An Evidence-Based Approach to Develop Listening Skills and Pragmatic Knowledge

By

Andrew S. Nelson

A Master's Paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in TESOL

Major Advisor's Signature

Date

University of Wisconsin-River Falls
2017

Abstract

This paper outlines one way to integrate pragmatic development into an English as a Second Language (ESL) class, focusing on listening skills. Pragmatics is the aspect of language that focuses on how users choose among available forms to communicate within a social context and co-create meaning. Pragmatic development is viewed through the lens of communicative competence and speech act theory. Communicative competence refers to focusing on student communicative abilities and skills rather than a form-focused, grammar guided language teaching approach. Speech act theory refers to understanding utterances and their intended functions in communication. An "evidence-based approach" is one supported by theory and research. According to second language acquisition (SLA), listening, and pragmatics theory, an evidence-based approach to develop listening and pragmatic knowledge would include the following principles: (a) deliberate practice, (b) opportunities for noticing forms, gaps, and holes, (c) meaningful interaction, (d) a focus on both one-way and two-way communication, (e) vocabulary development, (f) sound discrimination and finally, (g) attention to speech acts and their forms and uses. The focus of the early sections of the paper articulate the theoretical foundation of these principles followed by an example demo lesson unit that illustrates one way to integrate pragmatics and listening skills for an ESL class of 12 intermediate to upper intermediate students in a Minneapolis private university classroom. The demo lesson unit demonstrates the principles identified for teaching pragmatics integrated with listening development for a ten-lesson course. The single instructional focus of this demo lesson unit is the speech act of suggestions.

Table of Contents

Introduction 5

Second Language Acquisition Background 6

Listening Skill Development 15

Pragmatics and the Speech Act of Suggestions 22

Demo Lesson 37

Day 1 37

Day 2 39

Day 3 41

Day 4 43

Day 5 45

Day 6 47

Day 7 49

Day 8 51

Day 9 53

Day 10 55

Appendices 57

Appendix 1: Day 1 57

Appendix #2: A New Identity 59

Appendix #3: Interest Sheets 60

Appendix #4: Pronunciation 61

Appendix #5: Pronunciation 62

Appendix #6: TH distinctions.. 63

Appendix #7: Phonemes in Words 64

Appendix #8: The Problem... 65

References.. 67

Introduction

The impact of English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning and teaching continues to expand around the world. Proficiency in a second language determines life-changing opportunities for employees, students, businesses, and families. This picture is not likely to change because English has become a global language. Given the importance of learning English to further oneself, it would be reassuring if English teachers applied an evidence-based approach to help their students succeed. An “evidence-based approach” is one supported by theory and research. This paper presents an example of one way to achieve this goal. First, Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theory and key terms within the field are examined. Next, this paper presents models of listening, one-way and two-way communication, and learning challenges for L2 listeners. The SLA and listening skills sections act as the curtain raiser for the main discussion of this paper, pragmatic development and the speech act of suggestions; a neglected area in TESOL research. Finally, these theoretical sections are put to the test in a demo lesson unit. This unit reflects the following important principles: it is the teacher's job (1) to select appropriate input, (2) to facilitate student comprehension of the input, and (3) to help make less salient forms noticeable. This is done through the implementation of different types of practice. Teachers must organize classes to promote input and output practice that promotes noticing forms and processing authentic interactions to ensure that knowledge can be proceduralized and automatized. Doing so will help L2 learners develop their implicit language system. But before these principles can be properly understood and appreciated, let’s turn to the second language acquisition literature to more specifically identify the learning challenges for language students.

Second Language Acquisition Background

In the field of TESOL and for this paper, a second language (L2) is often defined as any other language than one's first language (L1). Second Language Acquisition (SLA) researchers, according to VanPatten (2003), examine (1) how a language user internalizes the linguistic system of another language and (2) identify "the ‘mechanisms’ that make use of that linguistic system" (p. 1-2). New findings and theories, along with their corresponding terminologies, shape how researchers approach future experiments. One concept that arose early in the literature and has driven much thought and research is *input*. VanPatten defined input as "the language that a learner hears (or reads) that has some kind of communicative intent" (p. 25). To him, input is meaningful language. Krashen (1985) wrote “we acquire language in only one way- by understanding messages or by receiving comprehensible input" (p. 2).

The idea of comprehensible input was introduced in Krashen's Monitor Model. Krashen's model consisted of five interrelated hypotheses. I will briefly describe three of them because of their relevance and importance to later sections of this paper. They are (1) the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, (2) the Input Hypothesis, and (3) the Affective Filter.

Krashen argued that there is only one way to acquire an L2, namely, through acquisition. Acquisition is a subconscious process, which is "very similar to the process children use in acquiring first and second languages" (Krashen, 1981, p.1). For Krashen, acquisition develops from comprehending input in meaningful contexts. This is different from learning, "a conscious process that results in 'knowing about' language" (Krashen, 1985, p. 1). Learning, according to Krashen, is not a way to develop language skill. From his perspective, there is no place for explicit grammar teaching in the classroom. The explicit learning of grammar forms, at best, can only develop one's ability to reflect or monitor grammar forms. In Krashen's view, learning will never become acquisition- - the ability to use language to communicate. Many theorists, however, believe that learning is indeed important.

Krashen’s (1985) Input Hypothesis states language improvement occurs "by understanding input that contains structures at our next 'stage'--structures that are a bit beyond our current level of competence" (p. 2). By understanding messages slightly above a learner's ability level, Krashen argues that competency improves. How does this happen? Krashen explained, "we are able to understand language containing unacquired grammar with the help of context, which includes extra-linguistic information, our knowledge of the world, and previously acquired linguistic competence" (1985, p. 2). Krashen pushed the idea that input must be comprehensible for the learner to improve, and the learner's focus should be on meaning. Sometimes, however, input can be blocked or limited from being comprehended. Krashen's Affective Filter hypothesis addressed this issue.

The Affective Filter Hypothesis reinforced the idea that comprehensible input is necessary for acquisition; however, the learner needs to be "receptive" towards it. Unfortunately, the affective filter, a metaphorical mental block, can prevent acquisition from reaching one's inner acquisition mechanism. Krashen explained that the filter is in effect when "the acquirer is unmotivated, lacking in self-confidence, or anxious" (p. 3). This filter offers one explanation for why learners do not acquire forms, even when receiving comprehensible input.

To summarize Krashen’s perspective, (1) acquisition and learning are two distinct ways to acquire different language elements, (2) input is the driver of acquisition, and (3) an affective filter can prevent or limit the ability of students to comprehend and make use of input.

Liu (2015), among others, has criticized Krashen's Monitor Model for at least three reasons: (a) the theory makes excessive claims, (b) there is an absence of evidence, and (c) the validity of the model is questionable. McLaughlin (1987) similarly complained that Krashen does not provide evidence for his hypotheses. The lack of evidence is compounded by undefined or ill-defined terms and the lack of falsifiability of his constructs. Despite these criticisms, Krashen's perspective has dominated discussions in the field and influenced teaching. Other theorists in the field, moreover, also focus on input and comprehensibility. For example, Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1983) advanced two claims about input and SLA. First, in agreement with Krashen, comprehensible input is necessary for second language acquisition. Second, modifications to the structure of conversations during the process of negotiating a communication problem help make input comprehensible to an L2 learner (Long, 1983).

Long (1983) suggests "…acquisition is either severely delayed or does not occur at all if comprehensible input is unavailable" (p. 97). As evidence, he identified how hearing children of deaf adults are severely language delayed when their only input was adult to adult speech on the television; however, these children were able to catch up with other children, according to Long, when adult-child conversation was made available to them. With such examples, Long concludes that "access to comprehensible input is a characteristic of all cases of successful acquisition ..." and "greater quantities of comprehensible input seem to result in better (or at least faster) acquisition ..." (p. 98). In other words, Long reinforced Krashen's idea that input is a crucial ingredient for acquisition. But, how does input become comprehensible?

Input becomes comprehensible, according to Long (1983, p.100), by "modifying not the input itself, but the interactional structure of conversation through such devices as self-and other-repetition, confirmation and comprehension checks and clarification requests." When communication breakdown happens, people negotiate meaning using repetition, confirmation and comprehension checks, and clarifications requests. These help unfamiliar input become comprehensible input. In other words, Long's Interaction Hypothesis agrees with Krashen's perspective and offers an explanation for how input can be made comprehensible.

Unlike Krashen’s theory, which suggests that input is a sufficient mechanism (the only thing needed) for acquisition, Long’s theory considers it is a necessary condition (not the whole picture). What transforms unfamiliar input into comprehensible input is the use of various clarificaton requests. Merrill Swain (1985), however, argued that a different mechanism influenced language development: output.

Swain's Output Hypothesis is a reaction to Krashen's Input Hypothesis. Based on her research with immersion students, Swain (1985) argued that input is not enough to acquire an L2. Learners, she argued, must produce output. Output is the act of producing language with some type of purpose. Swain (1985) suggested, "producing the target language may prompt second language learners to consciously recognize some of their linguistic problems; it may bring to their attention something they need to discover about their L2" (p. 126).

L2 learners, according to Swain, can notice their linguistic problems in two ways: (1) noticing a "hole," and (2) noticing a "gap." Noticing a hole is when "the activity of producing the target language may prompt second language learners to consciously recognize some of their linguistic problems" (Swain & Lapkin, 1995, p. 5). This occurs when L2 learners attempt to say something but do not have the ability. They notice problems when they speak which may direct their attention to relevant input. Swain argues that noticing a hole in a learner's knowledge system could be a prerequisite to noticing input. For example, in my own language learning, I tend to notice holes or new linguistic problems in the process of describing a story. I once tried to explain that my favorite sport is the Olympic Biathlon: cross country skiing combined with rifle shooting. Halfway through, I recognized that I did not know the vocabulary for *shoot* or *target*. I only recognized this problem in the middle of producing language. Swain's noticing a gap, relates to the linguistic choices a learner uses in speech as compared to what L1 speakers say.

The difference between a gap and a hole is when the noticing takes place. Noticing a hole occurs after a learner speaks and is searching for the needed input. Noticing a gap occurs when a learner compares his/her utterance to that of a native speaker. Swain suggested, rather than detecting input first, learners need to produce output which forces them to notice that they need a specific form.

Output, however, does not carry the same weight. How can L2 learners produce forms that they have not acquired? Output helps learners notice the gaps in their linguistic armor. Clearly, acquisition must occur first, which means input remains a priority. The takeaway from Swain's Output hypothesis is that output can help learners notice their weaknesses, which drives L2 learners to be more attentive to future input. Swain's emphasis on noticing gaps and holes also foreshadows another SLA perspective. One researcher claimed that without noticing, input cannot be acquired. His name is Richard Schmidt.

Schmidt (2010) defined noticing as "the conscious registration of attended specific instances of language" (p. 5). Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis is a theory that accounts for how input is processed. He said, "people learn about the things they attend to and do not learn much about the things they do not attend to!" (Schmidt, 2001, p. 30) Without attention, L2 learners cannot learn much. "What needs to be emphasized is that noticing here refers not to just noticing form alone, but noticing form in relation to the meaning it conveys and the context in which it is used" (Izumi, 2013, p. 26). This point is similar to Krashen's idea that L2 learners must focus on meaning, but Schmidt's addition is at the same time they must notice form. For

Long, interaction achieves this goal. Schmidt (2001) borrowing Baars' (1997) theatre metaphor claims "attention is like a spotlight and only events in the bright spot on stage are strictly conscious" (p.30).

During a real-life theatre production, one actor may be in the spotlight, the area in which the audience focuses on, while other actors are hidden in darkness. Relating this back to acquisition, input in our attention can become acquisition while input outside of attention will not. Attention is a feature of the language learner, not the input. Schmidt considers attention a prerequisite for awareness, and suggests awareness exists at two levels: (1) the level of noticing, and (2) the level of understanding (Schmidt, 1990, p. 132-133). The first level, the level of noticing, is also called intake which is "the conscious registration of an event" (Schmidt, 1995, p. 29). In addition, it is also defined as "the subset of input that actually gets in and which the learner utilizes in some way" (Cintron-Valentin & Ellis, 2016, p. 2). For example, noticing has occurred when an L2 learner sees the -ed morpheme on the end of regular simple past verbs. At this level, the learner can recognize walk*ed*, clos*ed*, and wait*ed*, but cannot formulate the rule. At the second level, the level of understanding, learners begin to restructure their knowledge systems by analyzing, comparing, testing hypotheses, and attempting to verbalize language rules. Here, students might realize that they are able to form the past tense of regular verbs by attaching –ed.

For Schmidt, attention is the mechanism which allows input to become intake. Later intake can be processed into understanding. The more input a learner notices, the more input he/she acquires. The takeaway from Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis is that input is not enough; attention is a pre-requisite for acquisition.

The example of the past tense inflection –ed was mentioned above. In reality, L2 learners may have trouble pronouncing past tense verbs because they can be pronounced three different ways: /t/ (walk*ed*), /d/ (clos*ed*), and /ɪd/ (wait*ed*) (Solt et al., 2003). Solt et al. go on to say "not all of these allomorphs are equally salient" (2003, p. 3). Kerswill and Williams (Cited in MacLeod) defined salience as "the property of a linguistic item or feature that makes it some way perceptually and cognitively prominent" (MacLeod, 2015, p. 1). Said another way, salience is the degree in which input can be detected. It is a feature of the input, not a feature of the learner. The results of Solt et al.'s study showed that (1) the regular past tense morpheme is not consistently perceived by adult learners, and (2) "while both beginners and more advanced learners are able to perceive the syllabic allomorph [ɪd] quite accurately, they are significantly less able to perceive the non-syllabic allomorphs [t] and [d]" (Solt et al., 2003, p. 8). This means perceiving /t/ and /d/ on –ed verbs was more difficult than /ɪd/. The forms were not on equal footing. In other words, forms that are less salient are less likely to be noticed. Attention might not be attracted to them. Even though language learners encounter input, it does not necessarily mean input will become noticed. Salience is a characteristic of the input, which may vary in degrees of difficulty and depend upon the learner's proficiency level.

The takeaway: not all input is created equal. Therefore, teachers should consider what forms they present in the classroom. Some forms may be too difficult for students to notice, while others will be noticed without the help of the teacher. There appears to be a middle ground where teachers should prioritize forms that are just right: not too easy and not too difficult. Instructional practices that focus learners' attention on things less likely to be noticed are justifiable (Schmidt, 2001).

Some people, however, believe that language learning is the same process as general learning. McLaughlin (1987, p. 133), for example, said "to learn a second language is to learn a skill" and that L2 learning "requires the automatization of component sub-skills." If learning a new skill were simply accumulation however, then learning a language would also be an accumulation of knowledge. This is not the case because internalizing the linguistic system of another language is a dynamic process where the addition of new input unconsciously restructures the system as a whole. We can identify step by step how we learned to tie our shoes, but not the steps that got us to our current language proficiency.

The above review suggests that input is the primary mechanism that drives acquisition. Different types of conversational adjustments used during the negotiation of meaning are at least one means for transforming unfamiliar input to comprehensible input. Output also helps L2 learners notice language weaknesses, which promotes noticing of future input. Furthermore, L2 learners are more likely to acquire input they pay attention to, and input varies in its degree of being noticeable. To put this into a nutshell, acquisition requires input and occurs when that input is comprehended.

Acquisition (the internalization of an L2) is fostered when (1) students receive lots of appropriately-leveled input, and (2) that input is noticed through meaningful tasks which involve interaction and output. After input is noticed, L2 learners are at the first level of Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis: intake. Here, an L2 learner has recognized a form which is partially acquired. What I mean by that is, acquiring a form is not a binary process: it is not black or white. Rather, acquisition is like a color spectrum. To create an example of this, white (the left side of the spectrum) is where you barely notice input yet it is still considered intake, and black (the right side of the spectrum) is the ability to produce that particular linguistic form. Forms are considered "darker" when they are closer to Schmidt's next level: understanding. If a form is noticed, and therefore, placed on this spectrum, it can be practiced and improved upon. Legge (1986) wrote that practice "simply involves using the skills that have been acquired, sometimes imperfectly (p. 228). Many people know the adage "practice makes perfect." I do not believe that, rather, I stand by Newell and Rosenblooms' correction "almost always, practice brings improvement, and more practice brings more improvement" (1981, p. 1). Is all practice equal? Bransford, Brown, and Cocking suggested "in deliberate practice, a student works under a tutor (human or computer based) to rehearse appropriate practices that enhance performance" (1999, p. 173). Ericsson, Prietula, and Edward Cokely (2007) suggest deliberate practice "focuses on tasks beyond your current level of competence and comfort" (p.2); in addition, the authors suggest "deliberate practice is different. It entails considerable, specific, and sustained efforts to do something you can't do well—or even at all" (2007, p.3). To have L2 learners perform deliberate practice would require specific goals combined with a sustained effort to bring improvement. But what kind of improvement and toward what end? The above discussion suggests that practice could be divided into three or four kinds: first, input practice to build up acquisition of new forms. Second, output practice to identify gaps and holes. Third, output practice to speed up processing. Fourth, input practice to focus attention and noticing. Input must be comprehended; once that occurs, learners can work from the level of noticing towards the level of understanding through deliberate practice. It is the teacher's responsibility to decide the cost-benefit of using class-time to present and have students practice less-salient forms. Teachers can manipulate input and noticing based on (1) how much class-time they spend on certain forms, and (2) using different tasks. If a teacher chooses to teach perceptually less salient content, more opportunities and different combinations of input, interaction, output, and noticing will be needed to help students succeed. Listening skills, however, are notoriously difficult to develop for many L2 learners, a topic we turn to now.

Listening Skill Development

Various definitions of what it means to listen come from psychology and linguistics. Some view listening as a type of behavior or competence while others view it as a type of system or process. In this first perspective, for example, listening is the interpretation of communicative behavior in an effort to understand meaning and implications of that behavior (Burleson, 2011, p. 29). According to this definition, listening is the interpretation of others' attitudes, appropriateness, and implications. Paulston (1974, p. 351) stated it “may simply be defined as tact and good manners and people not sharing that system will consider others rude and tactless." That being said, listening is the ability to interpret others manners and the ability to reply with tact. "To learn to listen is also to learn to respond and to continue a chain of listening and responding" (Brown, 1994, p. 240). Listening is an interactive behavior or balancing act in which L2 learners choose how they speak and react to others' speech. If one navigates through the conversation appropriately, he/she will continue to support the conversation resulting in more opportunities to receive input and negotiate meaning. If L2 learners do not show tact and react favorably, the conversation may end.

The other listening perspective, which originated from psychology, was an information processing model. Bodie et al. (2008), for example, views listening as a cognitive activity that involves the selection (attention), organization (interpretation) and integration (storage/recall) of information. Listening results from processing during these different stages that occur within the mind. Brown (1994) described how the brain processes speech by (1) holding speech in short term memory, (2) determining the source (radio, television, conversation), (3) examining the meaning of the message (semantics/literal meaning), (4) recalling background knowledge to better interpret the signal, and (5) determining the function of the speech (greetings, threats, etc.). Anderson's (1995) listening comprehension model, involved a different set of steps: (1) perception, (2) parsing, and (3) utilization. Perception, also known as decoding and sound-script recognition, is when a listener matches sounds with the words he/she knows. Anderson's definition of perception accounts for word recognition. Parsing, the next step, is when recognized words are then analyzed into larger units based on grammar and lexical clues. L1 speakers naturally perceive which words group together, but for L2 speakers parsing is a challenge. Anderson's final step, utilization, is the transformation of words into a mental representation and a search for meaning. It is the combination of piecing together the previous steps including the processing of phonological, grammatical, and lexical clues which are then compared to the listener's prior knowledge in order to interpret meaning. These information processing models explain how one listens. I strongly agree with Brown's model because it focuses on the *functions* of speech. Listening can be one-way or two-way.

One-way listening, or non-participatory listening, according to Goh (2014) involves having few or zero opportunities to interact with the speaker. In order to understand one-way speech, one must rely on linguistic knowledge rather than being able to negotiate meaning. Since listening is one of the primary senses for attending to input, it is a critical part of the acquisition process. Hearing and listening are not the same thing; hearing is passive while listening is not (Underwood, 1989). Two-way or participatory listening involves having the listener alternate between being a listener and a speaker, whereas one-way speech does not present this opportunity. Examples of two-way listening include such things as a job interview, a conversation in the hallway, or a chat on the telephone.

Brown (1994) uses the term *monologue* as a substitute for one-way speech and *dialogue* for two-way speech. I will now use the terms monologues and dialogues with these specialized meanings. Monologues, according to Brown, (1994), can be planned (a speech), or unplanned (an impromptu toast at a wedding, a campfire story etc.). The point being, a monologue will continue whether the listener comprehends it or not. To enjoy watching a play, one must pay attention to the story and characters in order to understand the plot, character development, drama, and humor, without having the opportunity to clarify meaning or ask for a line to be said again. This idea also applies to watching sports. The listener needs to focus on the announcer's commentary in order to better understand the key points of the match. Other examples are eavesdropping, listening to the radio, films, large lectures, and presentations. Listening to monologues is an important survival skill. For example, when travel delays happen, people need to listen for valuable information presented through the intercom at the airport or train station, without being afforded the ability to interact with the speaker.

Dialogues (or two-way speech), are listening opportunities where the listener can interact with the speaker, and according to Brown (1994), can be subdivided as well into (1) interpersonal, and (2) transactional categories. Interpersonal dialogues are meant to promote and maintain relationships; transactional dialogues are meant to express information (Brown, 1994). The topics, participants, communicative purposes as well as the place or setting of the interaction, governs the appropriateness of two-way communication. For example, the more familiar two interlocutors are, the more likely the discussion will utilize more assumptions because they share background knowledge. Strangers, however, must be more explicit in their explications because they do not know if the interlocutor is on the same page. Of course, both subclasses (interpersonal and transactional) can overlap (Brown, 1994). For example, we may change the way we speak to a close friend if he/she lacks knowledge about a particular topic much like how we would discuss the same topic with a stranger. Both monologues and dialogues present several challenges to L2 learners.

L1 listeners have an advantage over their L2 counterparts because they have spent an unbelievable amount of time listening before they were ever required to speak. Mary Underwood (1989) suggested that the relative ease of listening in one's L1 is due to (1) vast amounts of input, (2) the opportunities to practice listening with a variety of people throughout one's life, and (3) a strong knowledge of different content areas. Underwood (1989), however, states that L1 listeners are not perfect. She argues, that on rare occasions they experience listening problems due to such factors including jargon (job specific words), hearing difficulties (a loud birthday party), dialect differences (an American listening to an Australian) , and boredom (disinterest in what someone has to say). L2 learners face these issues and even more listening challenges.

As compared to written text which involves planning and editing before it reaches its intended audience, the spoken word, for the most part, is spontaneous (Richards, 1983). L2 listeners must simultaneously sift through a speaker's words for necessary information while disregarding fillers (um/er), self-corrections, false-starts, pauses, and ungrammatical utterances. In addition, everyday spontaneous speech can contain various amounts of idioms, slang, and reduced forms which complicate the understanding of meaning. Not only does what one say influence meaning, so does how one says it.

Stress, rhythm, and intonation (the prosodic or musical features of language) help L1 listeners navigate subtle messages such as sarcasm, endearment, and insults; however, these same cues may be missed by L2 learners. For example, the meaning of a statement like "what are you doing here?" depends on the way it is expressed, and could denote a feeling of surprise or anger. Moreover, speech, unless recorded, is temporary. Unlike written text, which can be revisited, speech immediately decays in the brain after it has been produced. There is a small window of opportunity in which a listener must process the message before it is gone. Not only does an L2 learner have to process temporary speech, he/she must balance what was previously mentioned and interpret how past information is relevant to the information he/she is now processing.

In writing, word boundaries distinguish where a word starts and ends. This is not the case with listening. Learners must infer and separate the speaker's speech stream into words (parsing) by using lexical and phonological clues (Leeser, 2004). In my own language learning, for instance, I misunderstood the phrase *gracias, adios* (thank you, goodbye) with *gracias a dios* (thank God). In addition, L1 interference can cause listening problems. I once misheard *me dicen* (they tell me) as the English word *medicine*.

Another listening challenge is the importance of context to disambiguate polysemous words. Quirk et al. (1985) state that some words "share the same phonological or orthographic 'shape'" (p. 70). Likewise, many English words have multiple meanings which can cause confusion. For example, to understand the meaning of the homograph *bank* depends on context. If the previous conversation was about going down a river in a boat, bank means *shoreline*, not a building where one deposits money.

In addition, listeners require background knowledge to infer meaning. For example, *The speaker said the groom was as smart as Joey and as manly as Ross while the bride was a perfect Rachael.* This sentence cannot be understood unless one has the appropriate background knowledge. Familiarity with the television show *Friends* is required to make sense of it.

Being able to process language also depends on the learner's current linguistic system. The phonemes (single sounds) in one's L1 greatly influence the learning of new phonemes in an L2. Spanish shares some vowels with English. Because of this, Spanish speakers will not experience difficulties with the vowel in the word *pen* but may have difficulty hearing the difference between *pen* and *pan* (pan contains a phoneme that does not occur in Spanish). Phonemic contrasts can cause listening difficulties, which can be exasperated by the fact that many English words differ by only one phoneme (e.g., sheep vs. ship).

What further complicates listening is pronunciation adjustments in general. Depending on the sounds that proceed a phoneme, a sound can change into another one or disappear based on the word's environment. Examples include *what are* /wɑːtʃə/, *going to* /gɑːnə/, and *sit down* /sI' daʊn/ (Ur, 1984, p. 19). While an L2 listener may be familiar with the pronunciation of a word in the dictionary (citation form), he/she may not be able to recognize a familiar word that has changed due to pronunciation adjustments. Even a moment of hesitation while listening can cause the learner to lose focus and miss subsequent conversation, which can be further complicated by learners who must understand every word.

Using Anderson's (1995) listening comprehension model as a basis for her research, Christine Goh (2000) found five listening problems that affected the L2 learners in her study. They (1) quickly forgot what was heard, (2) did not recognize words they knew, (3) understood words but not the intended messages (4) neglected the next part of speech when thinking about meaning, and were (5) unable to form a mental representation from the words they heard. Studies like this shed light on the momentous challenges of listening in an L2. This is a big concern because over 50% of an L2 learner's time will be used for listening (Nation & Newton, 2009). That being said, what aptitudes facilitate L2 listening?

It has been found that (1) auditory discrimination (Wilson et al. 2011); (2) depth of vocabulary knowledge (Staehr, 2009); and (3) speed of aural word recognition (Milton, 2009) all play a beneficial role in L2 listening. Wang and Treffers (2017) say, "the variable which correlated most strongly with listening comprehension was vocabulary size, followed by general language proficiency" (p. 149). Matthews & Cheng (2015) found "the ability to recognise high frequency vocabulary from speech is evidently one of the fundamentally important domains of knowledge indicative of skilled listening comprehension" (p. 10). Clearly, vocabulary knowledge can lessen the burden of processing meaning. However, for a maximum effect, "6000-7000 words families are needed to deal with spoken text" (Nation, 2006 p. 21), if students wanted to reach a level of 98% comprehension.

How can teachers help L2 learners succeed with listening? If students quickly forget what was heard, teaching listening strategies may help students approach how they listen differently. If students have trouble recognizing words they already know, teachers should include a pronunciation element into their listening courses to help students notice features of English like pronunciation adjustments. If students understand words but not their communicative intent, a listening teacher should include activities that include appropriate and meaningful vocabulary paired with a communicative element. If students are unable to form a mental representation of a word, teachers should repeat and reuse key words in different contexts across multiple classroom periods. These solutions may reduce some of the possible burdens of listening in an L2. In addition, activities that help notice form-meaning connections between what a speaker says and what he/she means will help students better navigate two-way communication resulting in more opportunities for input and negotiation of meaning. Videos can be used as sources of good and bad conversational interactions which may help students notice forms presented in class.

Listening is both a process and a behavior. To listen in an L2 is a challenge for many reasons, so teachers must decide how to use their classroom time to help students. As mentioned before, listening occurs in both one-way and two-way contexts. Using both as sources of listening input may increase the likelihood of language acquisition by giving students deliberate practice opportunities. Since two-way communication is a sensitive co-construction between interlocutors, L2 learners would benefit from two-way communication forms and strategies. Two-way communication, however, entails awareness and skillful deployment of pragmatic knowledge. This means that to effectively support student development of listening skills, teachers must also address pragmatic competence, a topic we turn to in the next section.

Pragmatics and the Speech Act of Suggestions

Dell Hymes (1972), a well-noted anthropologist and linguist, defined communicative competence as “the ability to communicate within a social context that is determined by the interactants and their communicative intentions and anchored in space and time” (p. 284). Hymes' point is that successful communication involves not only being well versed in the grammar of a language, but also navigating within the social context forged between two or more persons. Although the second half of Hymes' definition may seem obvious, it is in fact crucial because this idea of communicative competence gave power to the Communicative Approach: an idea that successful language learning comes from having to communicate real meaning. Before this perspective, teachers emphasized grammar and vocabulary rather than interaction. This new approach influenced how researchers observed and analyzed language learner interaction through communicative events which promoted an interest in pragmatics.

According to the linguist David Crystal, pragmatics is “the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make and the constraints they encounter in using language” (1997, p. 301). Crystal's definition emphasizes the view of the speaker as the main component in contrast to Hymes' definition which emphasizes the situation. However, the main idea shared between Hymes and Crystal is that users can choose how they communicate within a social context. For example, the words one uses to borrow someone’s pencil in class greatly differs from the words used to borrow someone's car for a week. The fact that most people would be willing to lend a pencil even to a stranger means the request would entail fewer features then one where the borrower knows that the listener might have many objections to lend the car. For example, "Hey John, can I borrow a pencil?" compared to "Hey John, an emergency has come up and I need a car for a few days. If you don't need yours this week, is there any chance I could borrow it?" In the first request to borrow a pencil, the speaker is very brief and direct. The second request might include, like the example here, a reason for the request as well as additional moves to mitigate the gravity of the request.

LoCastro (2003, p. 15) defined pragmatics as "the study of speaker and hearer meaning created in their joint actions that include both linguistic and non-linguistic signals in the context of socioculturally organized activities." Similar to Crystal, she reaffirms that meaning is co-created by speakers, adding that non-linguistic signals can change portrayed meanings. Unlike Crystal's definition that emphasized the view of the speaker, Locastro's definition highlights the illocutionary force between the speaker and hearer. The theme shared between these two definitions is how language should be viewed through social context. An additional theme is how a pragmatically competent speaker uses his/her language abilities to effectively achieve a specific purpose in context. Making a request to your boss is different than a request to your best friend.

While it is true that L1 speakers for the most part understand one another, an L2 with an L1 speaker may not be able to effectively get their intended meanings across. If an intended meaning is not received, pragmatic failure happens. Thomas (1983) stated that pragmatic failure is “the inability to understand what is meant by what is said” (p. 22). Pragmatic failure can occur, but is not limited to, when an L2 learner lacks either the knowledge of particular cultural information or the correct linguistic form to use during interaction. Additionally, he/she may choose to transfer a pragmatically competent phrase from his/her L1 which could end up causing offense or confusion, even when the phrase is grammatically correct. In order to become a pragmatically competent person, two conditions must be fulfilled: (1) pragmalinguistic competence and (2) sociopragmatic competence. Pragmalinguistic competence is the ability to use different forms to help achieve a desired outcome with speech. For example, knowing the past progressive tense (verb + ing) can soften a demand. If a language learner knows how to form the past progressive, he/she is able to change a phrase like "help me with my paper?" to something more effective like “I *was wondering* if you could help me with my paper?" This is more than simply adding a past progressive tense. Pragmalinguistic competence is the language learner’s ability to recognize the need for and employ linguistic elements to moderate the impact of the message to fit the context and interlocutor to achieve desired outcomes. Pragmatic competence is the ability or *how* of using language.

Another aspect of competence is sociopragmatic ability. This ability involves knowing *where* to use linguistic elements in an appropriate context. For example, people do not speak in the same manner at a birthday party as they do at church. A sociopragmatically appropriate individual can correctly match his/her words with the environment. Sociopragmatic competence is the ability to know when to use forms in appropriate contexts (Dippold, 2008). When an L2 learner develops both competencies, he/she understands "how-to-say-what-to-whom-when" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2013, p.1).

To summarize, pragmatics is the study of language based on the user in social interaction, and users can successfully deliver their intentions when two types of conditions, pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence, are met. To better understand pragmalinguistic competence, the ways we use language have been classified by Austin (1962) into different speech acts.

Although there is a wide selection of topics that fall under the field of pragmatics such as deixis, presupposition, relevance, face, politeness, implicature, and conversation structure, speech acts have received the most attention (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). Austin (1962) coined the term speech acts. A speech act is an utterance intended to perform a specific function. For example, "Please, do the dishes." Austin delineated speech acts into categories, and his student, John Searle (1979), later identified five categories that remain in common use in the literature today. They are (1) declarations, (2) representatives, (3) commissives, (4) directives, and (5) expressives. These five speech acts comprise much of the pragmatics literature in L2 learning.

(1) Declarations are words that change the world after being announced. For example, the utterance "I pronounce you man and wife," transforms two single people into a married couple (Cutting, 2015). (2) Representatives are words a speaker uses to state what he/she believes to be the case. An example of representatives is the philosopher Rene Descartes' famous words, "I think therefore I am" (2015, p. 15). (3) Commissives are words that commit the speaker to a future action (2015, p. 15). In the following sentence, "I promise to help move your couch on

Sunday," the speaker commits himself/herself into later moving a piece of furniture. (4) Directives are words aimed at making the hearer do something. The proverb "when in Rome, do as the Romans" is an example of a directive (2015, p. 15). The speaker wants the listener to act how the locals act. Finally, (5) Expressives are words that state how the speaker feels. For example, "I regret eating that ham sandwich." This paper includes topics from the speech act literature to address suggestions, which are a type of *directive* in listening contexts. To be able to comprehend oral speech directives, L2 learners need the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competency to decipher the elements of a suggestion and understand its locutionary and illocutionary meanings.

John Searle (1979, p. 13) stated that directives are "attempts by the speaker to get the hearer to do something." An example of this would be, "You should get your car fixed." By using a directive, the speaker is asking for the hearer to take a future action. Banerjee and Carrell (1988, p. 319) defined suggestions as "an utterance that the speaker intends the hearer to perceive as a directive to do something that will be in the hearer's benefit." In other words, suggestions are used to help the hearer perform an action that will benefit him/her.

However, Sophia Marmaridou (1990, p. 565) defined a suggestion as "a language function whereby one of the interlocutors may express his/her belief that a course of action is possible and desirable for him/herself and/or the addressee, and this course of action could be profitably taken up by either or both of them..." Unlike Banjeree and Carell's definition, Marmaridou posits that suggestions can be beneficial to both parties, but the shoulder of responsibility rests on the hearer. The forms used to make an appropriate suggestion depends on several factors, especially context. If a roommate can barely afford rent money, his other roommate might make a suggestion like "Have you considered getting a second job?" By saying this, the listener might perform a future action of finding a new job which will help him be able to afford rent, something that benefits both parties involved. Given this understanding of suggestions, research on them has been scarce.

Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig and Beverly Hartford (1990) analyzed suggestions through the lens of status congruence between academic advisors and advisees. The study was conducted in advising sessions, and data was collected through video and audio recordings. Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford defined (1990, p. 473) status congruence as, “the appropriate use of linguistic forms by both parties; essentially, the advisor has a higher status than the advisee, so he/she talked in such a way that was the match of a speaker’s status and the appropriateness of speech acts given the status.” Said another way, the researchers wanted to know if L2 advisees, over time, improved their ability to match their utterances in relation to their advisor's higher status. Did the L2 advisees adjust their utterances and speech acts to match the status of their interlocutor? No. While, L1 advisees used downtoners (words that reduce the force of utterances) to minimize the threat of suggestions to their advisors, L2 advisees did not. They were more direct which violated the status congruence construct.

Later, Bardovi and Hartford (1993), the same researchers, performed a longitudinal study using the same method. The participants in this study were six L1 advisees and ten L2 advisees who were taped in 35 advising sessions throughout the semester. Their goal was to see if status congruence increased over time between the advisor and L2 advisees. They found that L2 advisees adapted to a more appropriate level of status congruence in their advising sessions throughout the semester. In other words, it appeared that the L2 advisees were able to adjust their words to match the status congruence between them and their advisers without instruction. After

Bardovi and Hartford made the case that pragmatic competence can develop without instruction, E. Alcon (2001) conducted a replication study.

Following the same procedure, Alcon videotaped 30 academic advising sessions using the same criteria as mentioned above. She found that with her group of L2 advisees, improvement did not occur. The percentage of direct forms (inappropriate in this context) being used by L2 advisees at the end of the semester was too high. This status congruence mismatch was inappropriate; therefore, Alcon stated that pedagogical intervention should be done.

Suggestions and requests are both speech acts under the directive speech act category. Because these two speech acts share similar features, it may be possible to find common patterns between them to help explain the discrepancy of these studies. The main component of a request speech act is to have the hearer perform an action that exclusively benefits the speaker (Trosborg, 1995). Because the speaker is putting an imposition on the hearer, a balance of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic resources are needed in order to avoid conflict and achieve the speaker's goal. How is this done? The speaker may use *downtoners* and *hedges*, words to reduce the force of other words. Examples of downtoners are *barely*, *hardly*, and *somewhat*, while examples of hedges are *maybe*, *possible*, *perhaps*, and *could* (Quirk et al., 1985). Also, providing additional information may lessen the imposition of a request. A phrase using both of these elements could be "Would it be possible if I could please borrow your car this Friday? I have a job interview and my car's in the shop!" Knowing how to form and successfully achieve a goal by using a request in one's first language is doable; however, making a request in an L2 is difficult (Blum-Kulka, & Olshtain, 1984). Doing so requires a great deal of competency, and if done poorly, an L2 learner can be "perceived as rude, offensive or demanding" (Uso-Juan & Martinez-Flor, 2008, p. 237). If an L2 learner is perceived as rude or offensive when making a request, there will be a higher likelihood that the speaker will refuse to comply. Requests occur frequently in everyday situations and there may be cross-cultural differences in the linguistic forms used to formulate them. It is pertinent that L2 learners are able to correctly assess the situation and then choose what to say (Schauer, 2009).

Speech act studies tend to focus on what language learners say and how they express a request. These studies, for example, examine what linguistic tools learners use to lighten the imposition of a request. Halupka-Resetar (2014) looked at requests of 37 intermediate-level English for Specific Purposes (ESP) L2 learners. She analyzed six situations where the variables of social power and degree of imposition varied between the speakers and listeners. She found that intermediate learners showed a limited variation to both external and internal modifications (downtoners) on their requests. Additionally, learners showed a limited frequency of modification usage. The only strategies that participants used for internal modification was the downtoner *please*. The L2 learners in this studied failed to adjust their requests with tact.

Hill (1997) also focused on requests. He investigated the way students at different proficiency levels interacted. He found that higher proficiency level learners were able to use indirect requests, but students across the board of low, middle, and high proficiencies overused statements like *I want*. J.C. Félix-Brasdefer (2007) also investigated the development of requests across three proficiency levels. He found that beginner L2 learners used direct requests regardless of the situation, while the higher proficiency groups used indirect requests. A year later, he found that for teaching refusals, the instructed group developed while the control group did not show changes (Félix-Brasdefer, 2008). There was a theme that learners receiving pragmatics instruction did better than those who did not receive it.

It appears that without instruction L2 learners overused simple forms, showed a limited variation on modifying requests, and did not show improvement without instruction in contrast to the Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford (1993) study cited above. Alcon (2001) and others have expressed the value for instruction. Since requests and suggestions share similar characteristics, I argue that without instruction, learners will continue to overuse forms, limit the forms they use, and not improve because students may be unaware of what forms to use or do not notice holes in their competence. If speech acts are taught in the classroom, however, teachers need ways to test pragmatic competence in order to assess pragmatic learnability in the classroom.

Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs), also known as Written Discourse Completion Tasks (WDCTs), are one instrument used to collect data about speech acts. The student is given a set of scenarios and then asked to write down responses for those scenarios. This instrument is designed to "elicit stimulated speech act data under control conditions so as to measure pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge in a non-interactive format" (Roever, 2005, p. 18). In other words, DCTs measure pragmatic competence but do not account for interaction. DCTs are simple to create and easy to use for teachers and researchers because sociopragmatic variables such as (1) power, (2) the social distance between speakers and (3) degrees of imposition can be controlled (Hudson, 2001). Below is an example of my own DCT:

Figure 1: Sample DCT Question

Prompt: Your teacher (a good friend) smokes cigarettes constantly. You think he/she should quit. As you walk into the parking lot, you see him/her smoking next to your car.

You: ____.

One researcher (Marti, L., 2005) measured indirectness and politeness strategies between Turkish-German bilingual returnees and Turkish monolinguals. She wanted to examine who was more direct. To investigate this, the researcher used a DCT of 10 situations where informants had to provide requests. The finding was that Turkish immigrant speakers as compared to Dutch speakers employ more direct strategies.

In addition, another researcher (Codina-Espurz, V., 2013) examined if the speech act of refusals differed by L2 English speakers at different proficiency levels. Refusals were collected through a DCT. She suggested that the least proficient group in the study may have transferred L1 into the L2 (the production of adjuncts). DCTs are a popular tool for collecting speech act data. Because of their ease to make and distribute, DCTs have been widely used to collect data (Felix-Brasdefer, 2010). While researchers like Roever (2005) have found DCTs helpful for measuring pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge, it is dangerous to accept these results uncritically because DCTs are not truly interactive.

Golato (2003), for example, researched whether DCTs elicited similar responses to those used in authentic interactions. She videotaped conversations and recorded phone calls of 27 German middle class families, and collected 50 compliment sequences: a speaker said a compliment and the hearer responded. Later, she created a DCT based on the collected authentic compliment sequences. A different group of German L1 speakers answered the questions on the DCT. Golato found that none of the respondents chose to ignore a compliment event, even though in the instructions, the participants were asked to leave lines blank if they deemed doing so was appropriate. She also found that participants who answered questions on the DCT wrote answers that did not appear in the authentic data, while missing items that were in the authentic data. Golato (2003, p. 19) suggests that a DCT measures “what speakers believe what they should say in response to a compliment." It appeared the DCT measured what people think they should say instead of what people *actually* do say. Also, the DCT does not reflect real-time interaction, which is an essential part of Hymes' (1972) definition of communicative competence "determined by the interactants and their communicative intentions and anchored in space and time" (p. 284).

Besides DCTs, another popular data collection technique in the pragmatics literature is the role play. Students are asked to perform a dialogue in which they are placed in a fictitious situation where they must speak the L2. The researcher or teacher observes spoken interaction. For example, Nguyen & Hudson (2012) performed a pre-test, post-test design with 69 pre-service EFL Vietnamese teachers. The teachers had never visited an English speaking country and spent six to nine years learning English. The teachers were randomly placed into one of three conditions: (1) the explicit group (N=28), the implicit group (N=19), and the control group (N=22). Over ten weeks, the explicit group received consciousness-raising activities, explicit meta-pragmatic explanations, and error correction. The implicit group was taught with materials that contained input enhancement, and this group received feedback through recasts. The pretest and post-tests for each group consisted of (1) DCT, (2) role play, and (3) oral peer-feedback. Nguyen and Hudson (2012) found that the explicit group scored higher (on the DCT) than the implicit group. However, the implicit group performed significantly better than the control group on the role play and oral peer-feedback tasks.

Given the relatively new focus on pragmatics development in language learning, there has been a limited amount of research in this area. A majority of these studies have investigated whether explicit or implicit speech act instruction is beneficial for learners (e.g., Takahashi, 2010) and whether consciousness-raising promoted acquisition. Explicit pragmatic instruction is “the provision of metapragmatic information designed to make the feature more salient (Rose, 2005, pg. 393). In other words, explicit instruction is used to tell L2 learners exactly what they will be learning. This type of instruction is meant to help students notice key features they might have otherwise overlooked. It can help promote noticing.

On the other end of the teaching spectrum, implicit instruction is the use of forms without providing information. The literature suggests that explicit instruction is generally more effective than implicit instruction (Cohen, 2005; Jeon & Kaya, 2006; Rose and Kasper, 2001; Rose, 2005). Pragmatic functions may be less perceptually salient meaning that highlighting their features might make them more noticeable and therefore learnable. It is important to know, however, that testing instruments, participants and procedures greatly impact the results of studies. Some studies say explicit instruction is the best (e.g., Halenko & Jones, 2011), others say implicit (e.g., Fordyce, 2014), while some say both (e.g., Rezvani, Eslami-Rasekh, & Vahid Dastjerdi, 2014) are beneficial for learners in different ways. More research is needed to tackle the question of which instruction approach is the most effective.

Halenko & Jones (2011) observed the extent explicit instruction of requests enhances pragmatic competence for English for Academic Purposes (EAP) learners in the UK. Chinese learners who were studying abroad, were grouped into two groups of 13 participants. Each participant was between the age of 21-24 and had never studied abroad. All of the participants had studied English for 10 years, and they were considered B2s (intermediate skill level) on the Common European Framework. One group (the experimental group) was taught requests explicitly, while the other group acted as a control group. The experimental group took a DCT pretest with six request scenarios. These DCT responses were rated by three EAP teachers on a five point Likert type scale. Later, the first group received three, two-hour teaching phases. Phase

#1 contained awareness raising activities; phase #2 was explicit instruction; and phase #3 was production practice and discussion of scenarios in pairs. Pair exercises (role play) were done in front of the class, so the class could discuss the appropriateness of what the students said as compared to what they should have said. After both groups of L2 learners studied abroad in the UK, the groups returned to take a post-test. The experimental groups' pre-test mean score was M= 16.07. The post-test was M=20.05. The control groups' pre-test was M=15.12. The posttest-was M=15.33. The explicit groups' scores significantly increased while the control groups' scores did not. Both groups were of similar age, proficiency level, and years of study. Based on this study, I believe that directives are of low salience, otherwise the control groups' score would have increased due to the large amounts of available input abroad. The group that received noticing activities, instruction, and output practice were better able to attend to future input which was reflected on the post-test (weeks later).

Kenneth Fordyce (2014) also investigated the difference of explicit and implicit instruction on EFL learners' use of epistemic stance. Epistemic stance is when a speaker comments on the status of information with such examples as *maybe*, *perhaps*, *I think*, and *I guess*. 81 Japanese students, age 18-22, were separated into two groups (explicit N= 37, implicit N =44). To avoid an imbalance between the two groups, the students were listed in order of proficiency from High, Middle, and Low based on their TOEIC scores. The two groups were taught once a week for 45 minutes. The explicit group was taught with structured input (authentic texts) and enhanced input (bold type, underlining, and larger fonts for key forms). The explicit group received deductive activities (metalingustic and metapragmatic explanations) of epistemic stance forms. In addition, consciousness-raising activities were used. For the implicit group, the focus was on comprehension and analysis of the same authentic texts as the explicit group (without enhanced input). The order of teaching went like this: week one was pre-testing; weeks two through five were explicit and implicit instruction for the respective groups. Weeks six and seven was a post-test. Five months later, both groups were given a delayed post-test. Rather than using a DCT or Role Play as a testing instrument, the researcher asked for each student to produce two writing activities: a description, and an opinion essay. Participants from both groups looked at a photo and had to write a description about it. For the description task, participants were asked to write 150-200-word opinion about a pre-selected subject. The students were given 40 minutes to complete this section, and were not allowed to use a dictionary or online sources. How were these passages scored? If a student wrote down an epistemic stance marker like *think* five times, the word *think* would only count for one point. If a student used *think*, *maybe*, *seem*, and *may* in their paper, his/her total score would be four points. The more epistemic markers used, the better (with the exception of repeating the same marker). I believe that this type of task was effective because it measured the amount of different forms students noticed. The researcher saw if students could produce different forms that were presented in the input: this suggests that students had acquired/retained those forms. However, I think he should have added an interactive element.

Fordyce's results support the idea of introducing forms. All three proficiency levels increased their usage of epistemic forms. The explicit group had strong gains in the short-term (the highest amount) but these gains diminished over time. The implicit group had worse short-term gains but long-term, they used markers from the pretest (week 1) to post-test (week 7) to delayed posttest (week 29). Both groups improved their use of epistemic stance (e.g., I think, perhaps, maybe) but the implicit groups' improvement stuck over time. It seems while explicit instruction is beneficial for quickly gaining forms, implicit instruction may help students attain some sort of deeper language processing. It appears that both explicit and implicit instruction benefited learners over no instruction.

Speech acts are worth classroom time and L2 learners will benefit from instruction as compared to no instruction. Although suggestions have been researched lightly, research from other speech act studies can help teachers form ideas to teach L2 learners. Speech acts are used frequently to achieve desired outcomes in an L1 and an L2. As long as teaching activities are interactive, meaningful, full of input, and promote noticing, students will have more opportunities to develop their pragmatic competence in the classroom. By incorporating both explicit and implicit teaching in the classroom combined with appropriate assessment tools that measure forms, speech acts, and student appropriateness in interaction, teachers will be equipped to help students improve their future pragmatic language development.

Speech acts can be paired with speaking, listening, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary activities and assignments. Speaking and listening tasks can act as a segue to practice and produce output which will improve L2 learners' sociopragmatic competence. L2 learners need interaction so they can learn how to negotiate meaning and continue conversations tactfully. Because of their ease of use to create and administer, DCTs can be used as noticing tools to help L2 learners think about social factors like (1) power, (2) the social distance between speakers, and (3) degrees of imposition, as well as (4) linguistic forms, and (5) prosodic features. Assignments should be used as a tool for students to learn vocabulary and chunks of language and notice how language can be used in different contexts. As an L2 learner's communicative competence develops, he/she will be more confident speaking and listening: an avenue for more deliberate practice, learning, and acquisition.

In sum, developing students' listening skills and pragmatic competency at the same time makes sense. Both benefit through role plays and other communicative activities. Pragmatic skill will help students better pinpoint what speakers say and intend. The following demo lesson unit highlights best practices for doing that.

Demo Lesson Unit

The following lesson unit demonstrates the principles identified for teaching pragmatics integrated with listening development for a ten-lesson course. Each lesson is a 50 minute period. The classroom is in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The students' L1s are Spanish, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean. The students' abilities range from intermediate to upper-intermediate. The single instructional focus of this demo lesson unit is the speech act of suggestions. There are twelve students: five males and seven females. In the demo lesson unit that follows, there is a specific focus on pronunciation as a means to develop students' listening skills, specifically decoding.

Day 1

To begin day 1, the teacher will introduce himself, explain his background and teaching experiences through the use of a PowerPoint presentation. After the PowerPoint, he will present different ways to clarify meaning in two-way listening. Such examples include: *Excuse me, I have a question about this... Sorry to interrupt, but... What does X mean? I am not clear about X…* One of the issues mentioned above was comprehensible input. By providing ways for students to clarify meaning, they will be more likely to navigate through conversations and make input comprehensible (Long, 1983). An activity including negotiation of meaning is *two truths and a lie*. Students will be given time to brainstorm and write down three facts about themselves. Then, they will interact with their classmates while trying to discover which fact is the lie. This icebreaker allows students to meet their classmates while acclimating to group work focused on listening. After the activity, a discussion with the class about their favorite facts and lies will begin. As mentioned above, students need practice listening to one-way conversations. Next, students will complete a Needs Analysis (see Appendix #1). This will help the teacher better know his students and shape activities to better suit their needs.

Activity	*Materials*	*Focus*	*Objective*	*Time*
PowerPoint	Computer Projector Speakers	One-way listening	To build rapport	5 minutes
Clarification Requests	Paper and Pencil	Pragmatics	To help students negotiate meaning	5 minutes
Icebreaker	Board	Two-way listening	To use clarification requests	20 minutes
Needs Analysis	Appendix #1	Listening to instructions	To help the teacher know about student backgrounds	20 minutes
Homework	Word search		To help students notice requests	

Day 1 Overview

Day 2

At the start of day 2, the teacher will go around the room and glance at students' homework to see if it is done or not (pass/fail). He will ask students to pair up and discuss situations where they use these words. After, he will ask for volunteer responses and explain that the words in the word search are particularly useful to clarify meaning and keep the conversation going. Examples include: *What is the meaning of…? Can you tell me what … means? Is it similar to …? People use it to/for… It's where/when…*

Next, the teacher will play a video about continuing a conversation at a birthday party. The video shows different examples of what to do and what *not* to do. As discussed above, students need to notice (consciously register) forms in order to acquire them (Schmidt, 2001). A video showing two different scenes demonstrates this point. After the video, students will discuss with their partner what the major differences were. After the pair work, students (as a class) will discuss these points. Again, students are interacting and producing speech. Finally, students will fill out *exit-slips* (student responses on a piece of notebook paper) which act as feedback for the teacher. This reflection may act as a consciousness-raising tool to promote noticing (Schmidt, 2001). For homework, students will write two paragraphs that compare and contrast the two video scenes in order to review tact. The video will be posted to an online portal like D2l or Moodle for additional review.

Day 2 Overview

Activity	*Materials*	*Focus*	*Objective*	*Time*
Clarification Requests	Board	Review	To review ways to negotiate meaning	5 minutes
Video	Computer	Noticing practice	To have students notice the features of a smooth conversation	15 minutes
Discussion		Two-way listening	Compare and Contrast the two videos	15 minutes
Lecture		Class discussion	To promote listening to classmates	10 minutes
Exit Slips	Paper	Critical thinking	To reflect on today's lesson	5 minutes

Day 3

Day 3 begins with a review of the "good" version of the video from yesterday. After, class time will be spent as a pretend birthday party. The teacher plays music off the computer and asks students to introduce themselves and perform small talk similar to the video. One of the issues mentioned above was output practice (Swain, 1985). By having students produce language, they may notice gaps and holes. This pretend birthday party scenario demonstrates this point. Next, the teacher explains some *speech acts (requests, suggestions).* He will explain the purposes of speech acts in English and their importance outside the classroom. This section is extremely relevant to the students' everyday lives. Tomorrow’s lesson will involve a project centered around speech acts. The teacher introduces a glimpse of his “finding an apartment” activity to the class. The more students are exposed to speech acts, especially through consciousness-raising activities such as pre-viewing future projects, they will be more likely to notice and attend to new forms (Schmidt). Teaching vocabulary can mitigate L2 listening issues (Nation, 2006), therefore, introducing relevant vocabulary as homework for the next day is a must. The teacher will distribute a homework activity which includes such words as *rent*, *bedrooms*, *my needs and tastes*.

Day 3 Overview

Activity	*Materials*	*Focus*	*Objective*	*Time*
Video	Computer	Speech Acts	Provide input about small talk	5 minutes
Pretend Birthday Party	Music	Output practice	To have students notice gaps and holes	20 minutes
Speech Acts		Pragmatics focus	To define speech acts and how they are used	15 minutes
Preview for tomorrow	Board	Consciousness-raising	To prepare students for tomorrow's activity	10 minutes

Day 4

Day 4 begins with a vocabulary review. Wang & Treffers (2017) suggest that vocabulary size correlates with listening ability. One of the issues mentioned above was misunderstanding words or understanding the word but not its usage. Teaching vocabulary and how it is used in different situations is the first focus of today's lesson. After reviewing vocabulary, the teacher will disperse different handouts (finding an apartment). Students will be given a new identity based on the worksheet that they are given (see appendix #2). Students form groups that share the same numbers (e.g., all 4s group together). Students, working as a group, read and clarify to one another the information presented on their worksheet. It is important that they solidify how much money they have in their imaginary budget, and their wants and needs regarding a new apartment. The goal of this activity is for students to find a roommate from a different group. This activity includes elements from an evidence-based approach which includes (a) two-way listening, (b) negotiation of meaning, (c) output practice, (d) meaningful interaction, and (e) attention to speech acts and their forms. After students have discussed their needs, the teacher explains that each group has different reasons to find an apartment. Since students do not have enough money to live alone, they must find someone that can fit their lifestyle. Unfortunately, it is not that easy. Students need to introduce themselves to a potential roommate, create small talk, and if conditions are not right, suggest ways that they might be able to live together. This is an example of a "find-the-gap" exercise. If students find a good fit, they go to the landlord (the teacher) and present information about their roommate showing why they are a good fit. The teacher assesses his students' listening skill based on how accurately they describe their roommate's information. At the end of class, students will write down what they learned that day (exit slips). The student pairs' homework will include a list of items they will need.

Day 4 Overview

Activity	*Materials*	*Focus*	*Objective*	*Time*
Vocabulary Review	Board	Vocabulary	To build listening skills	5 minutes
New Identity	Appendix #2	Negotiation of meaning	To have students solve a problem with their new identities	12 minutes
Pre-teaching	Board	Listening to instructions	To clarify questions before doing the next activity	3 minutes
Finding a roommate	Worksheets	Suggestions	To have students successfully find a roommate	25 minutes
Exit Slips		Consciousness Raising	To have students reflect on today's activities	5 minutes

Day 5

For the end of the week, students must sit down next to their roommate from last class and create small talk. The teacher provides conversation topics such as their roommate's day or family. Then, the teacher explains that the "new roommates" want to celebrate by going out and doing something fun; however, they do not know each other's interests (see appendix #3). Students will be given a sheet with their new "interests." The teacher passes out sheets. Both sheets contain information the other student does not know. Because students are trying to achieve a task (going out to celebrate), but do not know their partner's interests, they must make suggestions. The teacher reinforces that students must hide their sheets from one another. The teacher, using the board, presents speech acts that are pertinent for this situation like, *Have you considered trying X? Do you have any other ideas/views/suggestions? What about…?* The teacher provides suggestions on the board (input) and models pronunciation. Students copy down the forms into their notes, while repeating them aloud. After this, students are ready to find a way to celebrate their living situation. Students will go up to the teacher and explain what they have learned about their partner. Since it is the end of week 1, students will be asked to write a reflection about their first week which must include terms such as small talk, speech acts, suggestions, and greetings. The first five days of a ten-day demo unit demonstrates the following principles (a) practice, (b) noticing, (c) meaningful interaction, (d) attention to speech acts, and (e) a focus on student speaking and listening skills. A majority of the activities involve the students taking charge in the classroom with support from the teacher.

Day 5 Overview

Activity	*Materials*	*Focus*	*Objective*	*Time*
Small Talk		Speaking and Listening	Provide opportunity for small talk	10 minutes
Interest Sheets	Appendix #3	Information Gap Activity	To have students listen for details	10 minutes
Suggestions	Board	Listening to instructions	To notice different forms e.g., *what about…?* *Do you have any other ideas?*	10 minutes
Finding a way to celebrate		Suggestions	To have students suggest an activity they will both enjoy	15 minutes
Reflection instruction for the weekend		Consciousness-raising	To have students write about their first week	5 minutes in class and all weekend (homework)

Day 6

To begin the second week of this ten-lesson course unit, the teacher collects the students' reflections and distributes student handout #1 (see appendix #4). After, he will disperse handout #2 (see appendix #5). These handouts are used as a diagnostic tool that also doubles as a consciousness-raising exercise. Then, he will present one part of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) related to consonant sounds. IPA symbols will be used to help visualize consonant differences. The Since many speech acts and ways to express oneself rely on the voiced and voiceless TH phonemes, he will have students finish class by watching a video about them. It is important to note that English speakers use forms like *th*ank you, and I *th*ink, frequently. Milton (2009) suggests that aural word recognition is a key component to build listening development; therefore, presenting phonemes like the voiced and voiceless TH must be covered, especially because they are uncommon in other languages.

Day 6 Overview

Activity	*Materials*	*Focus*	*Objective*	*Time*
Collect Friday's Homework		Discussion	Ease students into the second week	5 minutes
Pronunciation Needs Analysis	Appendix #4	Consciousness-raising	To learn about the students' speaking background	20 minutes
Needs Analysis #2	Appendix #5	Consciousness-raising	Speaking assessment	10 minutes
An Introduction to Consonants	Board	International Phonetic Alphabet	To have students notice and produce the voiced and voiceless TH, and practice producing sounds	15 minutes

Day 7

To begin day 7, students will forms groups and review the two TH phonemes. Next, the teacher will use technology to show how the tongue and structures of the mouth interact to create both versions of TH. Students will listen to this one-way speech and restate it to their partner. One of the issues mentioned above was one-way and two-way listening. An activity like this demonstrates this point. Students who can successfully pronounce both forms will be asked to share their thoughts with the class. By sharing information, a student may notice gaps and holes. Following the video, students will be asked to brainstorm as many words as possible that include TH in front, medial, and end position (e.g., *th*istle, bir*th*day, and grow*th*). This type of activity connects vocabulary and pronunciation with an interactive element. Groups will then approach the board and write examples. Finally, the teacher will disperse handout #3 (see appendix #6); this is a minimal pair activity. Students may notice that they have difficulties distinguishing different phonemes. For homework, tell students to complete a pronunciation homework assignment using D2l or Moodle.

Day 7 Overview

Activity	*Materials*	*Focus*	*Objective*	*Time*
Review of Consonants	Board	Pronunciation Practice	Review of both TH phonemes	10 minutes
Video Discussion	Computer	One-way and two-way listening	To restate the main points of the video with a partner	15 minutes
Brainstorm		Vocabulary	To think of words that begin, include, and end with TH	15 minutes
Listening Practice	TH handout (see appendix #6).	Noticing	To have students correctly identify phonemes (TH)	10 minutes

Day 8

To begin, there is a review of the two TH phonemes in addition to speech act examples. Students will discuss how they make suggestions in their L1. The teacher will write on the board example questions and conversation starters like, *what should we talk about? Well, we could always…, Have you considered saying…* Then, students will give an impromptu presentation in front of the class about their classmate's culture. As discussed above, it is important for each day to include some kind of communicative interactive practice that is meaningful. Pragmatic development is included in each day's lesson. Learning about another student's cultural background (something the student may not know) can promote speaking because student's have a strong background knowledge of the subject. After, the teacher will introduce some of the vowels. That teacher will make an informed choice about which vowels to teach based on the students' needs. Different vowels correspond with handout #4 (see appendix #7). The teacher clarifies unknown words. For homework, students will write 10 sentences that include a word from each section. This homework will help students focus on vocabulary development and letter-to-sound correspondence.

Day 8 Overview

Activity	*Materials*	*Focus*	*Objective*	*Time*
TH Review	Board	Vocabulary	To review words with TH	5 minutes
Speech Acts Review		Discussion	To have students discuss about culture differences and speech acts	5 minutes
Impromptu presentations		Speaking One-way listening	To have students share facts about their partner and the ways he/she does suggestions in the L1	35 minutes
Vowel Sound and Spelling Worksheet	Appendix #7	Vocabulary	To help students connection pronunciation with vocabulary	5 minutes

Day 9

To begin, the teacher writes these forms on the board; they are all examples of suggestions.

If I were you, I would…

I think you should…

What do you think should be done?

What should we do?

Well you could always….

Wouldn't it be possible to…

Have you considered…

Adapted from Gołębiowska, A. (1990, pp. 144-151).

These forms are introduced to make the following communicative activity easier. The activity is entitled *the problem* (see Appendix #8). Groups of four students are presented a dialogue. As a group they need to suggest ways to solve *the problem*. When the activity is done, the teacher will instigate a discussion of it. After, the teacher will review vowel sounds and key words that include those phonemes. It is important to repeat forms and examples because students do not acquire a form on that forms first mention. For homework, students must create a narrative with two characters who have a problem. The goal of this homework is to have students use some of the suggestions presented earlier in the lesson.

Day 9 Overview

Activity	*Materials*	*Focus*	*Objective*	*Time*
Suggestions	Board	Suggestions	To provide suggestions and their forms	10 minutes
Activity: The Problem	Appendix #8	Speaking and Listening	To have students use the presented suggestion forms	20 minutes
Discussion		Two-way Discussion	To help students reflect on the previous activity	10 minutes
Review of Vowels	Board	Critical Thinking	To have students think and write down words that include the vowels previously covered	10 minutes

Day 10

The conclusion of this 10-lesson unit plan begins with a DCT as a prompt for a role-play and the teacher asks students how they would respond to it. Next, there is a discussion. Next, the teacher presents the concept of how different factors such as power, setting, and ones' relationship to the speaker changes language. He asks students how they change their speech to different listeners. Next, the teacher will show a funny clip of communication breakdown (Seinfeld/Friends). The class finishes with a review of consonant, vowels, and speech acts.

Day 10 Overview

Activity	*Materials*	*Focus*	*Objective*	*Time*
DCT/Role-play		Critical Thinking	To see how students respond to a problem	15 minutes
Lecture: sociopragmatic competence		One-way speech	To show students that variables such as power and setting change language use	15 minutes
Video: misunderstanding	Video of Seinfeld or Friends	One-way listening	To show students misunderstandings in language use	10 minutes
Discussion	Board	Critical Thinking	What did the character mean?	10 minutes

The above lesson unit plan integrated teaching pragmatics in a listening skills course, and the goal of that plan is to help students improve their communicative competence through deliberate practice and communicative activities. Teachers must use their classroom time to decide what forms to present. In addition, they must decide how students will practice these forms. According to the SLA, listening, and pragmatics theory, an evidence-based approach to develop listening and pragmatic knowledge would include the following principles: (a) deliberate practice, (b) opportunities for noticing forms/gaps/holes, (c) meaningful interaction, (d) a focus on both one-way and two-way communication, (e) vocabulary development, (f) sound discrimination and finally, (g) attention to speech acts and their forms and uses. The above lesson plan includes all of these elements.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Day 1

Needs Assessment

Name ______________________

Job _________________________ How long? ____________________

I *speak* English at work YES NO
I *speak* English at school YES NO
I speak with ____

I speak about ____

How much on average? _________________________________

Do you use the telephone in English? _______________________

I listen to music in English YES NO

I watch movies in English YES NO

I watch television in English YES NO

I watch videos in English YES NO

How much time do you listen to English (outside of class)? ______________________

I am a strong listener (circle one).

Strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

If I do not understand everything I hear, I become upset or anxious (circle one).

Strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

When I watch a movie (in English) I understand __________%.

I can follow a discussion (in English) and ask questions (circle one.)

Strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

Generally, I can guess the topic of a conversation. YES NO

Generally, I can listen for details in a conversation. YES NO

Generally, I can listen for the implications of a message. YES NO

I understand lectures in school (circle one.)

Strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

On a scale of 1-5 (1 = least useful; 5 =most useful,) how useful would work on each of the following items be for you?

Grammar ______ Speaking _______
Vocabulary ______ Listening _____
Pronunciation _______ Listening Strategies _______

Rank the following tasks in terms of their importance to you. (1 = the most important, 2 = the second most important, 0 = not important)

Greeting Customers and other visitors at work _____

Making telephone orders at work ________

Responding to questions _______

Networking ________

Taking clients out to lunch ______

Making new friends in English _____

Interviewing job applicants ________

Being interviewed for a new job ______

Giving a presentation ________

Other (be specific:)

____

Adapted from Long, M. (2015, pp. 105-106).

Appendix #2: A New Identity

Group 1

You are an artist attending college, and the school is five miles away (too far to walk). You take the bus every day. You have a job in a coffee shop located by the school. After work, you like to go home and play loud music. You are very messy because you spend all of your time cleaning at work and at school. You make $100 a month but one-room apartments by the school cost $350. You like to be left alone and need a separate bedroom because that is where you complete your paintings.

Group 2

You own a nice car, have a dog, and own too much stuff. You want to share a bedroom with someone else in order to save space. You work at a very loud factory all day. When you get home, you like to enjoy the peace and quiet. You want a roommate who likes to talk and have fun. You make $300 a month but spend some a lot of money on restaurants.

Group 3

You have just moved from a different country. You are looking for a place to stay but do not have a job. You have $0. You are friendly and have many great skills. You can speak English really well but your spelling and reading skills are not good. You do not own many items except for clothes and a bicycle.

Group 4

You are a businessman/businesswoman. Sometimes you are home for days at a time; sometimes you are gone for days at a time. You make $800 a month. You need a clean apartment because you like to invite potential guests over.

Appendix #3: Interest Sheets

Roommate 1

You like sports (You have a lot of energy).

You love crowds and loud noises.

You like to be outside.

You like stupid action movies.

You dislike books.

You dislike fancy dinners.

You like to meet new people.

You have much money.

Roommate 2

You like books and libraries.

You like quiet places.

You are overweight (not energetic).

You are shy.

You like going to fancy places (the opera house, the theater).

You like to make new friends.

You do not have much money.

Appendix #4: Pronunciation

Name: __________________

Student Handout #1

Vowels

Examples: rob live hood far

Underline the vowel sounds in these words

Call learn pay toad

Does your language have the same vowel sounds?

Example words: _______________________________________

Consonants

Examples: mouse top work that

Underline the consonant sounds in these words

Shoe job hood believe

Does your language have the same consonant sounds?

Example words: ____

Consonant Clusters

Examples: black drop straight quest

Underline the consonant clusters in these words:

Space prayer crime strength

Does your language have the same consonant sounds?

Example words: ____

Syllables

Examples: mad (1 syllable) hammer (2) amazing (3) watermelon (4)

How many syllables do these words have?

community five actor furious

54. Does your language have the same number of syllables?

Example words: ____

Word Stress

Examples: traffic terrible tomorrow conversation

Underline the stressed syllable in these words:

Banana teacher engineer alone chemistry

Does your language have words with the same stress pattern?

Example words: ____

Intonation

down, up down, down up, up (example word: yes)

Does your language use words with these four tones?

Adapted from Hewings, H. (2004, pp. 24-25).

Appendix #5: Pronunciation

Name: ___________________________

Student Handout #2.

How do you feel about your English Pronunciation?
Circle your answer: 1 = low/poor 5= high/great
Vowels 1 2 3 4 5
Consonants 1 2 3 4 5
Consonant Clusters (bl, th) 1 2 3 4 5
Word Stress (banAna, teaCHER) 1 2 3 4 5
Intonation 1 2 3 4 5

What problems do you have with:
Vowels ____
Consonants ____
Consonant Clusters ____
Word Stress ____
Intonation ____

How important is good English Pronunciation…
When you talk to L1 speakers? 1 2 3 4 5
When you talk to L2 speakers? 1 2 3 4 5
When you speak English, what person do you want to sound like?
Why?____
____

Adapted from Hewings, M. (2004, p. 26).

Appendix #6: TH distinctions

Name: ____

Student Handout #3

Did the teacher say A or B? (Circle the word you hear)

A	**B**
Thin	tin
Three	tree
Through	true
Thank	tank

A	**B**
Thank	sank
Think	sink
Thaw	saw
Thick	sick

A	**B**
Than	Dan
They	day
Their	dare
Then	den

Adapted from Hewings, M. (2004, p. 69).

Appendix #7: Phonemes in Words

Student Handout #4

Vowel combinations in text with their corresponding vowel and dipthong phonemes

In text: **AI** example word: br<u>ai</u>n
IPA symbol /eI/ chain, drain, tail, rain
Occasional pronunciation: /I/ captain, mountain

In text: **AU** example word: astron<u>au</u>t

IPA symbol /ɔ/ author, autograph, autumn, exhaust pipe, laundry, saucepan, saucer,
Occasional pronunciation: /ɑ/ cauliflower, sausage

In text: **EA** example word: t<u>ea</u>
IPA symbol /i/ beach, beans, eagle, east
/e/ bread, dead, head, feather,
Occasional pronunciation /eɪ/ steak, break

In text: **IE** example word: t<u>ie</u>
IPA symbol /aɪ/ pie, flies,
Occasional pronunciation /i/briefcase, priest, shield, babies, batteries, berries, cookies

In text: **UE** example word: gl<u>ue</u>
IPA symbol /u/ tissue

In text: **UI** example word: fr<u>ui</u>t
IPA symbol /u/ suit, juice, bruise
Occasional pronunciation: /I/ biscuit, building, guitar

Adapted from Hewings, M. (2004, p. 172).

Appendix #8: The Problem

Name: ____________________________

The Problem

Mrs. Smith's husband has recently passed away (died). She thinks that working in a different country will make her feel better because everything in her apartment makes her sad. She just received a job in Europe. Now she has to figure out what to do with her apartment. She asks her children (you) for suggestions.

Mrs. Smith. You are very sad about your husband and do not know what to do with your apartment. You have many questions for your children and want suggestions. When presented new information, you become inconsistent in your decisions. You begin the conversation.

Mark. You think your mother could make money renting out the apartment. Since the apartment is in a good neighborhood, you believe that getting money is the best solution. You will collect any money while your mother is away.

Amy. You have strong feelings about the apartment you grew up in. You believe that apartment should stay in the family. You would be happy to live here. Also, you feel that it is wrong to exploit this sad situation for money.

Bill. You have your own family to worry about. You would be happy to visit your mother's apartment from time to time in order to water plants and take care of her dog. You like to help others but do not like problems and conflict.

Points to consider:

1) Should the apartment be rented?

2) Who could watch the apartment?

3) If the apartment were rented, would a stranger be ok?

4) Do you have any alternative suggestions?

Example Suggestions:

If I were you, I would…

I think you should…

What do you think should be done?

What should we do?

Well you could always….

Wouldn’t it be possible to…

Have you considered…

Adapted from Gołębiowska, A. (1990, pp. 76-77).

References

Alcon, E. (2001). Developing pragmatic competence in the academic setting: The case of suggestions in NS/NNS advising sessions. *Methodology and New Technologies in Languages for Specific Purposes,* 79-86, Castellon, Servei de Publications de la universitat Jaume,

Anderson, J. (1995). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*, 4th Ed. New York: Freeman.

Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Baars, B. (1997). *In the theater of consciousness: The workspace of the mind.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Banerjee, J. & Carrell, P. (1988). Tuck in your shirt, you squid: Suggestions in ESL. *Language Learning 38*, 313-364.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B.S. (1990). Congruence in native and nonnative conversations: Status balance in the academic advising session. *Language Learning, 40*, 467-501.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1993). Learning the rules of academic talk: A longitudinal study of pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *15*, 279-304.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2013). Developing L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning, 63*(1), 68–86.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, *5*(3), 196-213.

Bodie, G. D., Worthington, D.L., Imhof, M., & Cooper, L. (2008). What would a unified field of listening look like? A proposal linking past perspectives and future endeavors. *International Journal of Listening, 22*, 103-122.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (1999). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brown, H.D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Burleson, Brant. (2011). A constructivist approach to listening. *International Journal of Listening, 25,* 27-46.

Cintrón-Valentín, M. & Ellis, N. C. (2016). Salience in second language acquisition: Physical form, learner attention, and instructional focus. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7:1284.* Retrieved March 28, 2017 from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5002427/

Codina-Espurz, V. (2013). The role of proficiency in the production of refusals in English in an instructed context. *Utrecht Studies in Language and Communication, 25,* 121-145.

Cohen, A.D. (2005). Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 2*(3), 275-301.

Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (2nd Ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cutting, J. (2015). *Pragmatics: A resource book for students.* New York: Routledge.

Dippold, D. (2008). Reframing one's experience: Face, identity and roles in L2 argumentative discourse. In M. Putz and J. Aertselaer (Eds.). *Developing contrastive pragmatics: Interlanguage and cross-cultural perspectives, (*pp.131-154). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ericsson, K. A., Prietula, M. J., & Cokely, E. T. (2007). The making of an expert. *Harvard Business Review.* Retrieved April 18, 2017 from http://www.actionkarateonline.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/HarvardBusinessReview_DeliberatePractice.pdf

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2007). Pragmatic development in the Spanish as a FL classroom: A cross-sectional study of learner requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *4*(2), 253–287.

Félix-Basdefer, J. C. (2008). Teaching Spanish pragmatics in the classroom: Explicit instruction of mitigation. *Hispania, 91*(2), 477-492.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2010). Data collection methods in speech act performance: DCTs, role plays, and verbal reports. In E. Uso Juan and A. Martinez-Flor (eds), *Speech act performance: Theoretical, Empirical, and methodological issues* (pp. 41-56). John Benjamins Publishing.

Fordyce, K. (2014). The differential effects of explicit and implicit instruction on EFL learners use of epistemic stance. *Applied Linguistics, 34,* 6-28.

Goh, C. (2000). A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems. *System*, *28,* 55-75.

Goh, C. (2014). Second language listening comprehension: Process and pedagogy. In M.Celce-Murcia, D.M. Brinton, & M.A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp.72-90). Boston: National Geographic Learning.

Golato, A. (2003). Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics*, *24,* 90-121.

Gołębiowska, A. (1990). *Getting students to talk.* Cambridge: Prentice Hall International.

Halenko, N., & Jones, C. (2011). Teaching pragmatic awareness of spoken requests to Chinese EAP learners in the UK: Is explicit instruction effective? *System*, *39,* 240-250.

Halupka-Resetar, S. (2014). Request modification in the pragmatic production of intermediate ESP learners. *E.S.P. Today*, *2*(1), 29-47.

Hewings, M. (2004). *Pronunciation practice activities: A resource book for teaching English pronunciation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, T. (1997). *The development of pragmatic competence in an EFL context.* Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Temple University, Tokyo.

Hudson, T. (2001). Indicators for pragmatic instruction: Some quantitative tools. In K.R. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 283-300). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In Pride, J. B., & Holmes, J. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, (pp.269-293). Baltimore, USA: Penguin Education, Penguin Books Ltd.

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

Izumi, S. (2013). Noticing and L2 development: Theoretical, empirical, and pedagogical issues. In J.M. Bergsleithner, S., N. Frota, & J.K. Yoshioka (Eds.), *Noticing and second language acquisition: Studies in honor of Richard Schmidt* (pp. 25-38). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Jeon, E.H., & Kaya, T. (2006). Effects of L2 instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development: A meta-analysis. In. J.M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds). *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 165-211). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kerswill, P. & Williams, A. (2002). Salience as an explanatory factor in language change: Evidence from dialect levelling in urban England. In: Jones, M.C., Esch, E. (Eds.), *Lang Chang Interplay Internal, Extern Extra-linguistic Factors*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, pp. 81-110

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* New York: Pergamon Press Inc.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* New York: Longman.

Leeser, M. (2004). Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. *Language Teaching Research, 8,* 55-81.

Legge, D. (1986). Skills. In R. Harre & R. Lamb (Eds.), *The dictionary of developmental and educational psychology* (pp. 225-228). Oxford: Blackwell.

Liu, D. (2015). A critical review of Krashen's input hypothesis: Three major arguments. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, *4*(4). Retrieved from http://jehdnet.com/journals/jehd/Vol_4_No_4_December_2015/16.pdf

LoCastro, V. (2003). *An introduction to pragmatics: Social action for language teachers.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Long, M. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation in the second language classroom. Retrieved March 28, 2017 from https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/38598/1/Long%20(1983)_WP2(1).pdf

Long, M. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching.* Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

MacLeod, B. (2015). A critical evaluation of two approaches to defining perceptual salience. Retrieved March 28, 2017 from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2215039015300023

Matthews, J., & Cheng, J. (2015). Recognition of high frequency words from speech as a predictor of L2 listening comprehension. *System, 52.*

Marmaridou, S. (1990). Contrastive analysis at discourse level and the communicative teaching of languages. In J. Fisiak (ed), *Further insights into contrastive analysis* (pp. 561-573). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Marti, L. (2005). Indirectness and politeness in Turkish-German bilingual and Turkish monolingual requests. *Science Direct. Journal of Pragmatics* Retrieved April 6, 2017 from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378216605001438?via%3Dihub

McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second language learning.* London: Edward Arnold.

Milton, J. (2009). *Measuring second language vocabulary acquisition.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Nation, P. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *63*, 59–82.

Nation, P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching EFL/ESL listening and speaking.* London: Routledge.

Newell, A., & Rosenbloom, P.S. (1981). Mechanisms of skill acquisition and the law of practice. In J.R. Anderson (Ed.), *Cognitive skills and their acquisition* (p. 1-55). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Nguyen, H. T. M., & Hudson, P. (2012). Peer group mentoring: Preservice EFL teachers' collaborations for enhancing practices. In A. Honigsfeld & M. G. Dove (Eds.), *CoTeaching and Other Collaborative Practices in The EFL/ESL Classroom:Rationale*, *Research*, *Reflections*, *And Recommendations* (pp. 231-241). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Paulston, C. (1974). Linguistic and communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly. 8*(4) Retrieved March 28, 2017 from https://www.hpu.edu/Libraries_HPU/Files/TESOL/TQD/VOL_08_4.pdf

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language.* Longman, London.

Rezvani, E., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Vahid Dastjerdi, H. (2014). Investigating the effects of explicit and implicit instruction on Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic development: Speech act of requests and suggestions in focus. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning.* In press.

Richards, J. (1983). Listening comprehension: Approach, design, procedure. *TESOL Quarterly, 17,* 219-240.

Roever, C. (2005). Difficulty and practicality in tests of interlanguage pragmatics. In D. Boxer & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Studying speaking to inform second language learning* (pp. 283-301). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Rose, K. R., & Kasper G. (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Searle, J. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.

Schauer, G. A. (2009). Getting better in getting what you want: Language learners' pragmatic development in requests during study abroad sojourns. In M. Puetz &

J. Aertselaer (Eds.), *Developing contrastive pragmatics: Interlanguage and cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 399–426). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (p. 1-63). Honolulu: Hawai'i: National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P.J. Robinson (ed.), Cognition and second language instruction. Cambridge, U.K., 3–32.

Schmidt, R. (2010). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning. Retrieved March 28th, 2017 from http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/PDFs/SCHMIDT%20Attention,%20awareness,%20and%20individual%20differences.pdf

Solt, S., Pugach, Y., Klein, E. C., Adams, K., Stoyneshka, I. & Rose, T. (2003). L2 perception and production of the English regular past: Evidence of phonological effects. Retrieved March 28, 2017 from http://www.zas.gwz-berlin.de/fileadmin/mitarbeiter/solt/bu_paper.pdf

Staehr, L. (2009). Vocabulary knowledge and advanced listening comprehension in English as a foreign language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 31*, 577–607

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition (pp. 235-253)*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *16,* 371-391.

Takahashi, S. (2010). The effect of pragmatic instruction on speech act performance. In A. Martínez-Flor & E. Usó-Juan (Eds.), *Speech Act Performance. Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues* (pp. 127-144). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, *4,* 20-39.

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints and apologies.* Berlin, New York: Mouton Gruyter.

Underwood, M. (1989). *Teaching listening.* New York: Longman Inc.

Ur, P. (1984). *Teaching listening comprehension.* Cambridge, the Edinburgh Building: Cambridge University Press.

Uso-Juan, E., & Martinez-Flor, A. (2008). Teaching learners to appropriately mitigate requests. *Babel-Afial, 17,* 253-270.

Wang, Y. & Treffers, I. (2017). Explaining listening comprehension among L2 learners of English: The contribution of general language proficiency, vocabulary knowledge and metacognitive awareness. *System*, *65*, 139-150.

Wilson, W.J., Jackson, A., Pender, A., Rose, C., & Wilson, J. (2011). *The CHAPS, SIFTER, and TAPS-R as predictors of (C)AP skills and (C)APD. J Speech Lang Hear Res*, *54*(1), 278 – 291.

VanPatten, B. (2003). *From input to output: A teacher's guide to second language acquisition.* New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.