Event 2: Calling in Sick

Sublist 1 (5/5)	Sublist 2 (4/5)	Sublist 3 (3/5)
<p>1. Unfortunately, I am calling in sick today</p> <p>2. I'm not feeling well today</p> <p>3. <i>I'm so sorry to call last minute, but</i> + ____ [excuse]</p>	<p>1. I'm sorry, but I'm not well enough to come in to work today</p> <p>2. I don't think I should come in today</p> <p>3. I don't think I'm going to be able to come in</p> <p>4. I will not be able to come in today as I am feeling unwell</p> <p>5. I'm not going to be able to make it in today</p> <p>6. I am not well this morning</p> <p>7. I'm not feeling well enough to come into today</p> <p>8. It turns out I'm sick</p> <p>9. I apologize that this is such short notice</p> <p>10. I'm sorry, but I'm too sick to come in this morning</p> <p>11. Hopefully, I'll be/feel better tomorrow</p> <p>12. I should be better by tomorrow</p> <p>13. Thanks for your understanding</p>	<p>1. I don't think I will be able to make it into work</p> <p>2. <i>I've come down with a</i> ____ + [name the problem]</p> <p>3. <i>Sorry for the late notice, but</i> ____ + [excuse]</p> <p>4. I am sorry, but I woke up not feeling very well today</p> <p>5. I'm feeling terrible and not coming in today</p> <p>6. Not feeling the greatest today</p>

Speech Event 3: Requesting Specific Actions

Sublist 1 (5/5)	Sublist 2 (4/5)	Sublist 3 (3/5)
<p>1. <i>I really need you to</i> ____ + [do sth] <i>as soon as you can</i></p> <p>2. <i>If you could</i> ____ + [do sth] <i>for me by</i> ____ + [time period], <i>that would be great</i></p> <p>3. <i>I've noticed that I have not</i> ____ + [done sth] <i>yet</i></p> <p>4. <i>I've noticed that you have not</i> ____ + [done sth] <i>yet</i></p> <p>5. <i>Could you please</i> ____ + [do sth] <i>asap?</i></p> <p>6. <i>Please</i> ____ + [do sth] <i>asap</i></p> <p>7. <i>When can you get</i> ____ + [noun/pronoun] <i>to me?</i></p> <p>8. <i>How soon do you think you can get</i> ____ + [noun/pronoun] <i>to me?</i></p> <p>9. <i>When do you think that will be</i> ____ + [past participle-finished/done]? </p> <p>10. <i>How is</i> ____ + [noun/pronoun] <i>coming along?</i></p>	<p>1. <i>I need you to</i> ____ + [do sth] <i>as soon as you possibly can</i></p> <p>2. <i>Can you get</i> ____ + [noun/pronoun] <i>to me right away?</i></p> <p>3. <i>I need</i> ____ + [noun/pronoun] <i>right away</i></p> <p>4. <i>If you have a minute, could you please</i> ____ + [call for action]?</p> <p>5. <i>Is it possible for you to</i> ____ + [do sth] <i>asap?</i></p> <p>6. <i>Do you have</i> ____ + [noun/pronoun] <i>ready?</i></p> <p>7. <i>I noticed that you're late with</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]</p> <p>8. <i>I wanted to check in about</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]</p> <p>9. <i>How much longer do you need to</i> ____ + [do sth]?</p> <p>10. <i>How are you doing on</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?</p>	<p>1. <i>I don't want to rush you, but</i> ____ + [call for action]</p> <p>2. <i>I need</i> ____ + [noun/pronoun] <i>asap</i></p> <p>3. <i>It is important that you -</i> ____ + [do sth] <i>as soon as possible</i></p> <p>4. <i>Let me know if you need any help</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]</p>

Speech Event 4: Suggesting a Venue for Celebrating Company's Anniversary

Sublist 1 (5/5)	Sublist 2 (4/5)	Sublist 3 (3/5)
<p>1. <i>How about</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?</p> <p>2. <i>We could</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]</p> <p>3. <i>We should consider</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]</p> <p>4. Just a suggestion</p> <p>5. I highly recommend it</p> <p>6. <i>I would recommend</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]</p> <p>7. <i>Let's try</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]</p>	<p>1. That might be an option</p> <p>2. <i>I would really suggest that we consider</i> ____ + [gerund]</p> <p>3. <i>Maybe we can think about</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]</p> <p>4. <i>That might be a great option for</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]</p> <p>5. <i>Maybe we could try</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]</p>	<p>1. <i>Could I suggest</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?</p> <p>2. <i>Maybe we could consider</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]</p> <p>3. What do you guys think?</p> <p>4. I think everyone would enjoy it</p> <p>5. I think many of you would like it</p> <p>6. <i>I think</i> ____ + [suggest a place] <i>is worth a try</i></p> <p>7. <i>We should</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]</p>

Appendix B: Target Pragmatic Formulas Selected for the Teaching Intervention

<p>Lesson 1 (Extending invitations)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would you and your family like to come? 2. I'm/We're having a ____ + [noun: barbeque party] 3. Please feel free to come on ____ + [date]! 4. Would love it if you could ____ + [verb: join] 5. It would be great to have you there! 6. Would be happy if you could ____ + [verb: come] 7. Hope you can make it 8. Come by if you're free 	<p>Lesson 2 (Cancelling/rescheduling appointments)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I would like to cancel my appointment on ____ + [date] 2. I need to reschedule/cancel [my appointment] 3. Something's (has) come up 4. I will not (won't) be able to make it 5. I'm afraid I need to reschedule my appointment 6. I'm calling to reschedule my appointment 7. Do you have any availability ____ + [suggest date range]? 8. Could we reschedule? 9. I was wondering if it would be possible to ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]? 10. I can't make it
<p>Lesson 3 (Resolving issues)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who should I speak to about ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]? 2. <i>Could you check</i> ____ + [noun/pronoun] <i>and see if</i> ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]? 3. Can you please check if ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase] 4. I was hoping you can help me 5. Can you look into it? 6. I was wondering why this happened 7. I'd like this corrected, please 8. Please make sure that ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase] 	<p>Lesson 4 (Responding to requests)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unfortunately, I am unable to stay 2. I wish I could stay and help out, but ____ + [excuse] 3. I'm afraid I can't do it 4. I would love to help, but ____ + [excuse] 5. Is there another way I could help? 6. <i>I could</i> ____ + [promise of future action], <i>if that would help</i> 7. <i>I would usually</i> ____ + [help], <i>but</i> ____ + [excuse] 8. I would be happy to ____ + [work overtime] another day

Appendix C: Ethics Clearance

CERTIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ETHICS CLEARANCE

The Carleton University Research Ethics Board-A (CUREB-A) has granted ethics clearance for the research project described below and research may now proceed. CUREB-A is constituted and operates in compliance with the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (TCPS2).

Ethics Protocol Clearance ID: Project # 106916

Project Team Members: Alisa Zavialova (Primary Investigator)

David Wood (Research Supervisor)

Project Title: An emerging pedagogical approach to teaching pragmatic formulas [Alisa Zavialova]

Funding Source (If applicable):

Effective: **August 23, 2017**

Expires: **August 31, 2018.**

Restrictions:

This certification is subject to the following conditions:

1. Clearance is granted only for the research and purposes described in the application.
2. Any modification to the approved research must be submitted to CUREB-A via a Change to Protocol Form. All changes must be cleared prior to the continuance of the research.
3. An Annual Status Report for the renewal of ethics clearance must be submitted and cleared by the renewal date listed above. Failure to submit the Annual Status Report will result in the closure of the file. If funding is associated, funds will be frozen.
4. A closure request must be sent to CUREB-A when the research is complete or terminated.
5. Should any participant suffer adversely from their participation in the project you are required to report the matter to CUREB-A.

Failure to conduct the research in accordance with the principles of the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans 2nd edition* and the *Carleton University Policies and Procedures for the Ethical Conduct of Research* may result in the suspension or termination of the research project.

Please contact the Research Compliance Coordinators, at ethics@carleton.ca, if you have any questions or require a clearance certificate with a signature.

CLEARED BY:

Date: August 23, 2017

Andy Adler, PhD, Chair, CUREB-A

Bernadette Campbell, PhD, Vice-Chair, CUREB-A

Appendix D: Scenarios Used in Four Open-Ended Oral Discourse Completion Role-Plays

Extending Invitations

Pre-test scenario: You are organizing a barbeque party and would like to invite five families from the street. What would you say to invite one of your neighbours?

Post-test scenario: You are planning a birthday party at your house and would like to invite some friends you've made since you moved to Canada. What would you say to invite one of your Canadian friends?

Delayed post-test scenario: You are planning to host your child's party in your house. You are calling/talking to the parents of the kids your child is friends with to invite them to the party. What would you say in this situation?

Cancelling/Rescheduling Appointments

Pre-test scenario: You have a dental appointment that you need to cancel/reschedule. You are calling your dentist's office. What would you say in this situation?

Post-test scenario: You have an appointment with your financial advisor, but you need to cancel/reschedule that appointment. You are calling your bank. What would you say in this situation?

Delayed post-test scenario: You have an appointment with your family doctor, but you cannot keep this appointment anymore. You are calling your doctor's office to cancel/ reschedule it. What would you say in this situation?

Resolving Financial/Service Issues

Pre-test scenario: You cancelled your insurance plan (e.g., health, travel, home insurance) last month. However, your insurance company charged your chequing account for the same

insurance plan this month. You are calling the insurance company to try and resolve this problem. What would you say in this situation?

Post-test scenario: You have arranged for a technician from a cable company to come to your home at a certain time on a specific day, but they didn't show up. You still want the cable installed. You are calling the cable company to resolve this problem and explain what you want done about it. What would you say in this situation?

Delayed post-test scenario: You've been having very slow internet at home for the past couple of days. You decided to call your service provider to see what can be done to fix this issue. What would you say in this situation?

Responding to Managerial Requests

Pre-test scenario: Your manager is asking you to stay for several extra hours after work today. However, you have other things planned, so you can't stay. What would you say in this situation?

Post-test scenario: Your manager is asking you to come to the office and work this Saturday because your company is understaffed at the moment. You have other things planned, so you can't stay. What would you say in this situation?

Delayed post-test scenario: Your manager is asking you to work on a new project, but you are still working on a project that had been assigned to you earlier. You are not sure if you can handle two projects at the same time. What would you say in this situation?

Appendix E: Formula-Enhanced Lesson Booklets

E1. Lesson 1: Inviting Neighbors to a Barbeque Party

Phase 1: Guided Noticing (approx. 30 min)

Exercise 1. Warm-up and predicting

Note: The terminology should be removed in the student's version of the booklet.

Instructions: Can you think of some real-life situations in which people may say something like this:

Note: Here teachers can provide more than 3 examples (any examples from the shortlist).

- Would you and your family like to come?

Possible situation (s): _____

- It would be great to have you there!

Possible situation (s): _____

- Please feel free to come on ____ + [date]!

Possible situation (s): _____

Exercise 2. Exploration through written contextualized input

Background: 8 native speakers of English were asked to respond to the following scenario:

You are organizing a barbeque party and would like to invite five families from the street. What would you say to invite one of your neighbours?

Read their responses below and try to notice and underline any expressions/word combinations that were similar to those discussed at the beginning of today's lesson (e.g. *It would be great to have you there!*). The first response has been done for you.

- Hi, I'm planning a barbeque on [date and time], would you and your family like to come? Feel free to bring a salad or dessert.
- Hey! If you're not up to anything this weekend I'm having a BBQ at my place. It'll be really casual, just inviting a few local folks. Bring the fam if you're free.
- Hi! We are having a barbecue, please feel free to come on [date]!
- I am not sure if you have heard, but we are having a neighborhood barbeque this weekend and we would love it if you could join us.
- We're having a BBQ at our place. It would be great to have you there. Are you able to come?
- Hi, Tom. Say, we're going to be having a bit of a street party – a barbecue – and would be happy if you could come.
- We're having a barbeque next Sunday – 3PM – hope you can make it!
- Hey, we're having a barbeque on Saturday. Come by if you're free

Phase 2: Deep Cognitive Engagement and Stimulating Retention (approx. 60 min)

Exercise 1. Form-comparison and explicit metapragmatic explanation

Instructions: Now compare the expressions you've underlined in Exercise 1 with the list provided in your handout. Were you able to notice most of them?

Teacher's script:

Such expressions are also called '*pragmatic formulas*'. These are fixed or semi-fixed multi-word combinations *frequently used* by the native/highly proficient speakers of the language for *specific communicative purposes*. Such expressions can be very beneficial for developing *fluency* and *accuracy* in a second language. The knowledge of these expressions can also help you improve your *pragmatic competence* (ability to use your second language in a contextually appropriate way in order to be properly understood by the native/highly proficient speakers of

Target pragmatic formulas:

1. Would you and your family like to come?
2. I'm/We're having a ____ + [noun: barbeque party]
3. Please feel free to come on ____ + [date]!
4. Would love it if you could ____ + [verb: join]
5. It would be great to have you there!
6. Would be happy if you could ____ + [verb: come]
7. Hope you can make it
8. Come by if you're free

Exercise 2. Understanding the implied meaning of the target formulas and explicit metapragmatic explanation

Review 1. Match the pragmatic formulas with their best paraphrased versions. Pay careful attention to the hints provided for you.

1. Hope you can make it!

Hint: the verb 'make' doesn't mean 'make something with your hands' in this context

2. Would love it if you could ____ + [verb: join]

Hint: the phrase 'would love it' doesn't mean 'have romantic feelings for somebody' in this context

3. It would be great to have you there!

Hint: the verb 'have' doesn't mean 'own/possess' in this context

4. Please feel free to come on ____ + [date]!

Hint: the phrase 'feel free' doesn't refer to freedom in the literal/direct sense in this context

- a. It would be a great pleasure for me if you come
- b. It would be great if you are going to be present at my party
- c. I hope you are able to come to/join my party
- d. Come to the party if you like

Note: Note that these paraphrased versions are the interpretations of the author; teachers may want to create their own paraphrases.

Answer key: 1-c; 2-a; 3-b; 4-d.
--

Review 2. Review each pragmatic formula again and decide whether each pragmatic formula is a direct or an indirect speech act.

In other words, how direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

Circle or underline the chosen answer.

Hint: Direct speech acts is when the speaker says exactly what he/she means. Indirect speech acts is when the speaker means more than he/she says in reality. Indirect speech acts are generally considered more polite in English.

- I'm having a ____ + [noun: barbeque party]

How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Would love it if you could ____ + [verb: join]

How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Hope you can make it!

How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- It would be great to have you there!

How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Come by if you're free

How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Would you and your family like to come?

How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Would be happy if you could ____ + [verb: come]

How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Please feel free to come on ____ + [date]!

How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

Exercise 3: Speech act analysis

Instructions: Read each response and divide it into meaningful components (parts). Next, find a phrase that matches speaker's communicative strategy, as shown in the example. Check your answers with the rest of the class.

Example: Hi, I'm planning a barbeque on [date and time], would you and your family like to come? Feel free to bring a salad or dessert.

Part 1

Part 2

Hi, I'm planning a barbeque on [date and time]
come?

Would you and your family like to

Part 3

Feel free to bring a salad or dessert

Speaker's strategy

Phrase

Greeting + context → Hi, I'm planning a barbeque on [date and time]
Invitation → Would you and your family like to come?
Additional information → Feel free to bring a salad or dessert

- Hey! If you're not up to anything this weekend I'm having a BBQ at my place. It'll be really casual, just inviting a few local folks. Bring the fam if you're free.

Greeting + invitation → _____
Context → _____
Additional information → _____

- Hi! We are having a barbecue, please feel free to come on [date]!

Greeting + context → _____
Invitation → _____

- I am not sure if you have heard, but we are having a neighborhood barbeque this weekend and we would love it if you could join us.

Context → _____
Invitation → _____

- We're having a BBQ at our place. It would be great to have you there. Are you able to come?

Context → _____
Invitation → _____
Follow-up question → _____

- Hi, Tom. We're going to be having a bit of a street party – a barbecue – and would be happy if you could come.

Greeting → _____
Context → _____
Invitation → _____

- We're having a barbeque next Sunday – 3PM – hope you can make it!

Context → _____
Invitation → _____

- Hey, we're having a barbeque on Saturday. Come by if you're free.

Greeting + context → _____

Invitation → _____

Phase 3: Practice (approx. 30 min)

Instructions:

The class is divided into two groups: 'hosts' and 'guests (neighbours)'. Each 'host' will have to 'visit' each 'guest', introduce himself/herself, tell them they are planning a street BBQ and invite them to join it (by using the target pragmatic formulas).

Each 'guest' will also have to introduce himself/herself and accept the invitation. In addition, each 'guest' will mention what he/she will bring to the party to share with other guests (*each 'guest' will be given an information card containing a script*).

For example:

Guest: Sure, I would love to come/join! I'll bring a salad/desert etc.

As a result, the 'hosts' will make a 'guest list' (their names and what they are going to bring).

They'll have to make sure to write down all the information (*each 'host' will be given instruction cards on how to proceed*).

Next, the students switch roles: 'hosts' become 'guests' and vice versa and repeat the same scenario.

The teacher is going to monitor students' performance and provide feedback when necessary.

Instructions for 'hosts':

1. Visit each 'guest', introduce yourself, tell them they are planning a street BBQ and invite them to join it (by using the target pragmatic formulas).
2. Make a 'guest list' (your guests' names and what they are going to bring to the party).
Make sure to write down all the information when you talk to your guests.

The 'guest list'

Guest's name	What is he/she going to bring?

Scripts for the 'guests:

Guest 1: Sure, I would love to come! I'll bring a salad.

Guest 2: Sure, I would love to come! I'll bring some plastic plates and forks.

Guest 3: Sure, I would love to join! I'll bring some soft drinks.

Guest 4: Sure, I would love to come! I'll bring some fruit.

Guest 5: Sure, I would love to join! I'll bring some homemade banana bread for dessert.

Guest 6: Sure, I would love to come! I'll bring some beer.

E2. Lesson 2: Cancelling/Rescheduling a Doctor's Appointment

Phase 1: Guided Noticing (approx. 30 min)

Exercise 1. Warm-up and predicting

Note: The terminology should be removed in the student's version of the booklet.

Instructions: Can you think of some real-life situations in which people may say something like this:

Note: Here teachers can provide more than 3 examples (any examples from the shortlist).

- Could we reschedule?

Possible situation (s): _____

- I can't make it

Possible situation (s): _____

- Do you have any availability_____ + [suggest date range]?

Possible situation (s): _____

Exercise 2. Exploration through written contextualized input

Background: 10 native speakers of English were asked to respond to the following scenario:

You have a dental appointment that you need to cancel or reschedule. You are calling your dentist's office. What would you say in this situation?

Read their responses below and try to notice and underline any expressions/word combinations that were similar to those we discussed at the beginning of today's lesson (e.g., *Do you have any availability_____ + [suggest date range]?*). The first response has been done for you.

- Hello, *I would like to cancel my appointment on* Wednesday. My name is xxxxxx. I will call back to reschedule when I am available to come in.
- Hi, it's [name] calling, I have an appointment with Dr. Smith on Tuesday, March 6th?
Yeah, I need to reschedule. Thanks.
- Hi, (name). Something's come up, and I need to reschedule the appointment that I had for (time/date). Do you have any appointments free for (dentist) in the near future?
- Hi, this is Mr. Browne, unfortunately I will not be able to make my 11:00 appointment with Dr. Smith as something has come up. I will call back to reschedule as soon as I can.
- Hello. This is [name]. I'm afraid I need to reschedule my appointment.
- Hi, I am calling to reschedule an appointment for a cleaning with _____.
Unfortunately, I can't make it this week. Does he/she have an opening next week?
- Hi there, I'm just calling to reschedule my Thursday appointment with Dr. Z. I'm not going to make it. Do you have any availability next week? Early mornings are better.
- Hi, I'm calling about my appointment today. I won't be able to make it. I'm sorry. Could we reschedule?
- Hello, my name is (insert name) I have an appointment at (time). I am calling to inform you that I will not be able to make the appointment because..... My car is broken and I have to bring it in the shop to get it fixed. I was wondering if it would be possible to reschedule for another day?
- Hello, I need to cancel my appointment that's scheduled for tomorrow. Something came up, and I can't make it.

Phase 2: Deep Cognitive Engagement and Stimulating Retention (approx. 60 min)

Exercise 1. Form-comparison and metapragmatic explanation

Instructions: Now compare the expressions you've underlined in Exercise 1 with the list provided in your handout. Were you able to notice most of them?

Teacher's script:

Such expressions are also called '*pragmatic formulas*'. These are fixed or semi-fixed multi-word combinations *frequently used* by the native/highly proficient speakers of the language for *specific communicative purposes*. Such expressions can be very beneficial for developing *fluency* and *accuracy* in a second language. The knowledge of these expressions can also help you improve your *pragmatic competence* (ability to use your second language in a contextually appropriate way in order to be properly understood by the native/highly proficient speakers of the language). Such expressions can help you *sound more natural* in your second language, and, as a result, you are more likely to be accepted into the '*inner social circle*' of the second language community.

Now let's move on to Exercises 2 and 3. These exercises were designed to help you better memorize these

Target pragmatic formulas:

1. I would like to cancel my appointment on ____ + [date]
2. I need to reschedule/cancel [my appointment]
3. Something's (has) come up
4. I will not (won't) be able to make it
5. I'm afraid I need to reschedule my appointment
6. I'm calling to reschedule my appointment
7. Do you have any availability ____ + [suggest date range]?
8. Could we reschedule?
9. I was wondering if it would be possible to ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?
10. I can't make it

Exercise 2. Understanding the implied meaning of the target formulas and explicit metapragmatic explanation

Review 1. Match the pragmatic formulas with their best paraphrased versions. Pay careful attention to the hints provided for you.

1. Something has come up

Hint: the phrasal verb 'come up' doesn't refer to the action of coming in the literal/direct sense in this context

2. I was wondering if it would be possible to ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?

Hint: the phrase 'I was wondering' means 'I wanted to know' in this context

3. I can't make it

Hint: the verb 'make' doesn't mean 'make something with your hands' in this context

4. I'm afraid I need to reschedule my appointment

Hint: the phrase 'I'm afraid' doesn't mean 'I'm physically scared' in this context

- a. I can't come to my appointment
- b. Unfortunately, I need to reschedule my appointment
- c. Something unexpected has happened and I can't come to my appointment
- d. I just wanted to know if it would be possible to reschedule my appointment

Note: Note that these paraphrased versions are the interpretations of the author; teachers may want to create their own paraphrases.

Answer key: 1-c; 2-d; 3-a; 4-b.
--

Review 2. Review each pragmatic formula again and decide whether each pragmatic formula is a direct or an indirect speech act.

In other words, how direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation? Circle or underline the chosen answer.

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

Hint: Direct speech acts is when the speaker says exactly what he/she means. Indirect speech acts is when the speaker means more than he/she says in reality. Indirect speech acts are generally considered more polite in English.

- I'm calling to cancel/reschedule my appointment

How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I need to reschedule my appointment

How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Something has come up and I ____ + [excuse]

How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I would like to cancel/reschedule my appointment on ____ + [date- Wednesday]

How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Can/could we reschedule?

How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I was wondering if it would be possible to reschedule for ____ + [date- the following week]?

How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I won't be able to make it/ I can't make it

How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Do you have any availability/ies ____ + [suggest date range]?

How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Would it be possible to move the appointment to ____ + [suggest date range]?

How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I'm afraid I need to reschedule my appointment

How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

Exercise 3: Speech act analysis

Instructions: Read each response and divide it into meaningful components (parts). Next, find a phrase that matches speaker's communicative strategy, as shown in the example. Check your answers with the rest of the class.

Example: Hi there, I need to reschedule my appointment. Do you have any availabilities for [suggest date range]?

Part 1

Hi there, I need to reschedule my appointment
[suggest date range]?

Speaker's strategy

Greeting + Request for appointment change →
appointment

Follow-up question →
[suggest date range]?

- Hello, I would like to cancel my dental appointment on Wednesday. My name is xxxxxx. I will call back to reschedule when I am available to come in.

Greeting + request for appointment cancellation →

Providing personal information →

Promise of future action →

- Hi, it's [name] calling, I have an appointment with Dr. Smith on Tuesday, March 6th. Yeah, I need to reschedule. Thanks.

Greeting + context →

Request for appointment cancellation →

Thanking →

- Hi, (name). Something's come up, and I need to reschedule the appointment that I had for (time/date). Do you have any appointments free for (dentist) in the near future?

Part 2

Do you have any availabilities for

Phrase

Hi there, I need to reschedule my

Do you have any availabilities for

Greeting →

Explanation + Request for appointment change →

Follow-up question →

- Hi, this is Mr. Browne, unfortunately I will not be able to make my 11:00 appointment with Dr. Smith as something has come up. I will call back to reschedule as soon as I can.

Greeting →

Explanation →

Promise of future action →

- Hello. This is [name]. I'm afraid I need to reschedule my appointment.

Greeting →

Request for appointment change →

- Hi, I am calling to reschedule an appointment for a cleaning with _____. Unfortunately, I can't make it this week. Does he/she have an opening next week?

Greeting + Request for appointment change →

Explanation →

Follow-up question →

- Hi there, I'm just calling to reschedule my Thursday appointment with Dr. Z. I'm not going to make it. Do you have any availability next week? Early mornings are better.

Greeting + Request for appointment change

→

Explanation → _____

Follow-up question → _____

- Hi, I'm calling about my appointment today. I won't be able to make it. I'm sorry. Could we reschedule?

Greeting + context → _____

Explanation → _____

Apology → _____

Request for appointment change → _____

- Hello my name is (insert name). I have an appointment at (time). I am calling to inform you that I will not be able to make the appointment because.... My car is broken and I have to bring it in the shop to get it fixed. I was wondering if it would be possible to reschedule for another day?

Greeting → _____

Context → _____

Explanation → _____

Request for appointment change → _____

- Hello, I need to cancel my appointment that's scheduled for tomorrow. Something came up, and I can't make it.

Greeting + Request for appointment cancellation → _____

Phase 3: Practice (approx. 30 min)

Instructions:

Students work in pairs and role-play the following scenario:

Part 1: The first student is a *patient* and he/she is calling a dental clinic to try and reschedule his/her appointment. The second student is a *receptionist* who receives the call. Both students have their ‘calendars’ in front of them at the time of the call.

The ‘patient’ has his/her calendar with all the commitments marked until the end of the month.

The ‘receptionist’ has his/her own calendar with the doctor’s appointment schedule. Their task is to negotiate the best suitable time for a new appointment. If there are no available appointments, the ‘patient’ will need to cancel. It is important that ‘patients’ use the target pragmatic formulas as they negotiate appointments’ times.

Part 2: Student switch roles.

E3. Lesson 3: Resolving Financial Issues over the Phone

Phase 1: Guided Noticing (approx. 30 min)

Exercise 1. Warm-up and predicting

Note: The terminology should be removed in the student’s version of the booklet.

Instructions: Can you think of some real-life situations in which people may say something like this:

Note: Here teachers can provide more than 3 examples (any examples from the shortlist).

- Can you please check if ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]

Possible situation (s): _____

- Can you look into it?

Possible situation (s): _____

- I'd like this corrected, please

Possible situation (s): _____

Exercise 2. Exploration through written contextualized input

Background: 8 native speakers of English were asked to respond to the following scenario:

You cancelled an insurance policy last month. However, you were charged this month again for the same insurance policy. You are calling your insurance company to complain about the problem and explain what you want done about it. What would you say in this situation?

Read their responses below and try to notice and underline any expressions/word combinations that were similar to those we discussed at the beginning of today's lesson (e.g., *Can you look into it?*). The first response has been done for you.

- Hello, my name is (name) and I'm calling regarding policy number (x). I cancelled this policy a month ago, but I see from my bank statement that withdrawals are still being made from my bank account. **Who should I speak to about** having the money returned, and confirmation in writing that the withdrawals will no longer happen?
- Hello. I am calling about my insurance policy which I cancelled last month. I see that I was billed this month. Could you check my account and see if the policy was in fact cancelled in your system? I would also like to make sure I am reimbursed for this month's charge.

- Hello. I cancelled my policy last month on May 28th. However, I noticed that I paid again this month. Why would that be? Can you please check if I can be reimbursed?
- Hello, this is [name]. I cancelled my insurance policy last month, but I see that the charge came out of my account again this month. I was hoping you can help me.
- Hi there. I'm calling about my homeowner's policy. Hang on a sec, let me find it. That's the Policy number right...not the Reference Number? C10992888-17. Anyway, I cancelled that policy last month but when I checked my banking account for this month, it looks like there's still money coming out. Can you look into it?
- Hello, I recently canceled my insurance plan with your company, but I still got charge for the monthly fee. I was wondering why this happened? And will you be able to return the monthly payment back to me?
- I cancelled my policy last month, but you are still withdrawing money from my account. I'd like this corrected please.
- Hello, I cancelled my insurance policy last month, but another payment was taken from my account this month. Could you tell me why? I would like the money deposited back into my account and please make sure that the policy is cancelled.

Phase 2: Deep Cognitive Engagement and Stimulating Retention (approx. 60 min)

Exercise 1. Form-comparison and explicit metapragmatic explanation

Instructions: Now compare the expressions you've underlined in Exercise 1 with the list provided in your handout. Were you able to notice most of them?

Teacher's script:

Such expressions are also called '*pragmatic formulas*'. These are fixed or semi-fixed multi-word combinations *frequently used* by the native/highly proficient speakers of the language for *specific communicative purposes*. Such expressions can be very beneficial for developing *fluency* and *accuracy* in a second language. The knowledge of these expressions can also help you improve your *pragmatic competence* (ability to use your second language in a contextually appropriate way in order to be properly understood by the native/highly proficient speakers of the language). Such expressions can help you *sound more natural* in your second language, and, as a result, you are more likely to be accepted into the '*inner social circle*' of the second language community.

Target pragmatic formulas:

1. Who should I speak to about ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?
2. *Could you check* ____ + [noun/pronoun] *and see if* ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?
3. Can you please check if ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]
4. I was hoping you can help me
5. Can you look into it?
6. I was wondering why this happened
7. I'd like this corrected, please
8. Please make sure that ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]

Exercise 2. Understanding the implied meaning of the target formulas and explicit metapragmatic explanation

Review 1. Match the pragmatic formulas with their best paraphrased versions. Pay careful attention to the hints provided for you.

1. Please make sure that ___ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase- the policy is cancelled]

Hint: the verb 'make' doesn't mean 'make something with your hands' in this context

2. I was wondering why this happened

Hint: the phrase 'I was wondering' means 'I wanted to know' in this context

3. Can you look into it?

Hint: the phrase 'look into' doesn't mean 'to physically look at/see something' in this context

- a. I just wanted to know why this happened
- b. Could you please check my file to see what the problem is
- c. Please confirm that this won't repeat again

Note: Note that these paraphrased versions are the interpretations of the author; teachers may want to create their own paraphrases.

Answer key: 1-c; 2-a; 3-b.

Review 2. Review each pragmatic formula again and decide whether each pragmatic formula is a direct or an indirect speech act.

In other words, how direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved? Circle or underline the chosen answer.

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

Hint: Direct speech acts is when the speaker says exactly what he/she means. Indirect speech acts is when the speaker means more than he/she says in reality. Indirect speech acts are generally considered more polite in English.

- Can you please check if ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]

How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Please make sure that ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase- the policy is cancelled]

How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I'd like this corrected, please

How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Can you look into ____ + [pronoun- it/that]?

How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Could you check ____ + [noun/pronoun] and see if ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?

How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Who should I speak to about ____ + [any meaningful completion of the phrase]?

How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I was hoping you can help me

How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I was wondering why this happened

How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

Exercise 3: Speech act analysis

Instructions: Read each response and divide it into meaningful components (parts). Next, find a phrase that matches speaker's communicative strategy, as shown in the example. Check your answers with the rest of the class.

Example: Hello, my name is (name) and I'm calling regarding policy number (x). I cancelled this policy a month ago, but I see from my bank statement that withdrawals are still being made from my bank account. Who should I speak to about having the money returned, and confirmation in writing that the withdrawals will no longer happen?

Part 1

Hello, my name is (name) and I'm calling regarding policy number (x).

Part 2

I cancelled this policy a month ago, but I see from my bank statement that withdrawals are still being made from my bank account.

Part 3

Who should I speak to about having the money returned, and confirmation in writing that the withdrawals will no longer happen?

Speaker's strategy

Phrase

Greeting + Reason for calling →
policy number (x).

Hello, my name is (name) and I'm calling regarding

Context →

I cancelled this policy a month ago, but I see from my bank statement that withdrawals are still being made from my bank account.

Follow-up question →

Who should I speak to about having the money returned, and confirmation in writing that the withdrawals will no longer happen?

- Hello. I am calling about my insurance policy which I cancelled last month. I see that I was billed this month. Could you check my account and see if the policy was in fact cancelled in your system? I would also like to make sure I am reimbursed for this month's charge.

Greeting + Reason for calling →

Request to resolve an issue

→

Follow-up request →

- Hello. I cancelled my policy last month on May 28th. However, I noticed that I paid again this month. Why would that be? Can you please check if I can be reimbursed?

Greeting + Context →

Asking about the reason that caused an issue →

Request to resolve an issue →

- Hi there. I'm calling about my homeowner's policy. Hang on a sec, let me find it. That's the Policy number right...not the Reference Number? C10992888-17. Anyway, I

cancelled that policy last month but when I checked my banking account for this month, it looks like there's still money coming out. Can you look into it?

Greeting + Reason for calling →

Context →

Request to resolve an issue →

- Hello, I recently canceled my insurance plan with your company, but I still got charged for the monthly fee. I was wondering why this happened? And will you be able to return the monthly payment back to me?

Greeting + Context →

Asking about the reason that caused an issue →

Follow-up question →

- I cancelled my policy last month, but you are still withdrawing money from my account. I'd like this corrected please.

Context →

Request to resolve an issue →

- Hello, I cancelled my insurance policy last month, but another payment was taken from my account this month. Could you tell me why? I would like the money deposited back into my account and please make sure that the policy is cancelled.

Greeting + Context →

Asking about the reason that caused an issue →

Request to resolve an issue →

- Hello, this is [name]. I cancelled my insurance policy last month, but I see that the charge came out of my account again this month. I was hoping you can help me? I'd like to have that refunded back to my bank account.

Greeting + Context →

Request to resolve an issue →

Follow-up request →

Phase 3: Practice (approx. 30 min)

Instructions:

Students and the two teachers role-play the following scenario:

‘Agents’- teachers play the role of the customer service agents

The ‘agents’ explain the reasons behind the discrepancy with the insurance- 2 different scripts are provided

Reasons:

- There was a mistake on the company’s end (wrong month marked for the policy cancellation on their file) –*company’s fault- an agent offers a reimbursement*
- the tenant didn’t notify them on time that they moved/changed address- *customer’s fault – an agent doesn’t want to provide a reimbursement first, but the customer insists (by using the formulas), so the agent finally makes an exception*

‘Customers’- the students play the role of the customers

The ‘customers’ call each agent to find out what had caused the issue and, depending on the reason, negotiate if they can get a refund.

Scripts for the agents:

Agent 1

Hello, you've reached ZipSure insurance company (tenant and home insurance). My name is _____. How may I help you today?

Listen to the customer's explanation.

Oh, I see. Let me check your file here.... It looks like there was an error in our system and we marked the wrong month for your policy cancellation. I do apologize, this is totally our fault. We will refund you in full in the next 2-3 business days.

Listen to the customer's response.

Is there anything else I can help you with today?

Listen to the customer's response.

Thank you for your understanding. Bye now.

Agent 2

Hello, you've reached ZipSure insurance company (tenant and home insurance). My name is _____. How may I help you today?

Listen to the customer's explanation.

Oh, I see. Let me check your file here.... I am sorry, but my notes show that the last time you spoke to one of our agents, you didn't notify them that you were moving out from your previous address. We didn't have that information on file for you, that's why you were still charged this month.

Oh, I see. Let me check your file here....

Listen to the customer's response.

Alright, I see your point. I understand this was an inconvenience for you, so we are going to make an exception and reimburse your account in the next 2-3 business days.

Listen to the customer's response.

Thank you and have a nice day.

E4. Lesson 4: Responding to Manager's Requests

Phase 1: Guided Noticing (approx. 30 min)

Exercise 1. Warm-up and predicting

Note: The terminology should be removed in the student's version of the booklet.

Instructions: Can you think of some real-life situations in which people may say something like this:

Note: Here teachers can provide more than 3 examples (any examples from the shortlist).

- I would love to help, but

Possible situation (s): _____

- I'm afraid I can't do it

Possible situation (s): _____

- I wish I could stay and help out, but

Possible situation (s): _____

Exercise 2. Exploration through written contextualized input

Background: 8 native speakers of English were asked to respond to the following scenario:

Your manager is asking you to stay for several extra hours after work today. However, you have other things planned, so you can't stay. What would you say in this situation?

Read their responses below and try to notice and underline any expressions/word combinations that were similar to those we discussed at the beginning of today's lesson (e.g., *I'm afraid I can't do it*). The first response has been done for you.

- **Unfortunately, I am unable to stay** later today. I have important matters that I have to deal with at home.
- I wish I could stay and help out, but I have an appointment I need to attend, and I can't change it. I could come in a bit earlier tomorrow and stay later if that would help.
- I'm afraid I can't do it tonight. I have other things to attend to.
- I'm really sorry, I would love to help but am going to Toronto to visit my grandmother this weekend. We are heading out within the next hour. Can I work on it on Monday?
- Unfortunately, I am unable to stay today, as I have some pressing errands I need to run. Is there another way I can help you?
- Oh gosh I can't tonight I have to attend a function or otherwise I would. I could come in early tomorrow if that would help.
- I would usually stay the extra hours, but I have plans to go.
- I'm sorry, but today I'm not able to stay late. I would be happy to work overtime another day.

Phase 2: Deep Cognitive Engagement and Stimulating Retention (approx. 60 min)

Exercise 1. Form-comparison and explicit metapragmatic explanation

Teacher's script:

Such expressions are also called '*pragmatic formulas*'. These are fixed or semi-fixed multi-word combinations *frequently used* by the native/highly proficient speakers of the language for *specific communicative purposes*. Such expressions can be very beneficial for developing *fluency* and *accuracy* in a second language. The knowledge of these expressions can also help you improve your *pragmatic competence* (ability to use your second language in a contextually appropriate way in order to be properly understood by the native/highly proficient speakers of the language). Such expressions can help you *sound more natural* in your second language, and, as a result, you are more likely to be accepted into the '*inner social circle*' of the second language community.

Target pragmatic formulas:

1. Unfortunately, I am unable to stay
2. I wish I could stay and help out, but ____ + [excuse]
3. I'm afraid I can't do it
4. I would love to help, but ____ + [excuse]
5. Is there another way I can help?
6. *I could* ____ + [promise of future action], *if that would help*
7. *I would usually* ____ + [help], *but* ____ + [excuse]
8. I would be happy to ____ + [work overtime] another day

Instructions: Now compare the expressions you've underlined in Exercise 1 with the list provided in your handout. Were you able to notice them?

Exercise 2. Understanding the implied meaning of the target formulas and explicit metapragmatic explanation

Review 1. Match the pragmatic formulas with their best paraphrased versions. Pay careful attention to the hints provided for you.

1. I wish I could stay and help out, but ____ + [excuse]

Hint: the verb 'wish' expresses regret in this context

2. I would love to help, but ____ + [excuse]

Hint: the phrase 'would love it' doesn't mean 'have romantic feelings for somebody' in this context

3. I'm afraid I can't do it

Hint: the phrase 'I'm afraid' doesn't mean 'I'm physically scared' in this context

4. Is there another way I can help?

Hint: the phrase 'is there another way' doesn't refer to the actual way/road in this context

- a. I would really like to help, but I can't
- b. Unfortunately, I can't stay and help
- c. Can I help you with anything else meanwhile?
- d. I regret to inform you that I can't stay

Note: Note that these paraphrased versions are the interpretations of the author; teachers may want to create their own paraphrases.

Answer key: 1-b; 2-a; 3-d; 4-c.

Review 2. Review each pragmatic formula again and decide whether each pragmatic formula is a direct or an indirect speech act.

In other words, how direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Circle or underline the chosen answer.

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

Hint: Direct speech acts is when the speaker says exactly what he/she means. Indirect speech acts is when the speaker means more than he/she says in reality. Indirect speech acts are generally considered more polite in English.

- Unfortunately, I am unable to stay

How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I wish I could stay and help out, but ____ + [excuse]

How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I would love to help, but ____ + [excuse]

How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I could ____ + [promise of future action], if that would help

How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I would be happy to ____ + [work overtime] another day

How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I'm afraid I can't do it

How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I would usually ____ + [help], but ____ + [excuse]

How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Is there another way I can help?

How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

Exercise 3: Speech act analysis

Instructions: Read each response and divide it into meaningful components (parts). Next, find a phrase that matches speaker's communicative strategy, as shown in the example. Check your answers with the rest of the class.

Example: Unfortunately, I am unable to stay later today. I have important matters that I have to deal with at home.

Part 1

Unfortunately, I am unable to stay later today

Part 2

I have important matters that I have to deal with at home

Speaker's strategy

Regret + refusal →

Excuse →

home

Phrase

Unfortunately, I am unable to stay later today

I have important matters that I have to deal with at

- I wish I could stay and help out, but I have an appointment I need to attend, and I can't change it. I could come in a bit earlier tomorrow and stay later if that would help.

Regret + excuse →

Offering help →

- I'm afraid I can't do it tonight. I have other things to attend to.

Regret+ refusal →

Excuse →

- I'm really sorry, I would love to help but am going to Toronto to visit my grandmother this weekend. We are heading out within the next hour. Can I work on it on Monday?

Apology →

Regret + refusal →

Offering help →

- Unfortunately, I am unable to stay later today. I have important matters that I have to deal with at home.

Regret + refusal →

Excuse →

- Unfortunately, I am unable to stay today, as I have some pressing errands I need to run. Is there another way I can help you?

Regret + refusal →

Excuse →

Offering help →

- Oh gosh I can't tonight I have attend a function or otherwise I would. I could come in early tomorrow if that would help.

Refusal + excuse →

Offering help →

- I would usually stay the extra hours, but I have plans to go.

Excuse + refusal →

- I'm sorry, but today I'm not able to stay late. I would be happy to work overtime another day.

Apology + refusal →

Offering help → _____

Phase 3: Practice (approx. 30 min)

Instructions:

Students and the two teachers role-play the following scenario:

‘Managers’- teachers play the role of a manager

‘Employees’- students play the role of an employee

The ‘managers’ are requesting their ‘employees’ to stay extra hours after work (*scripts are provided*) to finish an important report. The ‘employees’ are going to decline their ‘manager’s’ request *by using the target pragmatic formulas* from their lists. The ‘employees’ also need to make sure that they offer help to their ‘managers’ at some point in the conversation (*again, by using the target formulas*). Once they do that, the ‘managers’ will suggest several other potential times and start negotiating with the ‘employees’ until a consensus is reached.

Scripts for the managers:

Manager 1

- Hi _____(name)! How is it going? I was wondering if you would be willing to stay until 7 today to finish that report we’ve been working on. Can you make it?

Wait for ‘employee’s’ response

- Oh, I see. But we really need it to be done by the end of next week...

Wait for ‘employee’s’ response- at this point, they should have offered help.

- Ok, great. How about you stay longer on Monday to finish it. Would that work?

Wait for ‘employee’s’ response. Continue negotiating until a consensus is reached.

Manager 2

- Hi _____(name)! How is it going? Would you be able to stay until 7 today to finish that report we've been working on. Can you make it?

Wait for 'employee's' response

- Oh, I see. But we really need it to be done by the end of next week...

Wait for 'employee's' response- at this point, they should have offered help.

- Ok, great. How about you stay longer some time early next week. Would that be possible?

Wait for 'employee's' response. Continue negotiating until a consensus is reached.

Appendix F: Awareness-Raising Lesson Booklets

F1. Lesson 1: Inviting Neighbors to a Barbeque Party

Phase 1: Exploration and Awareness-Raising (approx. 1 hour 30 min)

Exercise 1: Brainstorming and metapragmatic explanation

Instructions: Imagine yourself in this situation:

You are organizing a barbeque party and would like to invite five families from the street. What would you say to invite one of your neighbours?

*What would you say in this situation in **your first/native language**? What would you say **in English**?*

Before you write your answers, think:

➤ How big is the ***social distance*** (how well do the speakers know each other; their age & gender) between you and your neighbours?

➤ How much ***power/authority*** do you have over your neighbours?

➤ How big are the ***potential risks*** for you if your neighbor doesn't come to your party?

How big are the ***potential risks*** for your neighbour if he/she doesn't come to your party?

Brainstorm your possible responses in your native language first. Then think of an English translation.

My possible responses in my language:

English translation:

Teacher's script: *When you engage in a conversation with 2 or more people, there are 3 key factors you need to keep in mind:*

Social distance (how well do the speakers know each other; age & gender)

Note: As the level of social distance increases (goes up), the level of politeness increases (goes up)

Power (does the speaker have any power/authority over the hearer or vice versa; what are their roles)

Note: As the level of power (goes up), the level of politeness increases (goes up)

Imposition (the type of obligation the speaker is forcing the hearer to do- e.g., borrow money vs to borrow a pen- is this a high stakes context? What are potential risks?)

Note: As the level of imposition (obligation/responsibility) increases, so does the level of politeness

Exercise 2: Lay cross-cultural analysis

Instructions: This is how some native speakers of English reacted to the same situation. Read and compare their answers with your own responses in Exercise 1.

- Hi, I'm planning a barbeque on [date and time], would you and your family like to come?
Feel free to bring a salad or dessert.
- Hey! If you're not up to anything this weekend I'm having a BBQ at my place. It'll be really casual, just inviting a few local folks. Bring the fam if you're free.
- Hi! We are having a barbecue, please feel free to come on [date]!

- I am not sure if you have heard, but we are having a neighborhood barbeque this weekend and we would love it if you could join us.
- We're having a BBQ at our place. It would be great to have you there. Are you able to come?
- Hi, Tom. Say, we're going to be having a bit of a street party – a barbecue – and would be happy if you could come.
- We're having a barbeque next Sunday – 3PM – hope you can make it!
- Hey, we're having a barbeque on Saturday. Come by if you're free.

Questions for reflection:

- Are these responses different from/similar to your own responses in your native language?
- Are these responses different from/similar to your own responses in English?
- What are the main similarities (if any) between your own responses and those provided by the native speakers?
- What are the main differences (if any)?

Exercise 3: Speech acts analysis

Instructions: Read each response and divide it into meaningful components (parts). Next, find a phrase that matches speaker's communicative strategy, as shown in the example. Check your answers with the rest of the class.

Example: Hi, I'm planning a barbeque on [date and time], would you and your family like to come? Feel free to bring a salad or dessert.

Part 1

Hi, I'm planning a barbeque on [date and time]
come?

Part 2

Would you and your family like to

Part 3

Feel free to bring a salad or dessert

Speaker's strategy

Phrase

Greeting + context → Hi, I'm planning a barbeque on [date and time]

Invitation → Would you and your family like to come?

Additional information → Feel free to bring a salad or dessert

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hey! If you're not up to anything this weekend I'm having a BBQ at my place. It'll be really casual, just inviting a few local folks. Bring the fam if you're free.

Greeting + invitation →

Context →

Additional information →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hi! We are having a barbecue, please feel free to come on [date]!

Greeting + context →

Invitation → _____

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I am not sure if you have heard, but we are having a neighborhood barbeque this weekend and we would love it if you could join us.

Context → _____

Invitation → _____

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- We're having a BBQ at our place. It would be great to have you there. Are you able to come?

Context → _____

Invitation → _____

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Hi, Tom. We're going to be having a bit of a street party – a barbecue – and would be happy if you could come.

Greeting → _____

Context → _____

Invitation → _____

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ We're having a barbeque next Sunday – 3PM – hope you can make it!

Context →

Invitation →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hey, we're having a barbeque on Saturday. Come by if you're free.

Greeting + context →

Invitation →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she invited his/her neighbour to the party?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

Phase 2: Practice (approx. 30 min)

Identical to the FE group.

F2. Lesson 2: Cancelling/Rescheduling a Doctor's Appointment

Phase 1: Exploration and Awareness-Raising (approx. 1 hour 30 min)

Exercise 1: Brainstorming

Instructions: Imagine yourself in this situation:

You have a dental appointment that you need to cancel or reschedule. You are calling your dentist's office.

*What would you say in this situation in **your first/native language**? What would you say **in English**?*

Before you write your answers, think:

- How big is the **social distance** (how well do the speakers know each other; their age & gender) between you and a receptionist at the dental clinic?
- How much **power/authority** do you have over the receptionist at the dental clinic?
- How big are the **potential risks** for you if your appointment doesn't get rescheduled?

Brainstorm your possible responses in your native language first. Then think of an English translation.

My possible responses in my language:

English translation:

Teacher's script: *When you engage in a conversation with 2 or more people, there are 3 key factors you need to keep in mind:*

Social distance (how well do the speakers know each other; age & gender)

Note: As the level of social distance increases (goes up), the level of politeness increases (goes up)

Power (does the speaker have any power/authority over the hearer or vice versa; what are their roles)

Note: As the level of power (goes up), the level of politeness increases (goes up)

Imposition (the type of obligation the speaker is forcing the hearer to do- e.g., borrow money vs to borrow a pen- is this a high stakes context? What are potential risks?)

Note: As the level of imposition (obligation/responsibility) increases, so does the level of politeness

Exercise 2: Lay cross-cultural analysis

Instructions: This is how some native speakers of English reacted to the same situation. Read and compare their answers with your own responses in Exercise 1.

➤ Hello, I would like to cancel my appointment on Wednesday. My name is xxxxxx. I will call back to reschedule when I am available to come in.

➤ Hi, it's [name] calling, I have an appointment with Dr. Smith on Tuesday, March 6th?
Yeah, I need to reschedule. Thanks.

➤ Hi, (name). Something's come up, and I need to reschedule the appointment that I had for (time/date). Do you have any appointments free for (dentist) in the near future?

➤ Hi, this is Mr. Browne, unfortunately I will not be able to make my 11:00 appointment with Dr. Smith as something has come up. I will call back to reschedule as soon as I can.

➤ Hello. This is [name]. I'm afraid I need to reschedule my appointment.

➤ Hi, I am calling to reschedule an appointment for a cleaning with_____.

Unfortunately, I can't make it this week. Does he/she have an opening next week?

➤ Hi there, I'm just calling to reschedule my Thursday appointment with Dr. Z. I'm not going to make it. Do you have any availability next week? Early mornings are better.

➤ Hi, I'm calling about my appointment today. I won't be able to make it. I'm sorry. Could we reschedule?

➤ Hello, my name is (insert name) I have an appointment at (time). I am calling to inform you that I will not be able to make the appointment because..... My car is broken and I have to bring it in the shop to get it fixed. I was wondering if it would be possible to reschedule for another day?

➤ Hello, I need to cancel my appointment that's scheduled for tomorrow. Something came up, and I can't make it.

Questions for reflection:

- Are these responses different from/similar to your own responses in your native language?
- Are these responses different from/similar to your own responses in English?
- What are the main similarities (if any) between your own responses and those provided by the native speakers?
- What are the main differences (if any)?

Exercise 3: Speech acts analysis

Instructions: Read each response and divide it into meaningful components (parts). Next, find a phrase that matches speaker's communicative strategy, as shown in the example. Check your answers with the rest of the class.

Example: Hi there, I need to reschedule my appointment. Do you have any availabilities for [suggest date range]?

Part 1

Hi there, I need to reschedule my appointment
[suggest date range]?

Speaker's strategy

Greeting + Request for appointment change →
appointment

Follow-up question →
[suggest date range]?

Part 2

Do you have any availabilities for

Phrase

Hi there, I need to reschedule my

Do you have any availabilities for

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hello, I would like to cancel my dental appointment on Wednesday. My name is xxxxxx. I will call back to reschedule when I am available to come in.

Greeting + request for appointment cancellation →

Providing personal information →

Promise of future action →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hi, it's [name] calling, I have an appointment with Dr. Smith on Tuesday, March 6th.
Yeah, I need to reschedule. Thanks.

Greeting + context →

Request for appointment cancellation →

Thanking →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hi, (name). Something's come up, and I need to reschedule the appointment that I had for (time/date). Do you have any appointments free for (dentist) in the near future?

Greeting →

Explanation + Request for appointment change →

Follow-up question

→

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hi, this is Mr. Browne, unfortunately I will not be able to make my 11:00 appointment with Dr. Smith as something has come up. I will call back to reschedule as soon as I can.

Greeting

→

Explanation →

Promise of future action →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Hello. This is [name]. I'm afraid I need to reschedule my appointment.

Greeting →

Request for appointment change →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Hi, I am calling to reschedule an appointment for a cleaning with_____.
Unfortunately, I can't make it this week. Does he/she have an opening next week?

Greeting + Request for appointment change →

Explanation →

Follow-up question

→ _____

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Hi there, I'm just calling to reschedule my Thursday appointment with Dr. Z. I'm not going to make it. Do you have any availability next week? Early mornings are better.

Greeting + Request for appointment change →

Explanation → _____

*Follow-up
question →* _____

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Hi, I'm calling about my appointment today. I won't be able to make it. I'm sorry. Could we reschedule?

Greeting + context →

Explanation →

Apology →

Request for appointment change →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hello my name is (insert name). I have an appointment at (time). I am calling to inform you that I will not be able to make the appointment because.... My car is broken and I have to bring it in the shop to get it fixed. I was wondering if it would be possible to reschedule for another day?

Greeting →

Context →

Explanation →

Request for appointment change →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hello, I need to cancel my appointment that's scheduled for tomorrow. Something came up, and I can't make it.

Greeting + Request for appointment cancellation →

Explanation →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she asked for appointment change/cancellation?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

Phase 2: Practice (approx. 30 min)

Identical to the FE group.

F3. Lesson 3: Resolving Financial Issues over the Phone

Phase 1: Exploration and Awareness-Raising (approx. 1 hour 30 min)

Exercise 1: Brainstorming

Instructions: Imagine yourself in this situation:

You cancelled an insurance policy last month. However, you were charged this month again for the same insurance policy. You are calling your insurance company to complain about the problem and explain what you want done about it.

*What would you say in this situation in **your first/native language**? What would you say **in English**?*

Before you write your answers, think:

- How big is the **social distance** (how well do the speakers know each other; their age & gender) between you and a customer service agent from the insurance company?
- How much **power/authority** do you have over the customer service agent?
- How big are the **potential risks** for you if your account doesn't get reimbursed (refunded)?

Brainstorm your possible responses in your native language first. Then think of an English translation.

My possible responses in my language:

English translation:

Teacher's script: *When you engage in a conversation with 2 or more people, there are 3 key factors you need to keep in mind:*

Social distance (how well do the speakers know each other; age & gender)

Note: As the level of social distance increases (goes up), the level of politeness increases (goes up)

Power (does the speaker have any power/authority over the hearer or vice versa; what are their roles)

Note: As the level of power (goes up), the level of politeness increases (goes up)

Imposition (the type of obligation the speaker is forcing the hearer to do- e.g., borrow money vs to borrow a pen- is this a high stakes context? What are potential risks?)

Note: As the level of imposition (obligation/responsibility) increases, so does the level of politeness

Exercise 2: Lay cross-cultural analysis

Instructions: This is how some native speakers of English reacted to the same situation. Read and compare their answers with your own responses in Exercise 1.

➤ Hello, my name is (name) and I'm calling regarding policy number (x). I cancelled this policy a month ago, but I see from my bank statement that withdrawals are still being made from my bank account. Who should I speak to about having the money returned, and confirmation in writing that the withdrawals will no longer happen?

- Hello. I am calling about my insurance policy which I cancelled last month. I see that I was billed this month. Could you check my account and see if the policy was in fact cancelled in your system? I would also like to make sure I am reimbursed for this month's charge.
- Hello. I cancelled my policy last month on May 28th. However, I noticed that I paid again this month. Why would that be? Can you please check if I can be reimbursed?
- Hello, this is [name]. I cancelled my insurance policy last month, but I see that the charge came out of my account again this month. I was hoping you can help me.
- Hi there. I'm calling about my homeowner's policy. Hang on a sec, let me find it. That's the Policy number right...not the Reference Number? C10992888-17. Anyway, I cancelled that policy last month but when I checked my banking account for this month, it looks like there's still money coming out. Can you look into it?
- Hello, I recently canceled my insurance plan with your company, but I still got charge for the monthly fee. I was wondering why this happened? And will you be able to return the monthly payment back to me?
- I cancelled my policy last month, but you are still withdrawing money from my account. I'd like this corrected please.
- Hello, I cancelled my insurance policy last month, but another payment was taken from my account this month. Could you tell me why? I would like the money deposited back into my account and please make sure that the policy is cancelled.

Questions for reflection:

- Are these responses different from/similar to your own responses in your native language?
- Are these responses different from/similar to your own responses in English?

- What are the main similarities (if any) between your own responses and those provided by the native speakers?
- What are the main differences (if any)?

Exercise 3: Speech acts analysis

Instructions: Read each response and divide it into meaningful components (parts). Next, find a phrase that matches speaker's communicative strategy, as shown in the example. Check your answers with the rest of the class.

Example: Hello, my name is (name) and I'm calling regarding policy number (x). I cancelled this policy a month ago, but I see from my bank statement that withdrawals are still being made from my bank account. Who should I speak to about having the money returned, and confirmation in writing that the withdrawals will no longer happen?

Part 1

Hello, my name is (name) and I'm calling regarding policy number (x).

Part 2

I cancelled this policy a month ago, but I see from my bank statement that withdrawals are still being made from my bank account.

Part 3

Who should I speak to about having the money returned, and confirmation in writing that the withdrawals will no longer happen?

Speaker's strategy

Phrase

Greeting + Reason for calling →

Hello, my name is (name) and I'm calling regarding

policy number (x).

Context → I cancelled this policy a month ago, but I see from my bank statement that withdrawals are still being made from my bank account.

Follow-up question → Who should I speak to about having the money returned, and confirmation in writing that the withdrawals will no longer happen?

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hello. I am calling about my insurance policy which I cancelled last month. I see that I was billed this month. Could you check my account and see if the policy was in fact cancelled in your system? I would also like to make sure I am reimbursed for this month's charge.

Greeting + Reason for calling →

Request to resolve the issue

→

Follow-up request →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hello. I cancelled my policy last month on May 28th. However, I noticed that I paid again this month. Why would that be? Can you please check if I can be reimbursed?

Greeting + Context →

Asking about the reason that caused the issue →

Request to resolve the issue →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hi there. I'm calling about my homeowner's policy. Hang on a sec, let me find it. That's the Policy number right...not the Reference Number? C10992888-17. Anyway, I cancelled that policy last month but when I checked my banking account for this month, it looks like there's still money coming out. Can you look into it?

Greeting + Reason for calling →

Context →

Request to resolve the issue →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hello, I recently canceled my insurance plan with your company, but I still got charge for the monthly fee. I was wondering why this happened? And will you be able to return the monthly payment back to me?

Greeting + Context →

Asking about the reason that caused the issue →

Follow-up question →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ I cancelled my policy last month, but you are still withdrawing money from my account. I'd like this corrected please.

Context →

Request to resolve the issue →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hello, I cancelled my insurance policy last month, but another payment was taken from my account this month. Could you tell me why? I would like the money deposited back into my account and please make sure that the policy is cancelled.

Greeting + Context →

Asking about the reason that caused the issue →

Request to resolve the issue →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

➤ Hello, this is [name]. I cancelled my insurance policy last month, but I see that the charge came out of my account again this month. I was hoping you can help me? I'd like to have that refunded back to my bank account.

Greeting + Context →

Request to resolve the issue →

Follow-up request →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she explained how he/she wanted the issue to be resolved?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

Phase 2: Practice (approx. 30 min)

Identical to the FE group.

F4. Lesson 4: Responding to Manager's Requests

Phase 1: Exploration and Awareness-Raising (approx. 1 hour 30 min)

Exercise 1: Brainstorming

Instructions: Imagine yourself in this situation:

Your manager is asking you to stay for several extra hours after work today. However, you have other things planned, so you can't stay.

*What would you say in this situation in **your first/native language**? What would you say **in English**?*

Before you write your answers, think:

- How big is the **social distance** (how well do the speakers know each other; their age & gender) between you and your manager?
- How much **power/authority** do you have over your manager? How much **power/authority** does your manager have over you?
- How big are the **potential risks** for you if you decline your manager's request? How big are the **potential risks** for your manager if you decline his/her request?

Brainstorm your possible responses in your native language first. Then think of an English translation.

My possible responses in my language:

English translation:

Teacher's script: *When you engage in a conversation with 2 or more people, there are 3 key factors you need to keep in mind:*

Social distance (how well do the speakers know each other; age & gender)

Note: As the level of social distance increases (goes up), the level of politeness increases (goes up)

Power (does the speaker have any power/authority over the hearer or vice versa; what are their roles)

Note: As the level of power (goes up), the level of politeness increases (goes up)

Imposition (the type of obligation the speaker is forcing the hearer to do- e.g., borrow money vs to borrow a pen- is this a high stakes context? What are potential risks?)

Note: As the level of imposition (obligation/responsibility) increases, so does the level of politeness

Exercise 2: Lay cross-cultural analysis

Instructions: This is how some native speakers of English reacted to the same situation. Read and compare their answers with your own responses in Exercise 1.

- Unfortunately, I am unable to stay later today. I have important matters that I have to deal with at home.
- I wish I could stay and help out, but I have an appointment I need to attend, and I can't change it. I could come in a bit earlier tomorrow and stay later if that would help.
- I'm afraid I can't do it tonight. I have other things to attend to.
- I'm really sorry, I would love to help but am going to Toronto to visit my grandmother this weekend. We are heading out within the next hour. Can I work on it on Monday?

- Unfortunately, I am unable to stay today, as I have some pressing errands I need to run. Is there another way I can help you?
- Oh gosh I can't tonight I have to attend a function or otherwise I would. I could come in early tomorrow if that would help.
- I would usually stay the extra hours, but I have plans to go.
- I'm sorry, but today I'm not able to stay late. I would be happy to work overtime another day.

Questions for reflection:

- Are these responses different from/similar to your own responses in your native language?
- Are these responses different from/similar to your own responses in English?
- What are the main similarities (if any) between your own responses and those provided by the native speakers?
- What are the main differences (if any)?

Exercise 3: Speech acts analysis

Instructions: Read each response and divide it into meaningful components (parts). Next, find a phrase that matches speaker's communicative strategy, as shown in the example. Check your answers with the rest of the class.

Example: Unfortunately, I am unable to stay later today. I have important matters that I have to deal with at home.

Part 1

Unfortunately, I am unable to stay later today

Part 2

I have important matters that I have to deal with at home

Speaker's strategy

Phrase

Regret + refusal →

Unfortunately, I am unable to stay later today

Excuse →

home

I have important matters that I have to deal with at

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct

Somewhat direct

Somewhat indirect

Very indirect

- I wish I could stay and help out, but I have an appointment I need to attend, and I can't change it. I could come in a bit earlier tomorrow and stay later if that would help.

Regret + excuse →

Offering help →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct

Somewhat direct

Somewhat indirect

Very indirect

- I'm afraid I can't do it tonight. I have other things to attend to.

Regret + refusal →

Excuse →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct

Somewhat direct

Somewhat indirect

Very indirect

- I'm really sorry, I would love to help but am going to Toronto to visit my grandmother this weekend. We are heading out within the next hour. Can I work on it on Monday?

Apology →

Regret + refusal →

Offering help →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Unfortunately, I am unable to stay later today. I have important matters that I have to deal with at home.

Regret + refusal →

Excuse →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Unfortunately, I am unable to stay today, as I have some pressing errands I need to run. Is there another way I can help you?

Regret + refusal →

Excuse →

Offering help →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- Oh gosh I can't tonight I have attend a function or otherwise I would. I could come in early tomorrow if that would help.

Refusal + excuse →

Offering help →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I would usually stay the extra hours, but I have plans to go.

Excuse + refusal →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

- I'm sorry, but today I'm not able to stay late. I would be happy to work overtime another day.

Apology + refusal →

Offering help →

Now think: How direct was the speaker when he/she declined his/her manager's request?

Very direct Somewhat direct Somewhat indirect Very indirect

Phase 2: Practice (approx. 30 min):

Identical to the FE group.

Appendix G: Lesson Plan Notes for Teachers

Lesson Plan Notes: FE Group Teacher

Phase	Activities/exercises & procedures	Learning objectives	Duration (approx.)
1. Guided noticing	<p><u>Exercise 1: Warm-up and predicting</u></p> <p>The teacher gives some key examples of pragmatic formulas from each scenario & asks the students to predict the situations in which these formulas may occur (Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012)</p> <p><u>Exercise 2: Exploration through written contextualized input</u> (Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012)</p> <p>Once everybody identifies the target situation, the students read responses to the scenarios provided by 8-10 native speakers of English in response to a scenario and are asked to underline any expressions/word combinations similar to those they received in Exercise 1.</p>	<p>- To check/activate background knowledge and prepare the learners for the exercises that follow</p> <p>-To stimulate noticing of the target pragmatic formulas</p>	30 min

<p>2. Deep cognitive engagement & stimulating retention</p>	<p><u>Exercise 1: Form-comparison (Takahashi, 2005) & explicit metapragmatic explanation⁶¹</u></p> <p>- The students receive the <i>pre-selected lists of pragmatic formulas from researcher's corpus (8-10 per session)</i> and compare them with the expressions they underlined in Phase 1. Meanwhile, the teacher circulates around the classroom to check students' progress.</p> <p>- Once every student has completed the exercise, the teacher provides the class with the <i>explicit explanation</i> about <i>formulaic</i> (fixed or semi-fixed) nature of the formulas and benefits they provide for L2 fluency and pragmatic competence development (scripts are provided in the booklet).</p> <p><u>Note:</u> To better illustrate fixed and semi-fixed nature of the formulas, the teacher may pick some key examples from the list and write them on the board for the students to compare.</p> <p><u>Exercise 2: Understanding the implied meaning⁶² of the target formulas and explicit metapragmatic explanation</u></p> <p>Individual work + whole class discussion to check the results</p>	<p>- To engage learners in <i>intentional and conscious learning</i> of target pragmatic formulas based on the exemplars from input (Takimoto, 2007)</p> <p>- To satisfy the need for <i>width and depth of the chunk (formula) knowledge</i> (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009)</p> <p>- To provide the students with an opportunity to process the target pragmatic formulas on a deeper cognitive level & to stimulate deep cognitive engagement (<i>elaborative processing</i>)</p> <p>- To promote '<i>insightful learning</i>' and <i>the chance of retention</i> of the target formulas in learners' <i>long-term memory</i> (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009, p. 130)</p> <p>-To focus on both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of the target speech acts</p> <p>-To prepare for the practice phase activity</p>	<p>60 min</p>
--	--	--	---------------

⁶¹ Note that explicit metapragmatic explanation is provided throughout this phase to help learners navigate through the activities.

⁶² or '*pragmatic implicature*'

	<p><i>Exercise 2 consists of 2 parts</i> (idea borrowed from Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). Review 1 focuses on formula recognition- pragmalinguistics- focus on form; Review 2 focuses on interpreting pragmatic implicature (directness/indirectness)- sociopragmatics- focus on meaning.</p> <p><i>Hints</i> are added to avoid 'blind guessing' and stimulate 'a more conscious learning' (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009).</p> <p><u>Note:</u> In Review 2, the teacher may want to remind the students about 3 <i>sociopragmatic factors</i> (<i>social distance, power & imposition</i>) that affect the language choices during a conversation</p> <p><u>Exercise 3: Speech act analysis</u></p> <p>Exercise 3 focuses on pragmatic patterns (i.e., speaker's communicative strategies) identification & analysis.</p> <p>Here the attention is paid to both pragmalinguistic & sociopragmatic knowledge (attention to form & meaning).</p> <p><u>Note:</u> This exercise provides additional scaffolding in preparation for the practice phase.</p>		
3. Practice	<p><u>Communicative activity (problem solving role-play)</u></p> <p>Students participate in a communicative activity specifically designed to push them to repeatedly use the target formulas to achieve a meaningful communicative goal. This task/activity meets the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Genuinely communicative; 2. Inherently repetitive; 3. And functionally formulaic (Gadbonton & Segalowitz, 2005) 	<p>-To stimulate <i>repeated exposure</i> to and <i>use</i> of the target formulas and promote <i>automatization</i> of knowledge (to transform explicit knowledge into implicit knowledge)</p>	30 min

Lesson Plan Notes: AR Group Teacher

Phase	Activities & procedures	Learning objectives	Timing (approx.)
1. Exploration & awareness-raising	<p><u>Exercise 1: Brainstorming & metapragmatic explanation</u></p> <p>Teacher introduces a scenario/context (depending on that week's topic) and asks the Ss to brainstorm & write down responses in their own L1s (and then translate into English). Ss can also work in mini-groups based on L1; each group will share their responses with the rest of the class. Next, the teacher provides an explanation regarding 3 sociopragmatic factors and why it's important to consider them when engaging in speech acts (the speech act chosen for that week's lesson will serve as an example):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -<i>social distance</i> (i.e., the degree of familiarity that exists between the speakers) -<i>power</i> (i.e., the relative power of a speaker with respect to the hearer) -<i>imposition</i> (i.e., the type of imposition/obligation the speaker is forcing the hearer to do- e.g., borrow money vs to borrow a pen) <p>(Teacher's script adapted from Appendix A in Uso-Juan & Martinez-Flor, 2006)</p> <p><u>Exercise 2: Lay cross-cultural analysis</u> (Cohen, 2005)</p> <p>Teacher then provides the Ss with written input (NS responses to the same scenario) and asks the students to compare the NS responses with those of their own to see if there any similarities and/or differences between the responses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To check/activate background knowledge and prepare the learners for the exercises that follow - To start exploring a given communicative context and raise the students' initial awareness about the differences between their first language and English in terms of speech act realization -To further enhance students' awareness about the cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences of the speech act realization in hopes that this could help avoid negative transfers or automatic translations from students' L1s during the practice phase -To focus on both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of the target speech acts and prepare for the practice phase activity 	1 h 30 min

	<u>Exercise 3: Speech act analysis</u> Identical to the FE approach		
2. Practi ce	<u>Communicative activity (problem solving role-play)</u> Identical to the FE approach	Identical to the FE approach	30 min

Appendix H: Corpus of Students' Utterances Based on the First Cycle of Coding in the FE

Group

Extending Invitations

Coding category	Examples of students' utterances
Target-like use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would you and your family like to come? 2. We are having a birthday party for my son. 3. I'm planning to organize a party for my birthday. 4. I'm planning a birthday, my daughter birthday on Sunday. 5. Feel free to bring present or some dessert or chocolate. 6. I'm planning party, birthday party for my daughter. 7. Would you and your family like to come? 8. Would you like to come with your family? 9. Would you like to join us? 10. I will have a kid party on Sunday 11. Feel free to bring gift or dessert 12. And feel free to bring salad or lemonade
Target-like slot-and-frame pattern	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would you like to come to join with me? 2. If you join my birthday party, I would be very happy 3. If you can come, I will be happy 4. It will be great if you come 5. Feel free to take dessert or vegetable 6. I will very glad if you can come 7. I will be happy 8. If you have time or if you are free, you can come 9. Would you and your family... Would your children and you come here?

Non-target use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I want to invite you and your family if you can take place to this party 2. I want to open party 3. Do you like to participate for my... to take my invitation to be part of my organization? 4. I'm inviting you for... I have birthday party [probably meant 'barbecue party'] today. 5. Would you like it? 6. Excuse me, can I join us for a barbecue? 7. Do you have time? 8. This weekend my family will be have a birthday party and I want to invite you
Repetitive use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I want to invite you to join us 2. I want to invite you and your family to come 3. I want to invite you to come over in my home 4. I want to invite you and your family 5. Please come over 6. Can you... inviting me... you enjoy with me? 7. Can you come with family? 8. Can you join us with your family? 9. Please, can you come you and your family? 10. I have next Saturday birthday party, can you come with kids? 11. Could you come please? Could you come with kids? 12. Could you and your family bring the child for celebrate?

Cancelling/Rescheduling Appointments

Coding category	Examples of students' utterances
Target-like use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I need to cancel my appointment 2. I'm gonna cancel my appointment 3. I need to reschedule please 4. Do you have availability next week? 5. Do you have any availability next week? 6. Can you reschedule me? 7. I need to reschedule 8. I will reschedule when I'm available 9. I can make it Friday 10. Can you reschedule me? 11. I would like to let you know that I can't make [it] today 12. I call you to reschedule this appointment because I can't make it 13. I'm sorry for my appointment- I can't make it
Target-like slot-and-frame pattern	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I will call later to let you know what time I will come again 2. I can't to come in this date because I'm not available 3. But if is possible, I can have another time, another appointment in future? 4. Please if you can find another date for me, for another appointment, it will be good for me 5. I don't have time to come today 6. Please can you reschedule another appointment for me? 7. I have appointment I need cancel... I need another reschedule 8. I have an appointment yesterday, but I didn't make it 9. Would I reschedule for the next week? 10. If you are available at that time? 11. I calling for reschedule my appointment 12. Can I reschedule another day?

	<p>13. I have appointment today, but I need reschedule for next Thursday</p> <p>14. I like to reschedule my appointment on Tuesday at 3</p> <p>15. I need cancel my appointment and make reschedule for me</p>
Non-target use	<p>1. But I have some personal things to do next Saturday morning, so I want to change</p> <p>2. I have something problem today, can you change the day please?</p> <p>3. I will be not available for this appointment</p> <p>4. I cancel my appointment</p> <p>5. Please, you can cancel my appointment?</p> <p>6. The time will be next Wednesday. Is it ok?</p> <p>7. I must cancel my appointment</p>
Repetitive use	<p>1. I want to cancel my appointment</p> <p>2. Hi, I want to cancel my appointment, I want to reschedule it</p> <p>3. I want to cancel my appointment on Wednesday</p>

Resolving Financial/Service Issues

Coding category	Examples of students' utterances
Target-like use	<p>1. Please cancel it and refund my money</p> <p>2. Could you check and see my line please?</p> <p>3. I was wondering what happened?</p> <p>4. Who could I speak about it?</p> <p>5. So, who should speak to about these things?</p> <p>6. I hope you find this and pay back my money</p>
Target-like slot-and-frame pattern	<p>1. Could you fix and see my internet?</p> <p>2. I call you to check if you can do something</p> <p>3. I hope that you can help me</p>
Non-target use	<p>1. Which is condition to cancel insurance?</p> <p>2. Can you explain how is going on?</p> <p>3. Please give me a reason</p> <p>4. What happened?</p>

Repetitive use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please, can I help me? 2. Please can you cancel please? 3. Why still withdrawal money from my accounting bank? 4. Why do you withdraw my money from my checking account? 5. Why you are not cancelling my insurance? 6. Why you are not cancelling? 7. Why do you take some money in my account? 8. Why? 9. Can you tell me what have happened? 10. Can you tell me why? 11. Please could you check to tell me why he didn't come? 12. Can I know what is the problem? 13. Can you check for me what happened? 14. Can you check please for me because I need the internet be fast? 15. Can I have someone to come and to checking?
----------------	--

Responding to Managerial Requests

Coding category	Examples of students' utterances
Target-like use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I would come to... on Saturday, but I have a function to attend 2. I'm sorry, I'm not able to work this Saturday 3. I would be happy to work next Saturday 4. Unfortunately I'm unable to take part in your project 5. I'm not able to do [it] this week, but I would be happy to do next week
Target-like slot-and-frame pattern	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If you want, I can work overtime another day 2. I would... I can come on Sunday if it will be help 3. I would like to work... to come, but I have to go to see my mom 4. I would like to help, but I have another plan for today 5. It is possible if I can work overtime next week on Monday? 6. I'd like to work on it, but I have something to do at home 7. Oh, sorry, unfortunately, I have a job

Non-target use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you try for another solution? 2. I'm sorry, I don't feel to stay for today because I have another appointment. 3. The work may be...We can do the work tomorrow? 4. Sorry, if you want in future to stay more hours, please tell me before 2 days or 3 days 5. Can you change the day please for me because it can't for me today 6. If possible, you can call another one to stay for my place 7. You can ask another colleague if he can do it, because me, I am very busy. 8. If you think this project is emergency, I can cancel my holiday and after I finish this project 9. Are you ok?
Repetitive use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hi sir, today I can't stay here to continue work because I have appointment 2. Sorry, I can't stay today, I have something to do. Sorry for that 3. I'm sorry, I can't stay more hours because I have important appointment 4. Oh, sorry manager, today I have very important thing to do so I can't do work after working 5. Please, today I can't because I'm very busy. I have something very important 6. Please, I can't do that 7. I'm sorry, I can't stay 8. Could you come next Saturday? 9. Would you/could you check if is possible to do it next week? 10. Could I come tomorrow, please?

Appendix I: Corpus of Students' Utterances Based on the First Cycle of Coding in the AR

Group

Extending Invitations

Coding category	Examples of students' utterances
Target-like use	1. Would you like to come to party?
Target-like slot-and-frame pattern	1. On Saturday night I have birthday for my two kids
Non-target use	1. I invite you for my husband birthday 2. We have BBQ today 3. Tomorrow we have party 4. If you have time, I hope she coming 5. I am so happy if you answer... if you come to my home 6. Do you come an invite me? 7. I will invite you, you have to come 8. You can come my home 9. Can you and your husband, you child can come? 10. You can come tomorrow at house because I... we make BBQ for outside. You can come? 11. Do you have time? 12. I love to come you my children birthday 13. I like to come... if you can, you come 14. Please you and your family... I like you come to my home 15. Tell me if you can come and you can give anything for the party 16. I will make party... a party for my daughter, Nur, next week 17. I hope send your daughter 18. I am going to planning to party for kids, for my kids and for neighbours' kids 19. I like invited you and your family and also your kids on Saturday, this Saturday 20. We invite you, we [probably meant 'you'] need to come
Repetitive use	1. Could you please come for my house? 2. Could you please come to my house tomorrow night because I make a BBQ? 3. I would like to invite you to my daughter's birthday 4. Hello, I would like to invite you because my daughter has birthday party 5. I would like coming in the... with my party

	6. I would like to come if you have time 7. Can you come? 8. Can you please come with me and join us? 9. Could you? 10. I would like to invite you and our [your] children to my house to party 11. I would like to invite my house because I have a party for my kids 12. Could you please come if you have time?
--	--

Cancelling/Rescheduling Appointments

Coding category	Examples of students' utterances
Target-like use	1. Can you reschedule? 2. I have to cancel my appointment
Target-like slot-and-frame pattern	1. I need cancel please 2. Today I have appointment with my daughter... I need cancel please 3. I need cancel appointment today, I have another appointment 4. I have an appointment today for my daughter, but I need cancel please
Non-target use	1. Can you change the schedule to... for me? 2. I don't... I will don't come because I am busy, I have another appointment. I am sorry not come today 3. I am not coming to able this appointment because my daughter is sick that's why I am not possible to come this appointment 4. Cancel please the appointment 5. Can you give me reschedule? 6. Is possible or not? 7. I am very sorry because I wanna cancel my appointment because I have appointment with my family doctor 8. Today I have an appointment with Dr. family, with Dr. Somah. I want to schedule the appointment because I have another appointment for my son 9. What have you time?

Repetitive use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I want to cancel my appointment because I can't come 2. I have appointment for today, but I cannot come there today 3. I had appointment today, but I want to cancel my appointment 4. Could you please give me another appointment please? 5. Please, if you can give me next appointment for Saturday? 6. Can you? 7. Sorry, I cannot come today 8. I can't come today because I have an appointment with my doctor 9. I want to cancel my appointment because I don't have time 10. Could you please give me another appointment? 11. Can you please reschedule my appointment another day? 12. I want reschedule my appointment today at 11 pm because I have another appointment 13. Please, can you give me next appointment for tomorrow? 14. I want to cancel my appointment because I can't come 15. I'm sorry, I can't come today 16. 10 o'clock... if you can, give me 12 o'clock better. You know, I have... 10 o'clock I can't come there 17. I have an appointment today at 2 pm, and I can't come because I have an appointment at that time 18. Could you please reschedule another time? 19. Could you please give me another time? 20. Could you please make another schedule for me? 21. Can you please... Could you please reschedule at that time?
----------------	--

Resolving Financial/Service Issues

Coding category	Examples of students' utterances
Target-like use	n/a
Target-like slot-and-frame pattern	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If you can send someone fix it or check it because I need internet faster, not slowly
Non-target use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How can I do for that? 2. What's wrong? 3. Can you talk me about time? 4. What happened? 5. I don't know why

Repetitive use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you help me? 2. Hi, my name is ____, I check with insurance, I cancel direct. Why? 3. Why? Because I cancel insurance 4. I cancelled before my car insurance, but I check my accounting bank, it more money for this month, but before I cancelled this plan. Why? 5. What's going wrong? 6. Could you please see him and what happening? 7. Can you please come and connect my internet? 8. How about the technician? Late.... Not here yet... Why? 9. I have appointment today for my internet at 10 o'clock, but not come early. Why? 10. What's going wrong and what can I do? 11. Can you send me someone fix it? 12. Could you please send anyone to fix it? 13. Could you send someone to fix it? 14. Could you please help me? 15. Could you please send me someone to fix our... fix the internet?
----------------	--

Responding to Managerial Requests

Coding category	Examples of students' utterances
Target-like use	1. Sorry, I would, but I have appointment for my son
Target-like slot-and-frame pattern	n/a
Non-target use	1. No, I don't can seven. I have appointment for my daughter 2. I am very sorry because I have another plan 3. I don't want to stay more time 4. No, I can't stay because my children is coming, they are alone. I can't stay today. 5. Maybe next day I can 6. I would like to able to do, but I am very sorry because I have an appointment with my special doctor. 7. Oh, I am sorry, all Saturday I go with my children for shopping. I am busy all Saturday 8. Could you give me work on Sunday? I can come on Sunday 9. Can I... can we do tomorrow? 10. I am sorry, but I don't complete that 11. Oh, I hope that, I hope that... but I have not finish my project yet 12. Can you... Can Monday? 13. Could you give me second day for I make this project? 14. I'm very sorry, I didn't finish the last project. Can you give me time to finish this project?
Repetitive use	1. Hi, but sorry, I cannot, I have appointment at this time 2. I can't because I have children 3. I'm sorry, no I can't stay because I have five children 4. I am sorry, so sorry, I cannot come in Saturday because I have guest in home 5. Oh, sorry because I don't... I can't come on Saturday because I have kids and they are not... they don't have school 6. I am sorry, I not... I cannot stay 7. I can't because I take my children to Arabic school 8. I can't come on Saturday 9. Yeah, but... oh sorry, I can't because my project not finished for me 10. I'm so sorry, I can't do this new project because I haven't time and I have an appointment with my family doctor this time

	11. No sorry, I can't take this project because I have already one project, and I can't do both of them
--	---

Appendix J: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the FE Group

Extending Invitations

Code	Pre-test utterances	Post-test utterances	Delayed post-test utterances
Pragmalinguistic violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I want to invite you and your family if you can take place to this party - I want to open party - Do you like to participate for my... to take my invitation to be part of my organization? - I'm inviting you for... I have birthday party [barbecue party] today 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This weekend my family will be have a birthday party and I want to invite you to coming - Would you like to come to join with me? - If you join my birthday party, I would be very happy - If you can come, I will be happy - It will be great if you come 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feel free to take dessert or vegetable - I will very glad if you can come - I will be happy
Sociopragmatic violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would you like it? - Excuse me, can I join us for a barbecue? - Do you have time? 	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If you have time or if you are free, you can come - Would you and your family... Would your children and you come here?
Nativelike overuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I want to invited you to join us - I want to invite you and your family to come - I want to invite you to come over in my home - I want to invite you and your family 	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Stabilized non-nativelike overuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please come over - Can you inviting me... you enjoy with me? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can you come with family? - Can you join us with your family? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please, can you come you and your family? - I have next Saturday birthday party, can you come with kids? - Could you come please? - Could you come with kids?

			- Could you and your family bring the child for celebrate?
Purely nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	- Would you and your family like to come? - We are having a birthday party for my son	- Would you and your family like to come?
Creatively nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	- I'm planning to organize a party for my birthday	- Would you like to come with your family? - Would you like to join us?
Nativelike with minor deviations	<i>No instances recorded</i>	- I'm planning a birthday... my daughter birthday on Sunday - Feel free to bring present or some... some dessert or chocolate - I'm planning party, birthday party for my daughter	- I will have a kid party on Sunday - And feel free to bring gift or dessert - And feel free to bring salad or lemonade

Appendix K: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the AR Group

Extending Invitations

Code	Pre-test utterances	Post-test utterances	Delayed post-test utterances
Pragmalinguistic violations	- I invite you for my husband birthday [was supposed to be BBQ party] - We have BBQ today - Tomorrow we have party - If you have time, I hope she coming - I am so happy if you answer... if you come to my home - Do you come an invite me?	- I love to come you my children birthday - I like to come... if you can, you come - On Saturday night I am planning to... I am planning... I have birthday for my kids... two kids... for my two kids	- I will make party... a party for my daughter, Nur, next week - I hope send your daughter - I am going to planning to party for kids, for my kids and for neighbours' kids - I like invited you and your family and

			also your kids on Saturday, this Saturday
Sociopragmatic violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I will invite you, you have to come - You can come my home... - Can you and your husband, you child can come? - You can come tomorrow at house because I... we make BBQ for outside... outside. You can come? - Do you have time? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please you and your family... I like you come to my home - Tell me if you can come and you can give anything for the party 	- We invite you, we [you] need to come
Nativelike overuses	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Stabilized non-nativelike overuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could you please come for my house? - Could you please come to my house tomorrow night because I make a BBQ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would like to invite you to my daughter's birthday - Hello, I would like to invite you because my daughter has birthday party - I would like coming in the... with my party - I would like to come if you have time - Can you come? - Can you please come with me and join us? - Could you? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would like to invite you and our [your] children to my house to party - I would like to invite my house because I have a party for my kids - Could you please come if you have time?
Purely nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Creatively nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Nativelike with minor deviations	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	- Would you like to come to party?

Appendix L: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the FE Group

Cancelling/Rescheduling Appointments

Code	Pre-test utterances	Post-test utterances	Delayed post-test utterances
Pragmalinguistic violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - But I have some personal things to do next Saturday morning, so I want to change - I have something problem today, can you change the day please? - I will be not available for this appointment - I will call later to let you know what time I will come again - I can't to come in this date because I'm not available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please can you reschedule another appointment for me? - I have appointment I need cancel... I need another reschedule - I have an appointment yesterday, but I didn't make it - Would I reschedule for the next week? - If you are available at that time? - I calling for reschedule my appointment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I must cancel my appointment - Can I reschedule another day? - I have appointment today, but I need reschedule for next Thursday - I like to reschedule my appointment on Tuesday at 3 - I need cancel my appointment and make reschedule for me
Sociopragmatic violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I cancel my appointment - Please, you can cancel my appointment? - The time will be next Wednesday. Is it ok? - But if is possible, I can have another time, another appointment in future? - Please if you can find another date for me, for another appointment, it will be good for me 	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>

	- I don't have time to come today		
Nativelike overuses	- I want to cancel my appointment	- Hi, I want to cancel my appointment, I want to reschedule it	- I want to cancel my appointment on Wednesday
Stabilized non-nativelike overuses	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Purely nativelike	- I need to cancel my appointment	- I need to reschedule please - Do you have availability next week? - Do you have any availability next week?	- I need to reschedule
Creatively nativelike	- I'm gonna cancel my appointment	- Can you reschedule me?	- I will reschedule when I'm available - I can make it Friday - Can you reschedule me?
Nativelike with minor deviations	<i>No instances recorded</i>	- I'm sorry for my appointment. I can't make it	- I would like to let you know that I can't make [it] today - I call you to reschedule this appointment because I can't make it - Please can you reschedule another appointment for me?

Appendix M: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the AR Group

Cancelling/Rescheduling Appointments

Code	Pre-test utterances	Post-test utterances	Delayed post-test utterances
Pragmalinguistic violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can you change the schedule to... for me? - I will don't come because I am busy, I have another appointment. I am sorry, not come today - I am not coming to able this appointment because my daughter is sick that's why I am not possible to come this appointment - I need cancel please 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can you give me reschedule? - Is possible or not? - Today I have appointment with my daughter... I need cancel please... - I need cancel appointment today, I have another appointment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I want to schedule the appointment because I have another appointment for my son - What have you time? - I have an appointment today for my daughter, but I need cancel please
Sociopragmatic violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cancel please the appointment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am very sorry because I wanna cancel my appointment because I have appointment with my family doctor 	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Nativelike overuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I want to cancel my appointment because I can't come - I have appointment for today, but I cannot come there today - I had appointment today, but I want to cancel my appointment - Could you please give me another appointment please? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sorry, I cannot come today - I can't come today because I have an appointment with my doctor - I want to cancel my appointment because I don't have time - Could you please give me another appointment? - Can you please reschedule my appointment another day? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I want to cancel my appointment because I can't come - I'm sorry, I can't come today. I can't come today - 10 o'clock if you can, give me 12 o'clock better. You know, I have... 10 o'clock <u>I can't</u> come there - I have an appointment today at 2 pm, and I can't come because I have an appointment at that time - Could you please reschedule another time? - Could you please give me another time? - Can you please... Could you please reschedule at that time?

Stabilized non-nativelike overuses	- Please, if you can give me next appointment for Saturday? - Can you?	- I want reschedule my appointment today at 11 pm because I have another appointment - Please, can you give me next appointment for tomorrow?	-Could you please make another schedule for me?
Purely nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	- Can you reschedule?
Creatively nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	- I have to cancel my appointment because I have a work
Nativelike with minor deviations	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>

Appendix N: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the FE Group

Resolving Issues

Code	Pre-test utterances	Post-test utterances	Delayed post-test utterances
Pragmalinguistic violations	- Which is condition to cancel insurance? - Can you explain how is going on?	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Sociopragmatic violations	- Please, give me a reason - What happened?	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Nativelike overuses	<i>No instances recorded</i>	- Can you tell me what have happened? - Can you tell me why? - Can I know what is the problem?	- Can you check for me what happened? - Can you check please for me because I need the internet be fast? - Can I have someone to come and to checking?

Stabilized non-nativelike overuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please, can I help me [can you help me]? - Please, can you cancel please? - Why still withdrawal money from my accounting bank? - Why do you withdraw my money from my checking account? - Why you are not cancelling my insurance? - Why you are not cancelling? - Why do you take some money in my account? - Why? 	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Purely nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	- Could you check and see my line please?	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Creatively nativelike	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please cancel it and refund my money - I hope you find this and pay back my money 	- I was wondering what happened	- I call you to check if you can do something
Nativelike with minor deviations	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who could I speak about it? - Please, could you check to tell me why he didn't come? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - So, who should speak to about these things? - Could you fix and see my internet? - I hope that you can help me

Appendix O: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the AR Group

Resolving Issues

Code	Pre-test utterances	Post-test utterances	Delayed post-test utterances
Pragmalinguistic violations	- How can I do for that?	- Can you talk me about time?	- If you can send someone fix it or check it
Sociopragmatic violations	- What's wrong?	- What happened?	- I don't know why

Nativelike overuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can you help me? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could you please see him and what happening? - Can you please come and connect my internet? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can you send me someone fix it? - Could you please send anyone to fix it? - Could you send someone to fix it? - Could you please help me? - Could you please send me someone to fix our... fix the internet?
Stabilized non-nativelike overuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hi, my name is __, I check with insurance, I cancel direct. Why? - Why? Because I cancel insurance - I cancelled before my car insurance, but I check my accounting bank, it more money for this month, but before I cancelled this plan. Why? - What's going wrong? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How about the technician? Late... Not here yet... Why? - I have appointment today for my internet at 10 o'clock, but not come early. Why? - What's going wrong and what can I do? 	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Purely nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Creatively nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Nativelike with minor deviations	<i>No instances observed</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>

Appendix P: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the FE Group

Responding to Requests

Code	Pre-test utterances	Post-test utterances	Delayed post-test utterances
Pragmalinguistic violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can you try for another solution? - I'm sorry, I don't feel to stay for today because I have another appointment - The work may be... We can do the work tomorrow? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If you want, I can work overtime another day - I would... I can come on Sunday if it will be help - I would like to work... to come, but I have to go to see my mom - I would like to help, but I have another plan for today - It is possible if I can work overtime next week on Monday? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I'd like to work on it, but I have something to do at home
Sociopragmatic violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sorry, if you want in future to stay more hours, please tell me before 2 days or 3 days - Can you change the day please for me because it can't for me today - If possible, you can call another one to stay for my place - You can ask another colleague if he can do it, because me, I am very busy 	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If you think this project is emergency, I can cancel my holiday and after I finish this project - Are you ok? - Oh, sorry, unfortunately I have a job

Nativelike overuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hi sir, today I can't stay here to continue work because I have appointment - Sorry, I can't stay today, I have something to do. Sorry for that - I'm sorry, I can't stay more hours because I have important appointment 	- I'm sorry, I can't stay	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Stabilized non-nativelike overuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oh, sorry manager... sorry manager... today I have very important thing to do so I can't do work after working - Please, today I can't because I'm very busy I have something very important - Please, I can't do that 	- Could I come tomorrow, please?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could I come next Saturday? - Could you check if is possible to do it next week?
Purely nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would come to... come on Saturday, but I have a function... I have a function to attend - I'm sorry, I'm not able to work this Saturday - I would be happy to work next Saturday 	- Unfortunately, I'm unable to take part in your project
Creatively nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Nativelike with minor deviations	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	- I'm not able to do [it] this week, but I would be happy to do next week

Appendix Q: Students' Utterances in the Second Cycle of Coding in the AR Group

Responding to Requests

Code	Pre-test utterances	Post-test utterances	Delayed post-test utterances
Pragmalinguistic violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No, I don't can seven [o'clock]. I have appointment for my daughter - I am very sorry because I have another plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maybe next day I can - I would like to able to do, but I am very sorry because I have an appointment with my special doctor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am sorry, but I don't complete that - Oh, I hope that, but I have not finish my project yet
Sociopragmatic violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I don't want to stay more time - No, I can't stay because my children is coming, they are alone. I can't stay today 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oh, I am sorry, all Saturday I go with my children for shopping. I am busy all Saturday - Could you give me work on Sunday? I can come on Sunday - Can I... can we do tomorrow? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can you... Can Monday? - Could you give me second day for I make this project? - I'm very sorry, I didn't finish the last project. Can you give me time to finish this project?
Nativelike overuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sorry, I can not, I have appointment at this time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am sorry, so sorry, I cannot come in Saturday because I have guest in home - Oh, sorry because I don't... I can't come on Saturday because I have kids and they are not... they don't have school - I am sorry, I cannot stay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oh sorry, I can't because my project not finished for me - I'm so sorry, I can't do this new project because I haven't time and I have an appointment with my family doctor this time - No sorry, I can't take this project because I have already one project, and I can't do both of them

Stabilized non-nativelike overuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I can't because I have children - I'm sorry, no, I can't stay because I have five children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I can't because I take my children to Arabic school - I can't come on Saturday 	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Purely nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Creatively nativelike	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sorry, I would, but I have appointment for my son 	<i>No instances recorded</i>
Nativelike with minor deviations	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>	<i>No instances recorded</i>