Instructional Effects on Acquisition of Chinese Pragmatics

教学对汉语语用习得的效果

Feng Xiao[1]

Pomona College

Abstract: This article reviews data-driven research on instructed pragmatics with a focus on the seven studies that examined Chinese pragmatic instruction. Findings suggest that an effective method of teaching Chinese pragmatics needs to include direct metapragmatic instruction and adequate follow-up practice. The follow-up practice may increase the degree of task complexity to stimulate sufficient classroom discourses (e.g. peer-to-peer, teacher-learner), in order to consolidate learned pragmatic features. Instructors also need to make learning tasks adaptive to learner-related factors such as foreign language aptitude and proficiency. One good way to improve learning tasks is to do action research on teaching methods recommended by previous studies. Finally, instructors may also think about teaching pragmatics beyond pragmatic features at the utterance level (e.g. speech acts) to promote learning pragmatics in interaction.

摘要：本文综述语用教学类的实证研究并重点分析中文语用教学研究的七篇英文文章。结果显示中文语用教学需要包括直接的元语用知识教学和充分的后续练习。后续练习可以通过增强学习任务的复杂型来促进课堂交流（比如学生之间和学生与老师之间的交流），从而巩固已经学过的语用功能。教师应当根据学习者的个体差异（比如外援学习能力和外语熟悉程度）来调整学习任务。一个完善学习任务的好方法就是做基于已有实证研究结果的课堂行动研究。最后，教师也应考虑教授单句水平以外的语用功能来促进学生学习交际中的语用功能。

---

[1] Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Feng Xiao (email: feng.xiao@pomona.edu) at Pomona College.

Introduction

In Chinese learning, it is not uncommon for learners to have moments when they fully understand the semantic meaning of an utterance but have problem figuring out its actual function in context. For example, the utterance *我明天不见得有时间* (I will not necessarily have time tomorrow.) contains no vocabulary or grammar beyond the second year's Chinese textbook at college so its semantic meaning can be easily understood by learners who know the included words and grammar but few of them may understand that this utterance can be used as an indirect refusal to an invitation such as *我们明天一起吃午饭怎么样* (How about eating lunch together tomorrow?). On the other hand, Chinese instructors often provide cultural and social information to introduce new words and sentence structures. For example, *您贵姓* (What is your honorable surname?) is the norm to ask for someone's surname in a formal situation (e.g. at a business banquet), and *您* (the polite form of you) is often used to show respect to people of higher social status. All these examples are in the scope of pragmatics, which addresses culturally and socially appropriate language use in context.

From a cross-cultural perspective, Thomas (1983) defines two types of pragmatic failure: pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic failure. Pragmalinguisitic failure refers to inaccurate use of linguistic forms to perform a pragmatic function. For example, at a business banquet, one uses *你叫什么名字* (What is your name?, informal) instead of *您贵姓* (What is your honorable surname?, formal) to get to know a new friend. Sociopragmatic failure refers to inappropriate use of linguistic forms in context such as using a direct refusal to an invitation from a person of higher social status where an indirect refusal is the norm. Therefore, in order to communicate appropriately in a second language (L2), learners need to develop their pragmatic competence – the competence to use linguistic forms appropriately in context (e.g. Kasper & Rose, 2002;

Taguchi & Roever, 2017). Since 1980s, a growing attention has been paid to pragmatic competence alongside the wide acceptance of communicate competence in L2 learning and teaching. Empirical studies have shown that pragmatic competence does not develop hand in hand with L2 proficiency (for a review see Bardovi-Harlig, 1999, 2013; 2017; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Taguchi & Roever, 2017; Xiao, 2015). In other words, learners' advancedness in proficiency may not naturally lead to advancedness in pragmatics, calling for the need of pragmatic instruction. This article takes a systematic evidence-based approach to review existing empirical studies to offer suggestions on effective instruction on Chinese pragmatics. Because only seven previous instructional studies focused on L2 Chinese pragmatics (Li, 2012, 2013, 2017; Li & Taguchi, 2014; Yang, 2014, 2016; Yang & Zhu, 2016), and they targeted a limited number of pragmatic features (e.g. request, gratitude, greeting, and compliment), this article extends the review scope to research on other L2s, in order to situate L2 Chinese pragmatics studies in the broader context of instructed second language acquisition and find pedagogical implications that are generalizable to L2 Chinese pragmatic instruction.

Theoretical Construct of Pragmatic Competence

The theoretical construct of pragmatic competence is often traced back to Hymes's (1972) notion of communicative competence, where grammaticality and acceptability are considered equally important (p. 63). According to Hymes, grammaticality refers to rules of grammar whereas acceptability entails rules of performance (language use in situations). Following Hymes, Thomas (1983) distinguishes between pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics, with the former referring to forms that can perform pragmatic functions and latter referring to appropriate use of these forms in context. Concomitantly, the bifurcated view of pragmatic competence has been reflected in all models of communicative competence (e.g. Canale & Swan, 1980; Canale, 1983;

Bachman & Palmer, 1996, 2010). In Bachman and Palmer's articulation (2010), language knowledge consists of organizational knowledge and pragmatic knowledge. The former includes the knowledge to organize sentences and texts (i.e. grammatical and textual knowledge), whereas the latter encompasses functional and sociolinguistic knowledge of language use. Functional knowledge represents the knowledge of linguistic forms that can perform pragmatic functions while sociolinguistic knowledge refers to the knowledge of appropriateness of using linguistic forms in context. These two core pragmatic components suggest two main learning objectives of pragmatic instruction: linguistic forms for different pragmatic functions and sociopragmatic norms embedded in the use of these linguistic forms.

Learning Objectives

Adopting the concept of communicative competence, existing instructional studies have targeted a variety of pragmatic features such as speech acts (e.g. Alcón-Soler, 2015; Eslami, Mirzaei & Dini, 2015; Hernández & Boero,2018; Kim & Taguchi, 2015; Kondo, 2008; Martínez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005; Nguyen et al, 2017; Rose & Ng, 2001; Takimoto, 2006; Tateyama, 2001), pragmatic routines (e.g. Bardovi-Halrig, Mossman, & Vellenga, 2015), functional words such as address forms (e.g. Lyster, 1994; Van Compernolle, 2011), interactional markers (e.g. Iwai, 2013), reactive tokens (e.g. Utashiro & Kawai, 2009), hedging devices (e.g. Wishnoff, 2000), hearsay expressions (e.g. Narita, 2012), speech style (e.g. Ishida, 2009), and epistemic stance (e.g. Fordyce, 2014), and conversational implicatures (e.g. Bouton, 1994: Kubota, 1995). Among the seven previous instructional studies on Chinese pragmatics, four focused on request (Li, 2012, 2013,2017; Li & Taguchi, 2014), three on gratitude (Yang, 2014, 2016), and one on multiple speech acts (Yang & Zhu, 2016), following suit of the trend in instructed pragmatics research on. The advantage of targeting speech acts is that several types of speech acts (e.g.,

request, refusal, apology) have been well examined with L2 data since 1980s (e.g. Wildner-Basset, 1984), and most researchers use the coding scheme developed from the cross-cultural study speech act realization patterns (CCSARP; Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989). Therefore, cross-cultural comparisons can be done among studies that targeted the same speech act and adopted the CCSARP coding scheme, which can be used as learning objectives in pragmatic teaching. In teaching Chinese speech acts, instructors can ask learners to compare speech acts (e.g. request and apology) in Chinese and their first language so that learners can notice the cross-cultural differences in speech act realization and improve their performance of speech acts in Chinese through peer-peer interactions such as role-plays.

However, traditional speech act theory only deals with pragmatic functions at the utterance level but not those at the discourse level (for a review of speech act theory see Austin, 1962; Searle, 1976; Levinson, 2017). For example, in an invitational conversation, the speaker often insists on the invitation if it is refused, which is considered polite in Chinese (Mao, 1994). In other words, an invitational discourse in Chinese may include exchange of multiple turns rather than one turn pair (invitation-acceptance/refusal). This example resonates with the emergent interest in pragmatics in interaction (for a review see Roever, 2009; Roever & Kasper, 2018; Taguchi & Roever, 2017; Xiao, 2018), which accentuates the importance of pragmatic adaptation in the sequential context of interaction. Despite the growing attention to pragmatics in interaction, no instructional studies have focused on pragmatics in interaction regardless of L2s but two longitudinal studies may shed light on teaching Chinese pragmatics in interaction. Su and Ren (2017) used a three-scenario role-play to examine differences in request making across three proficiency groups: Level 2, 3 & 4 (proficiency determined by a computerized placement test). Data were coded for request strategies, internal modifications, supportive moves, and

sequential placement of supportive moves in pre-, post- and insert expansions. Findings showed

no difference in the choice of request strategies across proficiency levels and all the learners used

fewer internal modifications than the Chinese native speakers (baseline). At the discourse level,

the number of supportive moves in expansions increased from L2 to L3, and to L4, indicating a

positive proficiency effect.

Xiao (2017), on the hand, analyzed video-recordings of semi-structured interviews to

reveal changes of L2 use of Chinese mitigations over eight weeks of study abroad (SA). Findings

showed that at the beginning of SA, the two advanced-level Chinese learners (proficiency

determined by course level) used the *dànshì* /*kěshì* ('but') clause but did not use the four

mitigations identified as common sentential mitigation devices in Chinese corpora (reduplication

of verbs, verb+*yīxià*, the sentence final particle *ba,* and *a*/*ya*). At the end of SA, they started

using the sentence final particle *ba,* but not the other three common sentential mitigation forms.

At the discourse level, the learners used single pre- and post-expansions at the beginning of SA;

eight weeks later, they started using multiple pre- and post-expansions. The associated stimulated

recalls revealed that the learners' use of mitigation in both the pre- and post-interviews was

based on their face (pubic self-image) consideration in interaction. Despite the differences in

target pragmatic features, these two studies both engaged their learners in interactions with a

native speaker to elicit negotiation of pragmatic moves in the sequential context, implying that a

carefully designed oral task such a role-play and a semi-structured interview can be used to

teaching Chinese pragmatics in interaction.

In summary, in order to teaching pragmatic competence in L2 Chinese, instructors may

select learning objectives (e.g. speech acts) at both the utterance and discourse levels because

realization of a pragmatic function is not predetermined but negotiated between interlocutors. To

this end, oral tasks that require exchange of multiple turns (e.g. role-play and semi-structured

interview) may be suitable for teaching pragmatics in interaction.

Effects of Pragmatic Instructions

In addition to learning objectives, teaching methods are critical to the success of pragmatic

instruction. This section reviews studies with different teaching methods to discuss which

aspects of pragmatic competence can be advanced by what types of instruction.

Consciousness Raising Instruction

A group of instructional pragmatics studies examined the effect of consciousness raising

instruction (e.g. Eslami et al., 2015; Ishida, 2009; Fukuya & Zhang, 2002; Kondo, 2008; Narita,

2012; Yang, 2016; Yang & Zhu, 2016). Consciousness raising instruction is developed from the

noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990, 2010), which claims that noticing the difference in language

use is the initial stage of L2 acquisition. Two studies in this camp targeted L2 Chinese. Yang and

Zhu (2016) examined effects of consciousness raising instruction on production of multiple

speech acts (e.g. greeting, gratitude, request, and compliment) among 20 beginning-level

Chinese learners (proficiency determined by course level). Their instruction included a spate of

questions that elicited cross-cultural differences in speech act production between Chinese and

English. These questions were designed to draw the learners' attention to sociopragmatic norms

reflected in the target speech acts. The learners were evenly divided into two groups. Both

groups received the same pragmatic instruction but one before a regular lesson unit and the other

after it. After five sessions of pragmatic instruction over the semester, all learners took an oral

interview that elicited production of the target speech acts. Findings showed that all learners

were able to produce the target speech acts, and there was no between-group difference. Yang

(2016), on the other hand, used a pre-post design to examine the effect of a pragmatic instruction

website on the awareness of sociopragmatic norms coded in Chinese expressions of gratitude among 36 learners with the beginning-level and intermediate-level of proficiency. The website (written mainly in English) explicitly explained appropriateness of target expressions in different situations and provided prompts for the learners to analyze Chinese-English differences on gratitude expressing. In addition, the learners wrote weekly journals to reflect on their learning from the website for five weeks. The outcome measure was a metapragmatic assessment task which asked the learners to evaluate appropriateness of the target gratitude utterance in eight scenarios. Two-way ANOVA analyses showed a positive effect of the website-delivered pragmatic instruction. The learners with higher proficiency benefited more from the website than their lower-proficiency counterparts.

The positive effect of consciousness raising instruction has also been reported in studies on other L2s. Fukuya and Zhang (2002) used a pre-post design to examine the effect of recast on request making in L2 English. Different from direct error correction, recast only reformulates a learner's utterance with correct linguistic forms. In this study, recast was used in a role-play to indirectly raise the learners' awareness of their inappropriate production of requests. Their findings revealed gains in both accuracy and appropriateness of request production on the post discourse completion task (DCT). Similar findings were reported by Narita's (2012) study on L2 Japanese hearsay markers, Ishida's (2009) study on Japanese speech styles, and Kondo's (2008) study on English refusals. The findings of these studies suggest a positive effect of consciousness raising instruction on L2 pragmatics.

Different from the studies reviewed above, Eslami et al. (2015) compared explicit and implicit consciousness-raising instruction on L2 English request production through email exchanges with native speakers. In this study, the explicit instruction provided metapragmatic

feedback after consciousness-raising instruction on request forms and strategies, which followed by production practice and performance discussion, while with all other components alike, the implicit instruction provided input enhancement (e.g., bold-faced request forms) and guided reflections on cross-linguistic differences in request making but no metapragmatic feedback. According to a DCT and email responses, they found an advantage of the explicit awareness raising instruction over the implicit one, suggesting that if the distinction between explicit and implicit pragmatic instruction is whether or not having metapragmatic information, the explicit instruction is more effective. In fact, the comparison between explicit and implicit instruction has been examined extensively in L2 pragmatics. Many of these studies had consciousness raising instruction in all experimental conditions but only included metapragmatic information in the explicit instructional conditions. The comparison between explicit and implicit instruction is important because different pragmatic features may require different types of instruction. In other words, the multifaceted nature of pragmatic competence requires manipulation of different learning conditions so that different instructional methods could be implemented efficiently in learning different pragmatic features.

Explicit and Implicit Instruction

Originated in cognitive psychology, the distinction between explicit and implicit learning is a long stand interest in the field of second language acquisition, which taps into the relationship between consciousness and learning (for a review see R. Ellis, 2005, 2009; Rebuschat, 2013). According to R. Ellis (2009), explicit learning entails conscious acquisition of linguistic knowledge while implicit learning refers to unconscious acquisition of linguistic knowledge (often without metalinguistic awareness). However, explicit and implicit instruction is different from explicit and implicit learning. Explicit instruction refers to instruction that directly draws

learners' attention to linguistic rules, which often includes metalinguistic explanation of the

target rules, while implicit instruction refers to indirect instruction that guides learners to infer

rules from enriched input (Ellis, 2009; Norris & Ortega, 2000). In instructional research on L2

pragmatics, explicit instruction often includes direct metapragmatic information while implicit

instruction often includes different types of input but no direct metapragmatic information (e.g.

Bardovi-Harlig, 2015; Jeon & Kaya, 2006; Kasper, 2001; Taguchi, 2015; Xiao, 2018). For

example, Yang (2014) compared the effects of explicit and implicit instruction on the production

of Chinese gratitude among 15 advanced-level learners (proficiency determined by course level).

The learners were evenly divided into explicit, implicit and control groups. The explicit group

received explicit metapragmatic information on gratitude followed by role-play practice, while

the implicit group received examples of expressions of gratitude without explanation on related

metapragmatic information and completed role-play practice. The control group received online

reading exercises with no practice. The outcome measures included a written discourse

completion task (DCT) and a written survey. All learners completed the DCT three times (one

week before, immediately after, and two weeks after the instruction). Findings showed that the

two instructional groups outperformed the control group at the immediate and delayed posttests

but there was no difference between the two instructional groups. As stated by the author, the no

difference between explicit and implicit instruction may be attributed to the small sample size

(five per group) and short time of instruction (30 min). Another possible reason is the quantity

and quality of practice. These other instructional studies on L2 Chinese have investigated this

issue.

Adopting the input processing theory (VanPattern, 2015; VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T.,

1993), Li (2012) compared the effects of different amounts of input-based practice on learning

L2 Chinese requests. Two experimental groups received the same metapragmatic instruction but different amounts of the follow-up input-based practice. The intensive training (IT) group completed a practice on eight request situations while the regular training (RT) group completed a practice on four request situations. The input-based practice was a computerized learning module which had two sections. In section one, the learners judged the degree of imposition of a request situation written in English and chose the most appropriate request form for a dialogue based on the situation. After that, they read and listened to the complete dialogue twice. In section two, they rated appropriateness of four request utterances according to different situations. The outcome measures included a listening appropriateness judgment test (LJT) and an oral DCT. All participants completed the two outcome measures prior to, immediately after, and two weeks after the instruction. The findings showed that the two experimental groups both achieved significant gains in accurate production of target requests but only the IT group outperformed the control group. No group made gains in the production speed (indicated by speech rate and planning time). With regard to the LJT, no group had significant improvement in judgement accuracy. The IT group had significant gain in the judgement speed (indicated by response time) but did not outperform the RT and control group in this regard. These findings suggest that a higher amount of input-based practice generally can lead to more gains in accurate request production and speedy appropriateness judgement but not in production speed or judgement accuracy. In other words, when separate outcome measures are used to assess pragmatic knowledge and processing differently, the intensity of input-based practice may have different impacts on these two aspects of pragmatic competence.

Li & Taguchi (2014) on the other hand, compared effects between computerized input-based and out-based practice on L2 Chinese request making. After a metapragmatic instruction,

the input-based practice required the learners to make judgement on grammaticality and appropriateness of request forms according to different situations and offered explicit feedback. The output-based practice required the learners to first translate English requests into Chinese with target request-making forms and compared their translation with the correct ones, and then, they judged the nature of provided requests (i.e., a minor or a major request) in different situations. Finally, they completed given request utterances in context. The outcome measures included an LJT and an oral DCT. Their findings showed that only the input group achieved significant gains in both accurate and speedy judgement in the LJT from the pretest to the immediate posttest and to the delayed posttest two week later. With regard to request production, both the input and output group achieved significant gains in the oral DCT from the pretest to the immediate posttest and to the delayed posttest two week later. However, the output group had a higher retention rate than the input group. Similar findings were also reported by Li (2013). In a follow-up study, Li (2017) used the same outcome measures and revealed that different aspects of foreign language aptitudes (rote memory, grammatical sensitivity, and working memory) had different effects on Chinese pragmatic instruction. The input group positively correlated with working memory and reduction in LJT response time at both the immediate and delayed posttests, while the output group positively correlated with grammatical sensitivity and gain in speed rate of request production at the immediate posttest but negatively correlated with rot memory and reduction in planning time of request production at the immediate posttest. Taken together, Li and his colleague's studies suggest that instructional effects are susceptible to the effects of practice conditions (e.g. input-based and output-based practice) and foreign language aptitude.

In summary, most of the studies on L2 Chinese pragmatics (except Yang, 2014) suggest a positive effect of explicit instruction. However, this positive effective can be mediated by the quantity and quality of follow-up practice (Li, 2012; 2103; Li & Taguchi, 2014) and learners' personal traits such as foreign language aptitude. Although instructional effects are susceptible to task and learner related factors, these studies suggest an overall preference of explicit on teaching Chinese pragmatics, aligning with instructional studies on L2 English (e.g. Félix-Brasdefer, 2008; Nguyen et al., 2012; Fordyce, 2014).

New Trends in Instructed Pragmatics

Most recent research on instructed pragmatics has gone beyond the traditional paradigm of explicit and implicit instruction, embracing new theoretical frameworks that directly approach classroom activities. From a task-based instruction (TBI) perspective (e.g. Robinson, 2001, 2011), Kim and Taguchi (2015) compared effects of simple and complex tasks on request production in L2 English. After the direct introduction to metapragmatic information on request making, the simple task group was asked to completed a drama script construction task with detailed situational descriptions and matching pictures, while the complex task group was asked to compete the same drama script construction with pictures but no detailed situational description. To this end, the simple task group required little reasoning to figure out the request situation while the complex task group required sufficient reasoning to figure out the details of the situation (pragmalinguistics and sociopragamtics) through peer collaboration. The learners' oral interactions during the tasks were audio-recorded and analyzed on the amount of pragmatic-related episodes (PREs, peer-peer conversations on pragmatics). The outcome measure was a DCT. Their findings showed that both the simple and complex task groups outperformed the control group at the immediate posttest but no difference was found between these two

experimental groups. However, only the complex group maintained its pragmatic gains on the delayed posttest four week later. These findings suggest that although complex tasks can stimulate more PREs, both simple and complex tasks were effective in teaching L2 English requests. Taguchi & Kim (2016), on the other hand, examined effects of different types of PREs (i.e. peer-peer conversations vs. individual think-aloud episodes) on production of L2 English requests. After receiving the same metapragmatic information on request making, the collaborative group completed a drama script construction task with two request scenarios in pairs while the individual group completed the same task without collaboration. Peer-peer PREs from the collaborative group and individual think-aloud PREs were audio-recorded. A DCT was used to measure their learning outcomes. Their findings revealed that the collaborative group generated more PREs and target-like request head acts than the individual group at the immediate posttest but this advantage was not maintained on the delayed posttest four weeks later. With regard to the production of request modifications, there was no between-group difference. The findings of these two studies suggest that different manipulation of learning conditions of production practice (e.g. task complexity and types of PREs) may result in different learning outcomes. These two studies directly examined the effects of learning tasks (e.g. complexity) and collaborative dialogues (PREs) in classroom interaction on pragmatic learning. The advantage of examining classroom-based instructional methods (as opposed to lab-based instructional methods) is to generate the pedagogical implications that could be directly tested in a classroom setting. Although these two studies focused on L2 English, collaborative dialogues and learning tasks are universal across different L2 classrooms. Therefore, manipulation of task complexity and stimulation of PREs may be used to teaching Chinese pragmatics.

Aside from the implementation of TBI in pragmatic instruction, the concept-based instruction (CBI) has also been applied to teaching pragmatics (for a review of sociocultural theory and CBI, see Thorne & Lantolf, 2006). Van Compernolle (2011) reported a case study on using CBI to teach the sociopragmatic meaning of French second-person pronouns *Tu* and *Vous* in interaction. The distinction between these two words is that *Tu* is often used between friends and in informal situations while *Vous* is often used between strangers and in formal situations. Based on this rule of thumb, people can use *Tu* to project a close relationship and *Vous* to project a distant relationship. The indexical meaning of *Tu* and *Vous* was the learning objective in this study. The CBI instruction included three stages. First, a language awareness interview with a tutor (LAI) was given to provide explicit metapragmatic information on the indexical meaning of *Tu* and *Vous*, and then, the participant completed an appropriateness judgment questionnaire (AJQ) where she verbalized her choices of *Tu* and *Vous* and rationale behind her choices in given situations. The final stage included a summary of what learned in pervious stages and two follow-up AJQs. The instruction was delivered through the tutor's mediation in the collaborative dialogues during the tasks. The participants' increased engagement in the expert-learner interaction and verbalization on the rationale for her choices of *Tu* and *Vous* during the tasks revealed that CBI was effective to support the learner's microgenetic development of sociopragmatics. These findings suggest that carefully designed instructor-learner conversations based on CIB can be used to prompt learning of sociopragmatic norms. Although Van Compernolle's study focused on L2 French, CIB may also be useful in teaching Chinese pragmatics because it directly addresses differences in social and cultural concepts, and instructor-learner conversations are common in a L2 Chinese classroom that aims to teach communicative competence.

In summary, the studies reviewed above have investigated two new approaches to pragmatic instruction (e.g. TBI and CBI). The new approaches directly focus on classroom activities such as complexity of learning tasks, individual think-aloud, peer-peer interaction, and expert-learner interaction, suggesting the possibility of using these classroom activities in teaching Chinese pragmatics. If sociopragmatics is the learning objective, instructors may provide individualized intervention in instructor-learner interactions to guide the learner to discover sociopragmatic meaning of target linguistic forms.

Discussion

Along with the rise of models of communicative competence during the past four decades, instructional studies on L2 pragmatics have developed from examining the effects of conscious raising instruction (e.g., Fukuya & Zhang, 2002; Kondo, 2008; Narita, 2012; Yang & Zhu, 2016), to comparing explicit and implicit instruction (e.g., Félix-Brasdefer, 2008; Kubota, 1995; Nguyen et al., 2012; Takimoto, 2009; Tateyama, 2001; Yang, 2014), and to comparing different types of practice (Li, 2013; Li & Taguchi, 2014), different types of learning tasks (Kim & Taguchi, 2015), and different types of classroom interaction (Taguchi & Kim, 2016; Van Compernolle, 2011). A general suggestion is that explicit instruction with direct metapragmatic information and sufficient practice is more effective than implicit instruction with only input enhancement. However, the positive effect of explicit instruction may be affected by the quantity and quality of follow-up practice (Li, 2012; 2103; Li & Taguchi, 2014; Taguchi & Kim, 2016), task complexity (Kim & Taguchi, 2015), instructor's mediation (Van Compernolle, 2011) and learner-related variables such as foreign language aptitude (Li, 2017). Based on the empirical evidence generated by these instructional studies, effective instruction on L2 Chinese pragmatics (e.g. speech acts) needs to include direct metapragmatic information and adequate follow-up

practice. The follow-up practice may increase the degree of task complexity and stimulate more peer-to-peer discussion. In addition to method-related considerations, instructors may also factor in learners' personal traits such as foreign language aptitude, proficiency, previous learning experiences to improve instructional tasks for better learning outcomes. For this purpose, doing action research within an established curriculum is particularly important because although previous studies have focused on a variety of pragmatic features, no replication studies that use identical instructional methods and outcome measures have been done, which limits the generalizability of the findings of existing studies. Since the majority of these studies used a quasi-experimental design, the instructional effectiveness should be replicable if instructors adopt the same teaching methods and outcome measures. For example, action research can replicate an existing effective instructional method by using learners with different L2 proficiency levels so that the findings could be easily compared with those generated from studies that use the instruction. This type of replication is especially useful in pragmatic instruction because very few studies to date have tested the effectiveness of a certain instruction across different proficiency levels (e.g. Fordyce, 2014; Yang, 2016). Therefore, findings of a large number of action research at different proficiency levels can shed light on developing level-appropriate pragmatic instruction.

In addition to teaching methods, the theoretical construct of pragmatic competence needs to be expanded beyond speech acts. Although existing instructional studies operationalized pragmatic competence based on the concept of communicative competence, speech act performance at the utterance level was the dominant pragmatic feature examined in previous studies, such as request (e.g. Hernández & Boero, 2018; Li, 2012, Li & Taguchi, 2014;), gratitude (e.g. Yang, 2016; Yang & Zhu, 2016); refusals (e.g. Kondo, 2008), and criticisms (e.g.

Nguyen et al. 2012). Knowledge of speech acts is the core of pragmatic knowledge because it represents a clear form-function-situation mapping in language use. However, existing instructional studies only focused on the morphosyntactic structure of speech acts at the utterance level, which does not represent the adaptive nature of speech/communicative act performance in interaction.

According to Levinson (2013, 2017), pragmatic failures result from a misinterpretation of the speaker's intention in the preceding turn. In other words, this adaptive view of pragmatic competence provides a model that can explain the real-time pragmatic performance in communication. Future instructional research and practice should adopt this adaptive perspective to operationalize pragmatic competence because in real life communications, communicative acts are often jointly constructed by the speaker and listener. Pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge only provide the foundation of appropriate communication. It is the ability to be adaptive in the sequential context that defines a person's pragmatic competence in interaction. To this end, successful pragmatic performance requires an appropriate production of the follow-up move based on a proper understanding of the preceding turn. Therefore, the construct of pragmatic competence should be expanded to the ability to comprehend preceding turns and produce sequentially appropriate follow-up moves. Adopting this adaptive view of pragmatic competence, Chinese instructors need to design tasks that can elicit exchange of multiple turns in interaction. Since there were two studies that examined Chinese pragmatics in interaction (Su & Ren, 2017; Xiao, 2017), their pragmatic measures (role-play and semi-structure interview) might be developed to classroom tasks to teach pragmatics in interaction. Although no instructional studies have focused on this aspect of pragmatic competence,

instructors may do action research to test effectiveness of different tasks on pragmatics in interaction.

Conclusion

This article has reviewed studies on instructed pragmatics with a focus on L2 Chinese studies. Existing empirical evidence generally supports the effectiveness of direct metapragmatic instruction with sufficient follow-up practice. However, different practice conditions affect teaching effectiveness differently, as indicated by mixed findings reported by most recent studies, suggesting that L2 Chinese instructors may need to increase the degree of task complexity and stimulate sufficient classroom discourses (e.g. peer-to-peer, expert-learner) to facilitate learners' intake of target pragmatic features.

They also need to make learning tasks adaptive to learners' personal traits such as foreign language aptitude, proficiency, previous learning experiences. For this purpose, action research that replicates teaching methods examined in previous empirical studies can be done to test effectiveness of different methods among a given learning cohort. Finally, Chinese instructors may also teach pragmatics beyond speech acts to promote learning of pragmatics in interaction.

References

Alcón-Soler, E. (2015). Pragmatic learning and study abroad: Effects of instruction and length of stay. *System*, *48*, 62-74.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (2010). *Language testing in practi*ce. Oxford: Oxford University.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Bardovi-Harlig (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language learning*, *49*(4), 677-713.

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

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2015). Operationalizing conversation in studies of instructional effect in L2 pragmatics. *System*, *48*, 21-34.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2017). Acquisition of L2 Pragmatics. In S. Loewen, & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acq*uisition (pp. 224-225). New York: Routledge.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Vellenga, H. E. (2015). The effect of instruction on pragmatic routines in academic discussion. *Language Teaching Research*, *19*(3), 324-350.

Blum-Kula, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (Vol. 3). New York: Ablex.

Bouton, L. (1994). Can NNS skill in interpreting implicature in American English be improved
through explicit instruction? - A pilot study. *Pragmatics and Language learning*, *5*, 87-
109.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In
J.C. Richards and R.W. Schmidt (Eds.). *Language and communication*. London:
Longman.

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

Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *System*, *33*(2), 209-224.

Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge, and instruction. In R. Ellis, S.
Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philp & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Implicit and explicit
knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching* (pp. 3-25). Bristol, UK:
Multilingual Matters.

Eslami, Z. R., Mirzaei, A., & Dini, S. (2015). The role of asynchronous computer mediated
communication in the instruction and development of EFL learners' pragmatic
competence. *System*, *48*, 99-111.

Félix-Brasdefer, C. (2008). Pedagogical intervention and the development of pragmatic
competence in learning Spanish as a foreign language. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*,
16(1), 49-84.

Fordyce, K. (2014). The differential effects of explicit and implicit instruction on EFL learners'
use of epistemic stance. *Applied Linguistics*, *35*(1), 6-28.

Fukuya, Y. J., & Zhang, Y. (2002). Effects of recasts of EFL learners' acquisition of

    pragmalinguistic conventions of request. *Second Language Studies Paper, 21*(1), 1-47.

Hernández, T. A., & Boero, P. (2018). Explicit intervention for Spanish pragmatic development

    during short-term study abroad: An examination of learner request production and

    cognition. *Foreign Language Annals*, *51*(2), 389-410.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.).

    Sociolinguistics (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Ishida, K (2009). *Indexing stance in interaction: a pedagogical approach to teaching the

    pragmatic use of the Japanese plain and desu/masu forms*. (Unpublished doctoral

    dissertation). University of Hawaii, Manoa, Hawaii.

Iwai, T. (2013). Using *n desu* in small talk: JFL learners' pragmatic development. In K. Kondo-

    Brown, Y. Saito-Abbott, S. Satsutani, M. Tsutsui & A. Wehmeyer (Eds.), *New

    perspectives on Japanese language learning, linguistics, and culture* (pp. 27-47).

    Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Jeon, E. H., & Kaya, T. (2006). Effects of L2 instruction on interlanguage pragmatic

    development. In N. John & L. Ortega (Eds.). *Synthesizing research on language learning

    and teaching* (pp. 165-211). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K. Rose & G. Kasper

    (Eds.), Pragmatics *in language teaching* (pp. 33-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *19*,

    81-104.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (2002). Pragmatic development in a second language. *Language Learning*, 53(s1), 1–352.

Kim, Y., & Taguchi, N. (2015). Promoting Task-Based Pragmatics Instruction in EFL Classroom Contexts: The Role of Task Complexity. *The Modern Language Journal*, *99*(4), 656-677.

Kondo, S. (2008). Effects on pragmatic development through awareness-raising instruction: Refusals by Japanese EFL learners. In E. Alcón-Soler & A., Martínez-Flor (Eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing*, 153-177.

Kubota, M. (1995). Teachability of conversational implicature to Japanese EFL learners. *Institute for Research in Language Teaching Bulletin*, *9*, 35-67.

Levinson, S. C. (2013). Action formation and ascription. In T. Stivers, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 103-130). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Levinson, S. C. (2017). Speech acts. In Y. Huang (Ed.), Oxford handbook of pragmatics (pp. 199-216). Oxford: Oxford University.

Li, S. (2012). The effects of input-based practice on pragmatic development of requests in L2 Chinese. *Language Learning*, *62*(2), 403-438.

Li, S. (2013). Amount of practice and pragmatic development of request-making in L2 Chinese. In N. Taguchi (Ed), *Technology in interlanguage pragmatics research and teaching* (pp. 43-69). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Li, S. (2017). An exploratory study on the role of foreign language aptitudes in instructed

    pragmatics learning in L2 Chinese. *Chinese as a Second Language Research*, *6*(1), 103-

    128.

Li, S. & Taguchi, N. (2014). The effects of practice modality on pragmatic development in L2

    Chinese. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*(3), 794-812.

Lyster, R. (1994). The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion

    students' sociolinguistic competence. *Applied linguistics*, *15*(3), 263-287.

Mao, L. R. (1994). Beyond politeness theory:'Face'revisited and renewed. *Journal of*

    pragmatics, *21*(5), 451-486.

Martínez-Flor, A., & Fukuya, Y. J. (2005). The effects of instruction on learners' production of

    appropriate and accurate suggestions. *System*, *33*(3), 463-480.

Narita, R. (2012). The effects of pragmatic consciousness-raising activity on the development of

    pragmatic awareness and use of hearsay evidential markers for learners of Japanese as a

    foreign language. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44*(1), 1-29.

Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and

    quantitative meta-analysis. *Language learning*, *50*(3), 417-528.

Nguyen, T. T. M., Pham, T. H., & Pham, M. T. (2012). The relative effects of explicit and

    implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence.

    Journal of Pragmatics, *44*(4), 416-434.

Nguyen, M. T. T., Pham, H. T., & Pham, T. M. (2017). The effects of input enhancement and recasts on the development of second language pragmatic competence. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *11*(1), 45-67.

Rebuschat, P. (2013). Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge in second language research. *Language Learning*, *63*(3), 595-626.

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied linguistics*, *22*(1), 27-57.

Robinson, P. (2011). Second language task complexity, the cognition hypothesis, language learning, and performance. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Second language task complexity: Researching the cognition hypothesis of language learning and performance* (pp. 3-38). Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Roever, C. (2009). Teaching and testing pragmatics. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds). *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

Roever, C., & Kasper, G. (2018). Speaking in turns and sequences: Interactional competence as a target construct in testing speaking. *Language Testing*, *35*(3), 331-355.

Rose, K. R. & Ng, K. F. (2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 145-169). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129-158.

Schmidt, R. (2010). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning In W.

    M., K. N. Chin, S. K., Bhatt, & I. Walker (Eds.), *Perspectives on individual*

    characteristics and foreign language education (pp. 27-50). Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, *5*(1), 1-23.

Su, Y., & Ren, W. (2017). Developing L2 Pragmatic Competence in Mandarin Chinese:

    Sequential Realization of Requests. *Foreign Language Annals*, *50*(2), 433-457.

Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and

    should be going. *Language Teaching*, *48*(1), 1-50.

Taguchi, N., & Kim, Y. (2016). Collaborative dialogue in learning pragmatics: pragmatic-related

    episodes as an opportunity for learning request-making. *Applied Linguistics*, *37*(3), 416-

    437.

Taguchi, N. & Roever, C. (2017). *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Takimoto, M. (2006). The effects of explicit feedback on the development of pragmatic

    proficiency. *Language Teaching Research*, *10*(4), 393-417.

Takeyama, Y. (2001). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines. In K. R. Rose & G.

    Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 200-222). Cambridge: Cambridge

    University.

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

Thorne, S., & Lantolf, J. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language*

    development. Oxford: Oxford University.

Utashiro, T., & Kawai, G. (2009). Blended learning for Japanese reactive tokens: Effects of

    computer-led, instructor-led, and peer-based instruction (pp. 275-299). In N. Taguchi

    (Ed.), *Pragmatic competence*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Van Compernolle, R. A. (2011). Developing second language sociopragmatic knowledge

    through concept-based instruction: A microgenetic case study. *Journal of Pragmatics*,

    43(13), 3267-3283.

VanPatten, B. (2015). Foundations of processing instruction. *International Review of Applied*

    Linguistics, *53*(2), 91-109.

VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in*

    Second Language Acquisition, *15*(2), 225-243.

Verschueren, J. (1987). *Pragmatics as a theory of linguistic adaptation*. Antwerp: International

    Pragmatics Association.

Wildner-Basset, M. (1984). *Improving pragmatic aspects of learners' interlanguage*. Tubingen:

    Narr.

Wishnoff, J. R. (2000). Hedging your bets: L2 learners' acquisition of pragmatic devices in

    academic writing and computer-mediated discourse. *Second Language Studies*, *19*(1),

    127-157.

Xiao, F. (2015). Proficiency effect on L2 pragmatic competence. *Studies in Second Language*

    Learning and Teaching, *5*(4), 557-581.

Xiao, F. (2017). Development in the use of Chinese mitigation in interaction. *Chinese as a Second Language Research*, *6*(1), 39-71.

Xiao, F. (2018). Advanced-level pragmatics in instructed SLA. In P. A. Malovrh & A. G. Benati (Eds.), *Handbook of advanced proficiency in second language acquisition* (pp.461-482). Hoboken: Wiley & Sons.

Yang, L. (2014). The effects of pragmatics instruction on L2 learners' acquisition of Chinese expressions of gratitude: A pilot study. *Journal of The Chinese Language Teachers Association*, *49*(1), 95-115.

Yang, L. (2016). Learning to express gratitude in Mandarin Chinese through web-based instruction. *Language Learning & Technology*, *20*(1), 191-208.

Yang, L. & Zhu, J. (2016). The effects of pragmatic consciousness-raising activities on the learning of speech acts in the beginning CFL classroom. *Applied Language Learning*, *26*(2), 53-68.