

Pragmatics in Second Language Learning:
An update

Gabriele Kasper
University of Hawaii at Manoa

As a branch of applied linguistics in North America, pragmatics made a first cautious appearance about the same time that AAAL was founded as an independent academic organization. It is a pleasure and privilege to have the opportunity to celebrate both occasions. Happy birthday, AAAL and pragmatics, and many happy returns!

A Historical Sketch of Developmental Interlanguage Pragmatics

Over the past 30 years, the study of second language (L2) pragmatic development, broadly defined, has unfolded into a diverse research domain. Its key themes intersect with major research topics in the wider field of SLA and were to some degree, but not exclusively or consistently, extended from interlanguage grammar to pragmatics. If we arrange the key areas on a timeline in the order in which they first emerged,¹ two main phases become apparent. From the late 1970s to the early 1980s, researchers began to explore such topics as the comprehension of indirectness (Carrell, 1979), pragmatic awareness (Rintell, 1979; Walters, 1979), the development of pragmatic and discourse competence in cross-sectional (Scarcella, 1979) and longitudinal perspective (Schmidt, 1983), pragmatic transfer (Olshtain, 1983; Scarcella, 1983), the influence of social-affective factors on the development of pragmatic ability (Schmidt, 1983), and the effect of instruction on the classroom learning of L2 pragmatics (Wildner-Bassett, 1984). These themes were partly infused by sources from outside of SLA, such as Hymes's theory of communicative competence, Searle's speech act theory, Grice's theory of conversational implicature, and cognitive-psychological models of utterance processing. Some studies were specifically concerned with the relationship of grammar and pragmatics (Walters, 1980), but it took an explicitly articulated research agenda, proposed towards the end of the millennium by Bardovi-Harlig (1999), and a seminal study by Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) to bring the connection between grammar and pragmatics to the forefront.

A continuing line of investigation took grammar-focused SLA research into pragmatics. The discovery that morphosyntax develops in ordered sequences inspired researchers to look for similar acquisitional regularities in pragmatics—although it took almost another decade before the first longitudinal study by Schmidt (1983) saw a successor (Ellis, 1992). In the case of transfer, a topic that goes back to the behaviorist beginnings of SLA, a conceptual apparatus and explanatory constructs were available for application and adaptation to pragmatics. But, in fact, we see little reference in the literature on pragmatic transfer to SLA theory and research on transfer. The main impetus to examine pragmatic transfer came from cross-cultural pragmatics, the comparative study of speech acts or discourse phenomena in different languages. One of the few psycholinguistically informed studies on the topic is an investigation by Takahashi (1996) on pragmatic transferability, and unfortunately, it remained a singular case. On the whole, the

¹ I operationalize emergence as first publication in an English-language journal or book. As in SLA research, the emergence criterion is controversial (Pallotti, 2007, for a recent proposal).

interest in transfer has somewhat waned in recent years. Social-psychological theories of intergroup relations made a promising early entrance to interlanguage pragmatics with Schmidt's Wes study (1983), a test case of Schumann's (1978) acculturation model, but then it receded to the background again—although it was only in pragmatics and discourse that the predictions of the Acculturation model bore out.

In the decade from 1990 to 2000, the research agenda on developmental interlanguage pragmatics was substantially broadened. Continuing already active cognitive and (psycho)linguistic perspectives, a few studies adopted verbal report methodology in order to examine speech act production in a process perspective (Cohen & Olshtain, 1993; Robinson, 1992). A more extensive literature on an earlier topic addresses pragmatic, pragmalinguistic, and sociopragmatic awareness, either as topics in their own right (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998; Takahashi, 1996) or in conjunction with speech act production (Bergman & Kasper, 1993; Maeshiba, Yoshinaga, Kasper, & Ross, 1996). An important innovation in this period was a research program on the testing of pragmatics. Operationalizing the pragmatic component in Bachman's (1990) model for the testing of communicative abilities, Hudson, Detmer, and Brown (1992, 1995) launched a prototypical multiple method framework for testing speech acts. Subsequently the prototype was applied to the testing of speech acts in Japanese (Yamashita, 1996), followed by further validation studies on instrument effects (Hudson, 2001) and test characteristics (Brown, 2001).

Research on the instructed learning of pragmatics is perhaps the most prolific and theoretically diverse area in the wider domain. It was here that socially grounded theories of L2 pragmatic learning first evolved. Within the broader area of classroom research, we notice a dual bifurcation. Until recently, the two traditional sub-areas, interventional and observational research, advanced under two different metatheoretical orientations. Since the 1990s, interventional classroom research, aiming to determine the effect of different instructional arrangements on the learning of L2 pragmatics, has almost exclusively been framed by cognitive processing constructs, especially the noticing hypothesis and concepts of explicit/implicit learning and teaching (e.g., Lyster, 1994). By contrast, observational studies, which examine the processes of L2 pragmatic learning in instructional settings as they occur without experimental manipulation, engage a variety of socially grounded perspectives. In the first of these, Poole (1992) analyzed the emergence of interactional style in adult English as a second language (ESL) classes under a language socialization framework. Other theoretical approaches to L2 pragmatic development in language classrooms followed soon, notably Vygotskian theory and situated learning theory (Ohta, 1995) as well as socioculturally informed approaches to the development of interactional practices (Hall, 1993, 1999).

About the same time that classroom research on L2 pragmatic learning began to be enriched by views of L2 pragmatic learning as a socially grounded activity, researchers became interested in two social domains outside of classroom settings. A series of studies by Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1990, 1992, 1996) on the learning of speech acts in academic advising sessions inaugurated a productive line of research on interlanguage pragmatics in institutional environments (see Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 2005, for a recent collection). Other settings that have increasingly come under scrutiny as contexts for L2 pragmatic learning are study abroad and home stay contexts (Barron, 2003; see DuFon & Churchill, 2006; Marriott, 1993). Under the influence of poststructural theories, the relationship of identity and L2 pragmatic learning has been of increasing interest since Siegal's (1995, 1996) ethnographic study of Western women in Japan.

In this millennium, existing topics have been continued, revitalized, and reshaped through new technologies, synergies of theories and research methodologies, and in response to societal changes in the wake of migration and globalization. More longitudinal studies are now seen on trajectories of L2 pragmatic development by children (Achiba, 2003) and adults (Barron, 2003). After a hiatus of almost two decades, with Takahashi's (2005) study on the effect of motivation on attention to pragmatic resources, the social-psychological study of individual differences in pragmatic development has come to the fore again, complementing cognitive theories of L2 learning. Taguchi (2007) laid the groundwork for a promising new line of experimental research on speech act production in real time, based on a framework that integrates SLA research on task difficulty and fluency with pragmatic theory on speech acts and politeness. The relationship of grammar and pragmatics, a continued focus of interest (Schauer, 2006), has acquired a new dimension with Bardovi-Harlig's (2006) proposal to investigate the role of formulaic constructions in L2 pragmatic development. The first meta-analysis is now available on the effect of instruction in pragmatics (Jeon & Kaya, 2006). Technological advancements have led to the investigation of the affordances of computer-mediated communication for pragmatic development (Kinginger, 2000) and the testing of pragmatics (Röver, 2005). Lastly, interlanguage pragmatics' (ILPs') traditional research object has been qualitatively expanded to include the pragmatics of third languages. Safont (2005) found that students learning English as a foreign language (EFL) as their third language (L3), after Catalan and Spanish, are consistently superior in their production and awareness of requests compared to L2 EFL students. Although many interlanguage pragmatic studies include learners for whom the target language is the third, fourth, or nth language, but not the second language, the pragmatics literature overwhelmingly treats all learners as "second" language learners and thereby glosses over possible systemic differences between bilingual and multilingual learners and speakers. An extended research agenda that encompasses the pragmatic competencies of multilingual speakers (Cook, 1995; Hall, Cheng, & Carlson, 2006) must also give attention to the use and development of lingua francas in activities and contexts with real-life consequences for the participants (Firth, 1996).

As this brief sketch² suggests, ILP has taken up research topics and problems from different domains in applied linguistics and other social sciences. Together with the themes and questions, ILP has also incorporated the theoretical perspectives from which its research problems are conceptualized—and often it is the theoretical outlook that pulls particular objects and questions into view in the first place. A good illustration is the division of labor between approaches to classroom learning of pragmatics. As noted earlier, since the early 1990s, interventional classroom research has been conducted from a cognitive processing perspective, whereas observational studies have been guided by theories of L2 learning as socially constituted. The first proposal to approach classroom intervention on pragmatic learning objects from an alternative perspective was recently submitted by Ohta (2005). She reinterpreted three studies conducted under cognitive and discourse frameworks in light of Vygotskian theory, specifically the zone of proximal development (ZPD). Ohta evaluated the effectiveness of the instructional arrangements from the perspective of whether they afforded the type and amount of assistance necessary for the students to notice or produce the targeted pragmatic objects. Her reanalysis is highly suggestive of the value of sociocultural theory (SCT) and the ZPD construct for the planned instruction of pragmatics, but, as far as I can see, interventional SCT studies in

²For recent comprehensive reviews of L2 pragmatic development, see Bardovi-Harlig, (2001a, 2001 b); Kasper & Roever, 2005; Kasper & Rose, 2002.

traditional classrooms have not yet appeared in the published literature.³ The lead in undertaking interventional classroom research from a socially grounded perspective has been taken by conversation analysts (CA). Recent studies have shown how conversation analysis can be deployed for teaching culture-specific conversational openings (Liddicoat & Crozet, 2001) and speech act sequences (Félix-Brasdefer, 2006; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006) and for evaluating its own effectiveness for the instructed learning of pragmatics.

In the remainder of this article, I will discuss how two theoretical perspectives, psycholinguistic concepts of intrapsychological language processing and representation (henceforth “psycholinguistics”) and (CA), have been engaged in the study of two long-standing research topics in ILP, the comprehension of indirectly conveyed speech acts (psycholinguistics) and negative pragmatic transfer (CA). I selected these two outlooks because they contrast in several critical respects.

1. Consistent with their contrasting ontological stances, psycholinguistics and CA conceptualize the object and process of learning in different ways. Under a psycholinguistic framework, the learning **object** is theorized from a rationalist perspective, mainly drawing on Searle’s theory of speech acts as speaker intention encoded in linguistic conventions (Kasper, 2006b). The **process** of L2 learning is seen as intra-individual cognitive operations on knowledge representations. CA, by contrast, views the learning object, actions located in talk exchanges, as a socially constituted discursive practice. CA approaches to L2 development examine learning as a social practice and a social process—that is, as a matter of social construction (Kasper, 2006a; Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004).
2. The psycholinguistic representational view and CA’s specific version of constructionism (Hauser, 2005; Wagner, 1996) translate into opposing epistemological stances and attendant consequences for research methodology, as the upcoming examples will illustrate.
3. In the history of SLA, psycholinguistics and cognitive psychology more generally were among the foundational sources of the discipline, and they can claim the dignity of a long continuing line of intellectual ancestry. In contrast, CA as an approach to SLA is a recent arrival, and also one that is often viewed with skepticism and sometimes outright rejection. In this paper I wish to argue in favor of a strong psycholinguistic **and** microsociological foundation of L2 pragmatics research.

Psycholinguistic Approaches to L2 Pragmatic Learning: Comprehension of Indirectness

Some of the earliest work in acquisitional ILP examined how ESL learners develop the ability to comprehend indirect pragmatic meaning. The body of research on this topic is small, but the way it has evolved is instructive. The key studies are summarized in Table 1.

In retrospect, we can discern three phases, during which we see a shift in the theoretical grounding of the studies from Gricean implicature to psycholinguistic processing models. In terms of instrumentation, we register a movement from written to spoken stimuli, and from untimed to timed responses. The first work in this tradition was a cross-sectional study by Carrell (1979) on indirect responses. Her instrument was a written multiple choice questionnaire with a

³ Several studies examine telecollaboration among foreign language students and L1 speaking peers (Belz & Kinginger, 2002; Kinginger & Belz, 2005).

particular item design that became paradigmatic within research on the comprehension of implied meaning:

- (1) Sample item, Carrell (1979)
 Bob comes up to Ann in the Student Center.
 Bob says: “Did you go to the movies last night?”
 Ann says: “I had to study last night.”
 a. Ann went to the movies last night.
 b. Ann did not go to the movies last night.
 c. I have no idea at all whether (a) or (b).

Table 1

Studies of the Comprehension of Indirectness

Study	Object	Theory	Written-oral	Untimed-timed
<i>Phase 1</i>				
Carrell, 1979	Indirect responses	Grice implicature	Written	Untimed
Bouton, 1999 (summary)	Indirect responses	Grice implicature types	Written	Untimed
Cook & Liddicoat, 2002	Request strategies	General processing & memory models	Written	Untimed
<i>Phase 2</i>				
Takahashi & Roitblat, 1994	Conventionally indirect requests	Process models of nonliteral meaning	Written	Timed
<i>Phase 3</i>				
Taguchi, 2005, in press	Requests, refusals, & opinion statements	Pragmatic theories & accuracy-speed trade-off	Oral	Timed

In this design format, items are composed of a situational frame and a brief dialogue, followed by a set of alternative statements. Respondents have to choose the statement that best represents their understanding of the dialogue answer. Carrell found that the ESL respondents, regardless of their L2 proficiency, understood the meaning of the indirect answers significantly less correctly than a native speaker group.

The next step in the first phase was a series of studies on implicature comprehension by Bouton (1999 for summary). These were the first investigations that charted ESL learners' comprehension of implicature longitudinally. Like Carrell (1979), Bouton built his studies on Grice's theory of conversational implicature, but he distinguished different implicature types. Relevance implicatures, illustrated in the item from Carrell (1979), proved to be the most accessible implicature type from the beginning. After 3 years of exposure, the learners reached nativelike comprehension of relevance implicatures. By contrast, exposure did not substantially improve their understanding of formulaic implicatures, such as fixed expressions and indirect criticism. Conversely, the learners' comprehension of formulaic implicature proved to be highly

amenable to instruction whereas relevance implicature did not (Bouton, 1999). In the context of a web-delivered test of implicature, Röver (2005) found that EFL and ESL students' ability to interpret relevance and formulaic implicatures proved to be dependent on their English proficiency, not exposure, regardless of implicature type.⁴

The early studies essentially examined self-paced reading comprehension of indirectness in a product-oriented manner. Still within the same paradigm, Cook and Liddicoat (2002) shifted focus to the comprehension of different request types. Specifically they asked whether first language (L1) English respondents and L2 respondents at high and low proficiency interpreted direct, conventionally direct, and nonconventionally direct requests (Blum-Kulka, 1989) as expected. Whereas the L1 respondents generated interpretations as expected regardless of request type, the high proficiency L2 group performed at a similar level to the L1 respondents on the direct and conventionally indirect requests but not on the nonconventionally indirect requests. The low proficiency group understood only the direct requests as expected and supplied unexpected interpretations of both types of indirect requests. The nonconventionally indirect requests appeared to be particularly troublesome for these less proficient recipients. Cook and Liddicoat appealed to information-processing models (Schneider & Shiffrin, 1977) to explain their findings, arguing that low automatization of linguistic knowledge may force learners to rely more on controlled processing, which in turn overtaxes their limited processing capacities in accessing both linguistic and contextual knowledge.

In the second phase of research on L2 pragmatic comprehension, processing in real time became the central topic. Takahashi and Roitblat (1994) explored the process by which L2 recipients understand conventionally indirect requests. Building on a comprehensive research program in cognitive psychology, their study tested three competing models. According to the **literal meaning first** model, derived from Searle's (1975) theory of indirect speech acts, the recipient initially recognizes the literal meaning, evaluates it as a contextual misfit, and recovers the contextualized conventional meaning through implicature. The **multiple meaning** model holds that recipients process literal and conventional meanings concurrently and evaluate through contextual information which of the candidate meanings is relevant in the given scene. Finally, according to the **conventional meaning** model, the recipient draws on context information to directly assign the conventional meaning to the utterance without also deriving the literal meaning (Gibbs, 1999). Takahashi and Roitblat (1994) used a reaction time task with written scenarios in order to examine advanced ESL readers' online processing of conventionally indirect requests. The results supported the multiple meaning model of pragmatic comprehension for the ESL readers as well as for a group of L1 English readers. These outcomes contrast with earlier findings, according to which nonnative recipients are more likely to interpret indirect utterances literally. The main difference between the native and nonnative recipients was the overall processing speed—the L1 English readers responded consistently faster.

As the first study to use a reaction time format in ILP, Takahashi and Roitblat's investigation was a milestone in the history of research on the processing of L2 pragmatic meaning. Their study generated important new questions; for instance:

- Do L2 readers at lower proficiency exhibit a different processing profile from that of advanced L2 readers?
- Are accuracy, speed, and conventionality related?

⁴ As the purpose of the study was test validation, the sections (here: the implicature section) was timed, but the individual items were not.

- How does the developmental path of indirectness comprehension unfold along these variables?

These questions were taken up in the most recent phase in the experimental investigation of L2 pragmatic comprehension. Taguchi (2005, in press) investigated how Japanese EFL students understood three speech acts with different degrees of conventionality, indirect requests, and indirect refusals (more conventionalized), and implied statements of opinion (less conventionalized). Her studies brought two critical innovations to research on L2 pragmatic comprehension. First, she shifted modality from reading to listening comprehension. Secondly, in addition to models of the processing of indirectness, her theoretical framework incorporated the “accuracy-speed trade-off,” from SLA research and cognitive psychology, the prediction that high accuracy requires more time, and high speed is error-prone (Schmidt, 1992; Skehan, 1998). Taguchi examined how fast and accurately EFL listeners understood the more or less conventionalized implicatures, whether speed and accuracy were related, and the effect of L2 proficiency on both. A comparison group of L1 English listeners understood the implicatures equally fast and accurately independent of degree of conventionality. By contrast, EFL listeners comprehended the more conventionalized implicatures significantly faster and more accurately. Increased proficiency predicted higher accuracy but not speed, and there was no significant relationship between the two dimensions. The students’ listening comprehension of both speech acts improved over time, but the gains were greater in comprehension accuracy than speed, and the two processing dimensions were related to different L2 abilities but not to each other. The studies thus provide counter-evidence to the accuracy-speed trade-off. They suggest that accuracy and speed are independent dimensions in L2 pragmatic comprehension and follow separate developmental paths. The findings lend further support to models that separate L2 knowledge and processing into distinct capacities, as Bachman (1990) and Bialystok (1993) among others have proposed.

To summarize, theories and concepts from rationalist pragmatics, cognitive psychology, and SLA have shed light on how learners comprehend pragmatic objects in a L2. These research efforts have not only contributed to theoretical and methodological insights in ILP but to central topics in SLA at large. They highlight the role of pragmatic meaning as a critical factor in accuracy and speed of utterance comprehension, and thereby indicate the need to reconsider the notion of task complexity, with attendant implications for task-based instruction and language testing. By combining pragmatic theories with general processing theories, studies of L2 pragmatic comprehension can readily be aligned with efforts to conceptualize and study L2 listening and processing more generally.

Conversation Analysis: An Approach to Pragmatic Transfer

Moving on from psycholinguistics to sociologically based L2 pragmatics, CA’s project is to elucidate the methods through which social members accomplish coordinated actions in an orderly fashion through their verbal and nonverbal conduct. For CA, the habitat of action is social interaction in organized sequences. Pragmatic meanings emerge from participants’ ongoing, contingent interpretive work during jointly pursued practical activities.

An incipient literature demonstrates CA’s capacity to shed light on pragmatic development in microgenetic and ontogenetic perspective (Ishida, 2006, in press) and interventional classroom research as noted earlier in this paper. Here I will examine how CA can advance our understanding of a classic topic in ILP and SLA at large—that of negative transfer. Despite a large research literature on pragmatic transfer (Kasper, 1992), the topic has not

received much theoretical scrutiny lately, with the notable exceptions of studies by Takahashi (1996) and Yoshimi (1999).

Recent studies of telephone openings and compliment responses demonstrate CA's potential to get a distinct analytical and theoretical handle on pragmatic transfer. In a comparative analysis of telephone openings between L1 speakers of Farsi and L1 speakers of German, Taleghani-Nikazm (2002) found that Iranian openings normatively included extended reciprocal ritual inquiries after the health of the co-participant and his or her family. By contrast, in German opening exchanges, ritual inquiries are possible but not normative; they are shorter and not normatively reciprocal. In telephone openings between advanced Iranian L2 speakers of German and German L1 speakers, the Iranian L2 speakers but not the German L1 speakers produced extended ritual inquiries. These apparent pragmatic transfers derailed the interaction, as was evident in interturn gaps and repair initiations. On occasion, the German interlocutor oriented to the ritual inquiry as a topic initiation, showing that the co-participants diverged in their understanding of the activity at hand. Such contingently arising sequential misunderstandings were also observed in earlier interactional sociolinguistic research on "frame conflicts" in intercultural interaction (Gumperz, 1982; Ross, 1998; Tyler, 1995). The strength of Taleghani-Nikazm's study is that she was able to show, through comparative analysis of German and Iranian L1 telephone openings, what the source of the misalignments seemed to be.

The outcomes of Taleghani-Nikazm's (2002) analysis are paralleled by an instance of pragmatic transfer reported by Golato (2002) in a comparative study of compliment responses in German and American English. Although it is a single case rather than an instance in a collection, I am showing the extract here because it illustrates well CA's analytical grasp of pragmatic transfer as an interactional phenomenon. The episode runs as follows:

(2) Frühstück in Texas. D (NS AE), C & A (NS German)

- 1 D: that's the best tea (.) i've- i think i've ever had=
 D gazes at C
 with puzzled look
- |—
 | |
- 2 → C: = >great, right?<
 3 → (.)
 4 D: uh- that lemonny kinda yeah. it's quite nice
 5 C: ((smile voice)) (yeah we like it too)
 6 (0.2)
 7 A: what was the- exact name of it it's just called (.)
 8 orange tea?
 9 C: lemon tea it's zitronentee (from Golato, 2002, p. 566)

To summarize Golato's analysis, at the first arrow, Christiane responds to David's compliment about her tea with a "same strength assessment followed by a response pursuit marker" (2002, p. 567). The use of a same strength adjective plus tag is one of several conventionalized response options in German, but according to studies reviewed by Golato (2002, 2005), it is not used in American English. So there is a good possibility here that Christiane is transferring the practice from German. What is more, David's puzzled look after Christiane's response, co-occurring with her response pursuit and the short gap and hesitations in lines 3 and 4, suggest that the smooth flow of the interaction is disturbed—there is what Erickson and Shultz (1982) call an uncomfortable moment. Note also that David downgrades his second assessment from "best tea

I've ever had" (line 1) to "quite nice" (line 4), a practice for compliment **receiving** but not **giving** in American English. David thus treats Christiane's response as a dispreferred action—that is, as one that is not normatively expected as a relevant next to a compliment.

As Taleghani-Nikazm's (2002) study and Golato's (2002) example show, CA can refuel the research agenda on pragmatic transfer by examining what pragmatic practices L2 speakers transfer in situated interaction, whether and how the co-participants orient to pragmatic transfer in their subsequent vocal and nonvocal conduct, and how interactional misalignments are resolved. In developmental perspective, CA allows researchers to trace whether L2 speakers recalibrate transferred practices over time, or whether over the course of repeated interactions, the co-participant no longer treats a transferred practice as an interactional misfit. Because CA examines natural interaction rather than self-reports, it also has the capacity to specify possible sources of pragmatic transfer that are as yet unknown. With its focus on sequence organization and close attention to verbal and nonverbal interactional conduct, CA is capable of identifying pragmatic transfer as a participant concern—that is, as an interactional event that the participants themselves orient to.⁵ By comparing how L2 speakers and their co-participants undertake particular action sequences, analysts can observe how the participants display for **each other** the unremarkableness, the conduct-as-expected, or how they orient to an interactional event as out of line, as a misfit, as a dispreferred way of acting. These are discursive occurrences that L2 pragmatics researchers can notice, collect, and examine with CA's analytical mentality and apparatus.

Conclusion

Taking as examples research on the comprehension of indirectness and negative pragmatic transfer, I have argued that psycholinguistics and CA offer important and innovative perspectives to L2 pragmatic learning and development. In keeping with contemporary metatheoretical discourse, I have treated both approaches as not only distinct but also incompatible. But the fault line between psycholinguistics and CA runs only partially along different explananda. True, CA's main research object is quotidian social interaction; psycholinguistics (in the sense defined here) is concerned with the processing, acquisition, and representation of language through a person's cognitive apparatus. Interaction as a psycholinguistic topic has received some recognition⁶ but is no major theme in "mainstream" psycholinguistics and cognitive psychology generally.⁷ Conversely, for CA cognition is inescapably built into interaction as participants constantly monitor the ongoing interaction, project what comes next, infer meanings from the details of interactional conduct, and display

⁵ Compare CA's approach to the operational definition I suggested 15 years ago. Based on Selinker (1983), I defined negative pragmatic transfer as "the statistically significant differences in the frequency of a pragmatic feature between IL-L2 and L1-L2."

⁶ The research program of H. H. Clark and his associates examines a range of interactional phenomena, such as common ground and reference as collaborative processes (Wilkes-Gibbs, 1997), recipient design (Clark & Krych, 2004), and jointly accomplished actions (Clark, 2005; see also Clark, 1996).

⁷ In Vygotskian and neo-Vygotskian theories, interaction has a critical mediational role in the development of higher-order mental functions (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Interaction and text take center stage in discursive psychology, a branch of social and cognitive psychology that respecifies psychological topics as discursive constructions (Edwards, 1997; Edwards & Potter, 1992).

their understandings of the other party's action in their response (Kasper, in press; Markee, 2000; Schegloff, 1991; Seedhouse, 2004). CA treats cognition as socially shared, as arising from and grounded in interaction. What separates CA and psycholinguistics, then, is not the presence or absence of an interest in cognition but rather the **locus** of cognition—social interaction for CA, the individual mind for psycholinguistics. In either case, CA and the psycholinguistics of speech production and comprehension have an interest in common, and that is their concern with language use in real time. The temporal structuring of turns and sequences is a critical interactional resource in CA perspective, as Golato's (2002) compliment extract illustrates. Nonverbal conduct and the prosodic composition of turns and units within them are potentially interactionally meaningful, and so are temporal phenomena such as gaps, filled pauses, cut-offs, restarts, any practices that delay a projected action or unit, or that precipitate it. For psycholinguists, temporal variables in speech production offer a window to production processes and language representation (Kormos, 2006; Riggenbach, 2000). Whereas CA does not treat temporal phenomena as externalizations of internal cognitive processes, it is interested in the inferences that the participants draw from the temporal structuring of turns and that they display to each other in their responses. In this way CA turns participant resources into analysts' research topics, a crucial strategy for advancing the study of speech acts and other pragmatic phenomena in interaction (Kasper, 2006).

CA researchers and psycholinguists of speech production, perception, and comprehension, then, must be interested in observations of fine temporal granularity to do their work. If there is a rapprochement of CA and SLA as a cognitive science in the foreseeable future, the shared concern with temporal granularity could provide a plausible starting point. Without gazing too deeply into the crystal ball, connections to the neurolinguistics and neuropragmatics of L2 learning and use will also require observations at a microscopic level. With a view to these future perspectives, Schegloff (2000) offers a fitting closing remark: "I don't know if the workings of granularity is the single most important thing that I don't know, but knowing it better is surely among the most important things I look forward to" (p. 719).

References

- Achiba, M. (2003). *Learning to request in a second language: Child interlanguage pragmatics*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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., & Hartford, B. S. (1996). Input in an institutional setting. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 171-188.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic vs. grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, pp.233-259.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (Eds.). (2005). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Exploring institutional talk*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning, 49*, 677-713.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001a). Empirical evidence of the need for instruction in pragmatics. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001b). Pragmatics and second language acquisition. In R. Kaplan (Ed.), *Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 182-192). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2006). On the role of formulas in the acquisition of L2 pragmatics. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, C. Félix-Brasdefer, & A. Omar (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning: Vol. II* (pp. 1-28). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Belz, J. A. & Kinginger, C. (2002). The cross-linguistic development of address form use in telecollaborative language learning: Two case studies. *Canadian Modern Language Review/Revue canadienne des langues vivantes, 59*, 189-214.
- Bergman, M. L., & Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and performance in native and nonnative apology. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 82-107). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bialystok, E. (1993) Symbolic representation and attentional control in pragmatic competence. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bialystok, E. (1994). Analysis and control in the development of second language proficiency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*, 157-168.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1989). Playing it safe: The role of conventionality in indirectness. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 37-70). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Bouton, L. F. (1999). Developing nonnative speaker skills in interpreting conversational implicatures in English: Explicit teaching can ease the process. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture*

- in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 47-70). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. (2001a). Pragmatics tests: Different purposes, different tests. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 301-325). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrell, P. (1979). Indirect speech acts in ESL: Indirect answers. In C. Yorio, K. Perkins, & J. Schachter (Eds.), *On TESOL '79: The learner in focus* (pp. 297-307). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Clark, H. H., & Krych, M. A. (2004). Speaking while monitoring addressees for understanding. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 50, 62-81.
- Clark, H. H., (1996). *Using language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, H. H., (2005). Coordinating with each other in a material world. *Discourse Studies*, 7, 507-525.
- Cohen, A., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 33-56.
- Cook, M., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2002). The development of comprehension in interlanguage pragmatics: The case of request strategies in English. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 19-39.
- Cook, V. J. (1995). Multi-competence and the learning of many languages. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 8, 93-98.
- DuFon, M. A., & Churchill, E. (Eds.). (2006). *Language learners in study abroad contexts*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Edwards, D. (1997). *Discourse and cognition*. London: Sage.
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.
- Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom: A study of two learners' requests. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 1-23.
- Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper*. New York: Academic.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2006). Teaching the negotiation of multi-turn speech acts: Using conversation-analytic tools to teach pragmatics in the FL classroom. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, J., Félix-Brasdefer, C., & Omar, A. (Eds.). *Pragmatics and language learning, Volume 11* (pp. 165-196). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Firth, A. (1996) The discursive accomplishment of normality: On lingua franca English and conversation analysis. *J of Pragmatics*, 26, pp. 237-259.
- Gibbs, R. (1983). Do people always process the literal meanings of indirect requests? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 9, 524-533.
- Gibbs, R. (1994). *The poetics of mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Golato, A. (2002). German compliment responses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 547-571.
- Golato, A. (2005). *Compliments and compliment responses*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, J. K. (1993). The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The sociocultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language. *Applied Linguistics*, 14, 145-166.
- Hall, J. K. (1999). A prosaics of interaction: The development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 137-151). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, J. K., Cheng, A., & Carlson, M. (2006). Reconceptualizing multicompetence as a theory of

- language knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 220-240.
- Hauser, E. (2005). Coding 'corrective recasts': The maintenance of meaning and more fundamental problems. *Applied Linguistics*, 26, 293-316.
- Hudson, T. (2001). Indicators for pragmatic instruction: Some quantitative measures. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 283-300). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, T., Detmer, E., & Brown, J. D. (1992). *A framework for testing cross-cultural pragmatics* (Tech. Rep. #2). Honolulu, HI: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii.
- Hudson, T., Detmer, E., & Brown, J.D. (1995). *Developing prototypic measures of cross-cultural pragmatics* (Technical Report #7). Honolulu, HI: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii.
- Huth, T., & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research*, 10, 53-79.
- Ishida, M. (2006). Interactional competence and the use of modal expressions in decision-making activities: CA for understanding microgenesis of pragmatic competence. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, C. Félix-Brasdefer, & A. Omar (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning: Vol. 11* (pp. 1-28). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Ishida, M. (in press). Interactional competence with the use of *ne* in L2 Japanese: Longitudinal development in participating in alignment activities. In G. Kasper, & H. T. Nguyen, (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction across languages*. Honolulu, HI: 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 and L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 165-211). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research*, 8, 203-231.
- Kasper, G. (2006a). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review*, 19, 83-99.
- Kasper, G. (2006b). Speech acts in interaction: Towards discursive pragmatics. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, J. C. Félix-Brasdefer, & A. Omar (Eds.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Vol. 11* (pp. 281-314). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Kasper, G. (in press). Discourse and socially shared cognition. In J. Cenoz, & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 6. Knowledge about language*. Berlin: Springer.
- Kasper, G., & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 317-334). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kinginger, C. (2000). Learning the pragmatics of solidarity in the networked foreign language classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 23-46). NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kinginger, C., & Belz, J. A. (2005). Socio-cultural perspectives on pragmatic development in foreign language learning: Microgenetic case studies from telecollaboration and

- residence abroad. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2, 369-421.
- Kormos, J. (2006). *Speech production and second language acquisition*. NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Crozet, C. (2001). Acquiring French interactional norms through instruction. In K.R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 125-144). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyster, R. (1994). The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion students' sociolinguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 15, 263-287.
- Maeshiba, N., Yoshinaga, N., Kasper, G., & Ross, S. (1996). Transfer and proficiency in interlanguage apologizing. In S. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 155-187). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Marriott, H. (1993). Acquiring sociolinguistic competence: Australian secondary students in Japan. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 4, 167-192.
- Ohta, A. S. (1995). Applying sociocultural theory to an analysis of learner discourse: Learner-learner collaborative interaction in the zone of proximal development. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 93-121.
- Ohta, A. S. (2005). Interlanguage pragmatics in the zone of proximal development. *System*, 33, 503-517.
- Olshtain, E. (1983). Sociocultural competence and language transfer: The case of apology. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 232-249). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Pallotti, G. (in press). An operational definition of the emergence criterion. *Applied Linguistics*, 27.
- Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning*, 42, 593-616.
- Riggenbach, H. (Ed.). (2000). *Perspectives on fluency*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Rintell, E. (1979). Getting your speech act together: The pragmatic ability of second language learners. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 17, 97-106.
- Rintell, E. (1981). Sociolinguistic variation and pragmatic ability: A look at learners. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 27, 11-34.
- Robinson, M. (1992). Introspective methodology in interlanguage pragmatics research. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as native and target language* (Technical Report #3, pp. 27-82). Honolulu, HI: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Ross, S. (1998). Divergent frame interpretations in Oral Proficiency Interview interaction. In R. Young & A. W. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 333-353). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Röver, C. (2005). *Testing ESL pragmatics*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Safont, M. P. (2005). *Third language learners: Pragmatic production and awareness*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Scarcella, R. (1979). On speaking politely in a second language. In C. A. Yorio, K. Peters, & J. Schachter (Eds.), *On TESOL '79: The learner in focus* (pp. 275-287). Washington, DC: TESOL.

- Scarcella, R. (1983). Discourse accent in second language performance. In S. M. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 306-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schauer, G. A. (2006). Pragmatic awareness in ESL and EFL contexts: Contrast and development. *Language Learning*, 56, 269-318.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 150-171). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). On granularity. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 715-720.
- Schmidt, R. (1983). Interaction, acculturation and the acquisition of communicative competence. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 137-174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schmidt, R. (1992). Psychological mechanisms underlying second language fluency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 357-385.
- Schneider, W., & Shiffrin, R. M. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: 1. Detection, search, and attention. *Psychological Review*, 84, 1-66.
- Schumann, J.H. (1978). The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In R. C. Gringas (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 59-82). New York: Academic Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Selinker, L. (1983). Language transfer. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 33-53). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Siegal, M. (1995). Individual differences and study abroad: Women learning Japanese in Japan. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 225-244). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 356-382.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taguchi, N. (2005). Comprehension of implied meaning in English as a second language. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 543-562.
- Taguchi, N. (2007). Task difficulty in oral speech act production. *Applied Linguistics*, 28, 113-135.
- Taguchi, N. (in press). Development of speed and accuracy in pragmatic comprehension in English as a foreign language. *TESOL Quarterly*.
- Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 189-223.
- Takahashi, S. (2005). Pragmalinguistic awareness: Is it related to motivation and proficiency? *Applied Linguistics*, 26, 90-120.
- Takahashi, S., & Roitblat, H. (1994). Comprehension process of second language indirect requests. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 15, 475-506.
- Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2002). A conversation-analytic study of telephone conversation opening between native and nonnative speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1807-1832.

- Tyler, A. (1995). The coconstruction of cross-cultural miscommunication. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17, 129-152.
- Using conversation-analytic tools to teach pragmatics in the FL classroom. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, J. C. Félix-Brasdefer, & A. Omar (Eds.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Volume 11* (pp.165-196). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Wagner, J. (1996). Foreign language acquisition through interaction: A critical review of research on conversational adjustments. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 215-235.
- Walters, J. (1979). The perception of politeness in English and Spanish. In C. Yorio, K. Perkins, & J. Schachter (Eds.), *On TESOL '79: The learner in focus* (pp. 288-296). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Walters, J. (1980). Grammar, meaning, and sociological appropriateness in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology/Revue Canadienne de Psychologie*, 34, 337-345.
- Wildner-Bassett, M. (1984). *Improving pragmatic aspects of learners' interlanguage*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Wilkes-Gibbs, D. (1997). Studying language use as collaboration. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 238-277). London: Longman.
- Yamashita, S. O. (1996). *Six measures of JSL pragmatics* (Tech. Rep. #14). Honolulu, HI: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii.
- Yoshimi, D. (1999). L1 socialization as a variable in the use of *ne* by L2 learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1513-1525.