Lang. Teach. (2012), **45.1**, 44–63 © Cambridge University Press 2011
doi:10.1017/S0261444811000462

Research Timeline

Interlanguage pragmatics: From use to acquisition to second language pedagogy

Anne Barron Leuphana Universität Lüneburg, Germany
barron@leuphana.de

How do learners use a second language? How do they acquire the conventions of use of the target language (L2)? And how may pragmatic competence in an L2 be taught? Such have been the questions guiding interlanguage pragmatic research in the roughly thirty years of its existence. Succinctly put, research in interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) is, and has been, concerned with, as Kasper & Rose (1999: 81) put it, '. . .the study of non-native speakers' use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic knowledge. . .'.

The present timeline is historical. It traces the path which ILP has taken on its way to tackling these questions by focusing on the key research and benchmark publications which have advanced the field. While the timeline therefore necessarily includes many less recent publications that have shaped the field, it also highlights the position in which ILP finds itself today (cf. also Kasper 2007, 2009, 2010a, b; Alcón Soler & Martínez-Flor 2008; Bardovi-Harlig 2010; Taguchi 2010 for recent overviews). The following four themes dictate the structure of the overview:

A Use and acquisition

1 Operationalisation of pragmatic competence: Focus on production
2 Development of pragmatic competence: Focus on production
3 Transfer
4 Relationship between grammatical and pragmatic competence
5 Role of routines in use and acquisition
6 Influence of context

B Pedagogy

1 Pragmatic instruction
2 Testing
3 Teaching materials

C Social-affective factors
D Appropriateness of an L2 pragmatic norm for learners

The rightmost column in the timeline shows which themes are referenced in each particular study.

The first theme (A) is use and acquisition, the core of ILP. The six sub-topics listed are the issues that have dominated and continue to dominate the discussion. A prominent feature of ILP research has, for instance, been the almost routine operationalisation of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pragmatic competence on the level of the speech act, and primarily on the level of the individual speech act in isolation. The publications chosen for the sub-theme A1 are those which have showed new directions in operationalisation, via, for instance, a focus on the pragmalinguistic resources for realising illocutions, on speech act sequences or on discourse structure. The second sub-theme (A2), the development of pragmatic competence, traces the sluggish beginnings of research on acquisition in ILP. Indeed, ILP was long characterised by a focus on use rather than acquisition, but recent years have seen progress in this area. Both of these initial sub-themes (A1 and A2) focus on learner production only, given the constraints of the present overview and the fact that the focus of ILP research has been primarily on production rather than on comprehension (see, for example, Kasper 2007, 2010b: 141–143 for a brief overview of pragmatic comprehension focusing on both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic issues).

The second theme (B) is dedicated to pedagogy, reflecting recent advances in how learners can be taught to 'do things with words' in an L2 (Austin 1962) and how such knowledge can, in turn, be tested. The final two topics trace the research on issues which have been gaining in importance, namely the effect of social-affective factors on the use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence (C) and the appropriateness of proposing and employing an L2 native speaker pragmatic norm for learners. While the issue of norms has been discussed in the literature to some degree since the mid-1990s, research on the effect of individual factors is currently in its infancy, despite its firm place in research in second language acquisition (SLA). However, judging from the recent and recurring calls for such research and also the initial awakenings in the area, it would seem to be a research area with much potential.

References

Alcón Soler, E. & A. Martínez-Flor (2008). Pragmatics in foreign language contexts. In E. Alcón Soler & A. Martínez-Flor (eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 3–21.

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

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2010). Exploring the pragmatics of interlanguage pragmatics: Definition by design. In A. Trosborg (ed.), 219–259.

Kasper, G. (2007). Pragmatics in second language learning: Current developments. *Foreign Languages in China* 111, 6, 17–25.

Kasper, G. (2009). L2 pragmatic development. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (eds.), *New handbook of second language acquisition*. Leeds: Emerald, 259–295.

Kasper, G. (2010a). Interlanguage pragmatics. In L. Cummings (ed.), *The pragmatics encyclopedia*. London: Routledge, 231–234.

Kasper, G. (2010b). Interlanguage pragmatics. In M. Fried, J.-O. Östman & J. Veschueren (eds.), *Variation and change. Pragmatic perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 141–154.

Kasper, G. & K. R. Rose (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 19, 81–104.

Taguchi, N. (2010). Longitudinal studies in interlanguage pragmatics. In A. Trosborg (ed.), 333–361.

Trosborg, A. (ed.) (2010). *Pragmatics across languages and cultures*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

ANNE BARRON is Professor of English Linguistics at the Leuphana University of Lüneburg, Germany. Her research in interlanguage pragmatics examines the development of pragmatic competence in a foreign language and also the pedagogical implications of pragmatic findings; in the area of intercultural and intracultural communication, her focus has been on speech acts and genres in the varieties of English and in German. She is author of *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics* (John Benjamins, 2003) and co-editor with Klaus P. Schneider of *The pragmatics of Irish English* (Mouton, 2005) and *Variational pragmatics* (John Benjamins, 2008). She has also published in *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *Journal of Pragmatics*, *System* and *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
1979	Scarcella, R. (1979). On speaking politely in a second language. In C. A. Yorio, K. Perkins & J. Schachter (eds.), *On TESOL '79: The learner in focus.* Washington DC: TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), 275–287.	In this early cross-sectional study, **Scarcella** reported on a study of ten beginners and ten advanced learners of English with Arabic as a first language (L1). The focus was on learners' development of pragmatic and discourse competence in inviting and requesting within the context of videotaped open roleplays. Results revealed learners gradually approximating native speaker uses of most of the speech act realization strategies with increased proficiency. SCHMIDT (1983) took up this focus on development within the framework of a longitudinal study.	**A2**
1980	Walters, J. (1980). Grammar, meaning and sociocultural appropriateness in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 34, 337–345.	**Walters**' study explicitly examined the relationship between the grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic aspects of communicative competence put forward by Canale & Swain (1980).[1] Specifically, he investigated children's interlanguage productive speech act behaviour in four experiments and established that appropriate politeness levels were used, despite incorrect forms. This study was one of the first to examine the relationship between grammatical and pragmatic competence (see also SCHMIDT 1983[2], TROSBORG 1995, BARDOVI-HARLIG & DÖRNYEI 1998 and SALSBURY & BARDOVI-HARLIG 2000).	**A4**
1981	Weydt, H. (1981). Partikeln im Rollenspiel von Deutschen und Ausländern: Eine Pilotstudie. In H. Weydt (ed.), *Partikeln und Deutschunterricht: Abtönungspartikeln für Lerner des Deutschen.* Heidelberg: Groos, 161–166.	In this early study, **Weydt** examined how learners of German used modal particles and how this use correlated with time spent in the target speech community. The focus on modal particles as a pragmalinguistic device contrasted with the general focus on speech acts at the time. In addition, the development focus made this one of the very early studies to investigate the effect of input on the development of L2 pragmatic competence.	**A1, A2, A6**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
1983	Schmidt, R. (1983). Interaction, acculturation, and the acquisition of communicative competence: A case study of an adult. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 137–174.	**Schmidt**'s study of Wes, a Japanese artist living in Hawaii, was the first longitudinal study of pragmatic and discourse competence (the next was that of ELLIS, nine years later). It was designed to test Schumann's (1978)[3] acculturation model. As such, it also investigated the influence of social-affective individual differences, such as integrative or instrumental motivation, on the development of pragmatic ability. The study of individual variation based on such psychological variables has not enjoyed much research interest since, as indeed noted by KASPER & SCHMIDT (1996) and the research dearth remains. However, the topic has been taken up again recently by TAKAHASHI (2005) and KURISCAK (2010). Schmidt's research was also important in the discussion about the relationship between grammatical and pragmatic competence. It provided evidence for the view that they are independent entities, as Wes was shown to use formulas in a manner which provided evidence of pragmatic competence, despite a low level of grammatical competence. A contradictory view was later proposed by researchers such as TROSBORG (1995) and SALISBURY & BARDOVI-HARLIG (2000). Finally, this is one of the few studies to discuss the role of developmental formulas in acquisition. This perspective on formulas contrasts with the sociolinguistic view which examines whether learner formulas are target-like and what factors facilitate their acquisition (cf. WILDNER-BASSETT 1984; MARRIOTT 1995; BARRON 2003). The need to further the study of formulas in developmental research has been brought to the fore by BARDOVI-HARLIG (2006).	**A2, A4, A5, C**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
1983	Olshtain, E. (1983). Sociocultural competence and language transfer: The case of apology. In S. M. Gass & L. Selinker (eds.), *Language transfer in language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 232–249.	This paper was one of the first to look at the extent and type of transfer present in learner productions. The data analysed were the apologies of English and Russian L2 speakers of Hebrew gathered using closed roleplays. In addition, metapragmatic assessment questionnaires were employed. The study also examined whether learners' perceptions of language universality or specificity affected actual performance. The topic of transferability was later discussed in detail by KASPER (1992) and TAKAHASHI (1996).	**A3**
1984	Wildner-Bassett, M. E. (1984). *Improving pragmatic aspects of learners' interlanguage: A comparison of methodological approaches for teaching gambits to advanced learners of English in industry*. Tübingen: Narr.	This is an early study which looks at the effect of a range of methodological approaches on the teaching of L2 pragmatics in the classroom. The focus was on routine formulas and her informants were adult learners of English. Further studies on pragmatic instruction from an observational (POOLE 1992; OHTA 1995) and cognitive perspective (LYSTER 1994) followed. The study took a sociolinguistic perspective on formulas and examined the factors which facilitate their acquisition (see also MARRIOTT 1995, BARRON 2003). This method contrasted with that of SCHMIDT (1983).	**A5, B1**
1989	Blum-Kulka, S., J. House & G. Kasper (eds.). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.	This seminal volume reported on findings from the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realisation Project (CCSARP), a project which investigated the production of requests and apologies from a cross-cultural and interlanguage perspective. It spurred cross-cultural and interlanguage research in a range of speech acts across a variety of languages.	**A**
1990	Bardovi-Harlig, K. & B. S. Hartford (1990). Congruence in native and nonnative conversations: Status balance in the academic advising session. *Language Learning* 40, 467–501.	This is an early paper which examines learner pragmatics in an institutional context. Specifically, research focused on the academic advising session. The informants were native and advanced non-native graduate students, all of whom negotiated with faculty advisors. **Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford** suggest a lack of context-specific pragmatic competence to explain differences between learner and native-speaker interactions in negotiating suggestions. Research within the institutional context continues to play an important role in ILP, as evidenced by BARDOVI-HARLIG (2006). The study was also one of the first to analyse speech acts as communicative acts rather than as isolated utterances. It thus represented a departure in main-line speech act research.	**A1, A6**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
1992	Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning* 42, 593–616.	**Poole** was one of the first of an observational line of studies which investigated the acquisition of L2 pragmatics in instructional settings without intervention. She adopted a language socialisation framework for her analysis of teacher/student interaction in two adult beginner English as a second language (ESL) classes in the USA. The focus was on classroom discourse features and how these encode cultural norms and beliefs. Other observational studies followed from different theoretical approaches (e.g. OHTA 1995). See also LYSTER (1994) for a complementary line of research on the instruction of learner pragmatics from an interventionalist perspective.	**A2, B1**
1992	Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom: A study of two language learners' requests. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 14, 1–23.	**Ellis** took up SCHMIDT's (1983) focus on longitudinal development. He studied the acquisition of ESL requests by two beginners (pre-teens) in the context of naturally-occurring classroom discourse. Findings show that the range of request strategies which the beginners were capable of producing was not L2-like in either the initial or final phases. However, with increasing linguistic proficiency, a gradual increase is recorded in the number of strategies employed. Ellis' focus on the acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence was taken up in later studies (e.g. TROSBORG 1995).	**A2, B1**
1992	Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research* 8, 203–231.	In this overview article, **Kasper** discussed the concept of pragmatic transfer as used in ILP in detail. She introduced the concepts of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic transfer. Later psycholinguistic research on transfer by TAKAHASHI (1996) focused on the conditions for pragmatic transfer. Researchers have also examined the bi-directionality of transfer (BLUM-KULKA & SHEFFER 1993 and more recently SU 2010). A further perspective which views transfer as an interactional event to which participants themselves have to make adjustments has been offered in recent years by conversation analysts (e.g. TALEGHANI-NIKAZM 2002).	**A3**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
1992	Hudson, T., E. Detmer & J. D. Brown (1992). *A framework for testing cross-cultural pragmatics*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.	**Hudson et al.** represented the first large-scale project in the testing of cross-cultural pragmatic competence. These researchers developed a multiple method framework for testing requests, refusals and apologies. The prototypical test also encompassed the social variables of power, social distance and degree of imposition. The reliability and validity of the test formats for measuring L2 pragmatic competence was later tested by YAMASHITA (1996). Testing has not received much attention in the ILP research overall. However, recent developments are seen in ROEVER'S (2005) and COHEN'S (2008) use of technology in testing and in WALTERS' (2007) introduction of conversational analysis (CA) as an approach to testing.	**B2**
1992	Hays, P. R. (1992). Discourse markers and L2 acquisition. In D. Staub & C. Delk (eds.), *The proceedings of the twelfth Second Language Research Forum*. Michigan: Papers in Applied Linguistics, 24–34.	**Hays** looks at a range of discourse markers (e.g. *but*, *and*, *so*, *well*, *you know*) used by Japanese learners of English in their first, second and third years of study. Results suggested a developmental order in the acquisition of discourse markers. By focusing on discourse markers, this early study broadened the focus of ILP from its previous overriding concentration on speech acts. However, although a number of studies have followed which look at learner's use and acquisition of discourse markers (e.g. MÜLLER 2005), the strong focus on speech acts remains.	**A1, A2**
1993	Kasper, G. & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.	**Kasper & Blum-Kulka** was the first edited volume devoted exclusively to the field of ILP. It included articles on several topics central to ILP, such as transfer, the L2 pragmatic norm and also cognitive approaches to ILP.	**A**
1993	Blum-Kulka, S. & H. Sheffer (1993). The metapragmatic discourse of American Israeli families at dinner. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 196–223.	This study of the dinner-time discourse of three bilingual American immigrant families to Israel suggested that the L2 pragmatic norm may cause alterations in the L1 pragmatic norm of individual speakers. This bi-directional line of research on transfer has recently been investigated systematically by SU (2010) for intermediate and advanced EFL learners.	**A3**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
1994	Lyster, R. (1994). The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion students' sociolinguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics* 15, 263–287.	In contrast to POOLE (1992), who investigated the teaching of L2 pragmatics from an observational perspective, this is an early interventional study focusing on the teaching of L2 pragmatics. **Lyster**'s focus was on the acquisition of appropriate choices in the system of French address pronouns. The methodology used included observation and questionnaires for the teachers during the treatment and pre- and immediate post-tests and delayed post-tests for the students. This is recognised as the first study to approach L2 pragmatic instruction from a cognitive perspective. Indeed, following Lyster, interventional research long drew exclusively from cognitive processing theories. See, however, LIDDICOAT & CROZET (2001) on recent developments.	**B1**
1995	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* 6.2, 93–121.	**Ohta**, like POOLE (1992), is an observational study of L2 pragmatic development within the language classroom. It takes recourse to Vygotskyan theory and situated learning theory. The analysis focused on teacher-fronted and pair interaction involving two learners in an intermediate class. Learner-learner activity was shown to be collaborative, resulting in pragmatic gains for both the weaker and stronger learner.	**A2, B1**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
1995	Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics. Requests, complaints, apologies.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.	**Trosborg**'s monograph, focusing on the development of pragmatic competence in requesting, complaining and apologizing by Danish learners of English, represented an important contribution to the study of acquisition in L2 pragmatics. This cross-sectional study used roleplay data and adopted a speech act focus, analyzing the realization strategies and directness levels employed in the illocutions mentioned. In addition, Trosborg took a discourse-oriented perspective based on Sinclair & Coulthard's (1975)[4] framework and analysed the types of moves (initiating moves, responding moves, follow up moves) used. The study also shed light on the relationship between grammar and pragmatics (see also SALSBURY & BARDOVI-HARLIG 2000). It provided evidence for the view that a lack of grammatical competence can restrict a learner's capacity to produce linguistic action, Trosborg's learners being found to use internal modifiers to a greater degree with higher proficiency.	**A1, A2, A4**
1995	Marriott, H. (1995). The acquisition of politeness patterns by exchange students in Japan. In B. F. Freed (ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 197–224.	**Marriott** is an early quantitative longitudinal study which investigated the development of L2 pragmatic competence of eight low proficiency Australian learners of Japanese in the context of a sojourn in the target speech community (Japan). The focus was on students' acquisition of formulas and of honorifics. Marriott finds overgeneralisation of the plain style over time to the exclusion of the honorific style. She explains this with reference to the lack of input and output opportunities of the polite style (see also BARRON 2003 on input and acquisition in the study abroad context).	**A2, A5, A6**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
1995	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*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 225–244.	Viewing language learners in their context of use, this study introduced a novel perspective to ILP by approaching language acquisition as a process of socialisation (cf. DUFON 2006). It also triggered an interest in the influence of identity assertion in L2 pragmatics and a consequent questioning of L2 norms (cf. HOUSE & KASPER 2000). This is a qualitative study of two advanced learners in Japan, specifically upper-middle-class Western women learning Japanese. The analysis showed that speakers construct their identity through language use and behaviour and if they are not comfortable with the identity associated with a particular language form, they are likely to reject it. In addition, this longitudinal study provided a further insight into pragmatic acquisition in the study abroad context (cf. BARRON 2003).	**A6, C, D**
1996	Yamashita, S. O. (1996). *Six measures of JSL pragmatics*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.	**Yamashita** was the first of a number of subsequent investigations to examine the reliability and validity of the testing battery developed by HUDSON et al. (1992). She tested its use for English-speaking students of Japanese as a foreign and second language. The tests were translated into Japanese and slightly modified for this purpose.	**B2**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
1996	Kasper, G. & R. Schmidt (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18.2, 149–169.	In this seminal article on 'developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics', **Kasper & Schmidt** provided a critical overview of interlanguage pragmatic research. They highlighted the overriding focus of the time on language use and highlighted the research gap in acquisitional research. In addition, they also posed the question 'Does type of input make a difference?'. These two questions were the impetus for the subsequent upsurge in research focusing on acquisition (e.g. KASPER & ROSE 2002; ACHIBA 2003; BARRON & WARGA 2007), as well as on the effect of input on acquisition (see, for example, Barron 2003, Barron & Warga 2007 on acquisition in the study abroad context). The authors highlighted the need for research on individual factors. This call has been slower to bear fruit (cf. TAKAHASHI 2005 and KURISCAK 2010). In addition, the role of formulas in the acquisition of pragmatic competence was discussed. This call has recently been taken up BARDOVI-HARLIG (2006). The paper also highlighted the need for research into the effectiveness of instruction (see e.g. LIDDICOAT & CROZET 2001) and how pragmatic competence can be tested. In addition, the role of transfer in acquisition (cf. TAKAHASHI 1996) was discussed, as was the appropriateness of an L2 norm for learners, later taken up by HOUSE & KASPER (2000).	**A2, A3, A6, B1, B2, C, D**
1996	Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18.2, 189–223.	This study is the first and as yet the only study specifically designed to investigate transferability. It investigates the probability with which a particular L1 indirect request strategy will be transferred relative to other strategies. Transferability was operationalised as transferability rate and measured by means of a transferability judgment questionnaire. A further perspective on transfer which views it as an interactional event to which participants themselves have to make adjustments has been offered in recent years by conversation analysts (cf. TALEGHANI-NIKAZM 2002).	**A3**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
1998	Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Z. Dörnyei (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly* 32, 233–259.	This article explicitly investigated the relationship between the development of grammatical competence and pragmatic competence. Specifically, these researchers aimed to determine the role that awareness of input might play in these competencies. Focusing on requests, apologies, suggestions and refusals, **Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei** compared the pragmatic and grammatical awareness of ESL teachers and learners of fifteen different L1s living in the United States with Hungarian and Italian EFL teachers and learners. A detailed methodology, the contextualized pragmatic and grammatical judgment task, was developed for the study. They found both ESL teachers and learners to give pragmatic errors more weight than grammatical errors, whereas both EFL groups did the opposite. That grammatical competence often exceeds pragmatic competence in EFL participants was explained by the fact that learners are more aware of such errors and regard their violation as more serious. Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei suggested that input may be lacking and also that grammatical issues may be overemphasised. A number of follow-up studies have been completed in the meantime (e.g. Niezgoda & Roever 2001;[5] Schauer 2006;[6] Xu et al. 2009).[7]	**A4, A6**
1999	Gass, S. M. & N. Houck (1999). *Interlanguage refusals: A cross-cultural study of Japanese-English*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.	Using roleplays, **Gass & Houck** investigated how Japanese learners of English negotiate refusals in interaction. Their analysis differed from many speech act analyses up to this point in that it examined the sequential organisation of refusals and took both the verbal and non-verbal behaviour of the informants in their roles of speakers and hearers into account. Transfer was also discussed from the perspective of non-verbal communication.	**A1, A3**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
2000	House, J. & G. Kasper (2000). How to remain a nonnative speaker. In C. Riemer (ed.), *Kognitive Aspekte des Lehrens und Lernens von Fremdsprachen. Cognitive aspects of foreign language learning and teaching: Festschrift für Willis J. Edmondson zum 60. Geburtstag.* Tübingen: Narr, 101–118.	In this article, **House & Kasper** continued the discussion of an appropriate norm in ILP. They argued for disregarding the '"difference = deficit" hypothesis' which had long been adhered to in interlanguage pragmatic research up to this point. Instead, they made a case for adopting a descriptive, non-evaluative approach to data.	**D**
2000	Salsbury, T. & K. Bardovi-Harlig (2000). Oppositional talk and the acquisition of modality in L2 English. In B. Swierzbin, F. Morris, M. Anderson, C. Klee & E. Tarone (eds.), *Social and cognitive factors in second language acquisition. Selected proceedings of the 1999 Second Language Research Forum (SLRF).* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 57–76.	This article took up the discussion of the relationship between grammatical and pragmatic competence. In this longitudinal study using conversational production data, **Salsbury & Bardovi-Harlig** showed that grammaticalised expressions of modality, such as 'could' and 'would', emerge later than other lexical forms, such as 'maybe' and 'think', and that these stages of acquisition affected learners' choice of expressions of modality in oppositional talk (disagreements, challenges, denials, accusation, threats and insults). As such, the study supported the view that a lack of grammatical competence can restrict a learner's capacity to produce linguistic action.	**A1, A2, A4**
2001	Rose, K. R. & G. Kasper (eds.) (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.	This edited volume was a timely addition to the research on the instruction of L2 pragmatics in the language classroom. It investigated both the teachability and the assessment of L2 pragmatic competence from a variety of perspectives.	**B1, B2**
2001	Liddicoat, A. J. & C. Crozet (2001). Acquiring French interactional norms through instruction. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 125–144.	**Liddicoat & Crozet** focused on the teaching of exchanges initiated by the 'weekend question' to a group of ten Australian foreign language learners of French. The effect of instruction on this feature was investigated using open roleplays carried out prior to, immediately after and one year after the instruction. The study was one of the first of an increasing number of studies to conduct an interventional study using a socially-grounded theory (cf. HUTH & TALEGHANI-NIKAZM 2006). Prior to this, interventional research had been conducted with recourse to cognitive processing models only (cf. LYSTER 1994).	**B1**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
2002	Kasper, G. & K. R. Rose (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Oxford: Blackwell.	**Kasper & Rose** was the first book dedicated to the acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence. It gave a state-of-the-art overview of research on pragmatic development, the relationship between grammar and pragmatics, learning contexts, the effect of instruction and also individual differences. In so doing, it served as an impulse for further research.	**A2, A4, A6, B1, C**
2002	Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2002). A conversation analytical study of telephone conversation openings between native and nonnative speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34, 1807–1832.	In this study, **Taleghani-Nikazm** adopted conversation analysis (CA) in a cross-cultural investigation of ritual formulas in telephone openings among Iranian NS and German NS. The paper illustrates how sequential misunderstandings occur when Iranian non-native speakers (NNS) employ their own culture-specific conventions when speaking German with German NS. This study was one of the first in ILP to illustrate the potential of CA in understanding interactional misalignments which may ensue as a result of pragmatic transfer on the sequential level of conversation. This line of research continues to gain momentum. KASPER (2006) argued for employing CA in interlanguage analyses of speech acts.	**A1, A3**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
2003	Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics. Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.	This monograph examined the acquisition of the pragmatic competence of thirty-three Irish learners of German over time spent in a study abroad context in the target speech community, Germany. Pragmatic competence was operationalised as competence in requesting, offering and refusing offers and the methodology used included questionnaires, retrospective interviews, assessment questionnaires and background questionnaires. The focus of the analysis was on internal modification and also on the use of formulas. Formulas were analysed as social formulas and target and non-target-like uses identified and their development over time discussed (cf. BARDOVI-HARLIG 2006 on the need to further the study of formulas in developmental research). In addition, **Barron** analysed the discourse structure of offers and refusals of offers from a discourse analytical perspective, an analysis which revealed transfer on the sequential level. Metapragmatic data shed light on the question of the appropriateness of an L2 norm (cf. SIEGAL 1995; HOUSE & KASPER 2000), some learners preferring the L1 over the L2 norm even when interacting in the foreign language. MATSUMURA (2007) (after-effects of study abroad), as well as DUFON (2006) and SHIVELY (2011) (study abroad as socialisation process), offer recent perspectives on the effect of a sojourn in the target speech community.	**A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, D**
2003	Bardovi-Harlig, K. & R. Mahan-Taylor (2003). *Teaching pragmatics*. http://exchanges.state.gov/englishteaching/resforteach/pragmatics.html	**Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor** reacted to the general consensus in the literature that L2 pragmatics can be taught by initiating the development of thirty lesson plans for teaching the pragmatics of English. These were made freely available on the internet. A more recent development in the development of teaching materials for pragmatics is the CARLA web-site (COHEN & ISHIHARA 2005).	**B3**
2003	Achiba, M. (2003). *Learning to request in a second language: A study of child interlanguage pragmatics*. Clevedon: Multinlingual Matters.	**Achiba** is a monograph focusing on the development of child L2 pragmatics. Specifically, this longitudinal study focuses on the pragmatic development in requesting of a seven-year-old Japanese girl over seventeen months spent in the target speech community, Australia. Data include diary-entries and tape-recorded data.	**A2**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
2005	Takahashi, S. (2005). Pragmalinguistic awareness: Is it related to motivation and proficiency? *Applied Linguistics* 26.1, 90–120.	This paper was one of the first to investigate the effect of social-affective factors on intervention in the teaching of L2 pragmatics. Specifically, it examined whether motivation – as well as proficiency – plays a role in Japanese EFL learners' noticing of six types of L2 pragmalinguistic features in implicit pragmatic instruction. Instruments used included a motivation questionnaire, a proficiency test, a noticing-the-gap activity as the treatment task and a retrospective awareness questionnaire (see also KURISCAK 2010).	**B1, C**
2005	Cohen, A. D. & N. Ishihara (2005). A web-based approach to strategic learning of speech acts. Minneapolis, MN: Centre for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA), University of Minnesota, http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/Japanese%20Speech%20Act%20Report%20Rev.%20June05.pdf	**Cohen & Ishihara** reported on a self-access internet site for learners of Japanese (Centre for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA) website). The site included instructional units for five speech acts: requests, refusals, compliments, thanks and apologies. The project also focused on language learning strategies found to be supportive in learning L2 speech acts. Web-based materials have been gaining in currency (see also COHEN 2008).	**B3**
2005	Roever, C. (2005). *Testing ESL pragmatics: Development and validation of a web-based assessment battery*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.	**Roever** took up HUDSON et al.'s (1992) test format and developed and validated a web-based battery of tests designed to examine the pragmalinguistic knowledge of EFL and ESL learners. The focus was on the speech acts of apology, requests and refusals, and on implicatures and routines.	**B2**
2005	Bardovi-Harlig, K. & B. S. Hartford (2005). Institutional discourse and interlanguage pragmatics research. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & B. S. Hartford (eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics: Exploring institutional talk*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 7–36.	This overview article on institutional discourse in ILP, published in an edited volume on the topic, demonstrates the growing importance of the institutional context in its own right in ILP, as well as its status as a useful source of replicable, comparable and authentic data for the field.	**A6**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
2005	Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.	This is one of a small number of interlanguage studies following HAYS (1992) in focusing on discourse markers. Müller investigated the use of discourse markers (*so*, *well*, *you know* and *like*) by German learners of English, based on the retellings and discussion of a short film by American English NS and German learners of English.	**A1**
2006	Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2006). On the role of formulas in the acquisition of L2 pragmatics. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, C. Félix-Brasdefer & A. S. Omar (eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning.* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language, 1–28.	Formulas have been dealt with in ILP research from a developmental perspective and from a sociolinguistic perspective. In this article, however, **Bardovi-Harlig** sketched a research agenda with the aim of systematically investigating the role of formulaic constructions in the development of learner pragmatic competence. This development also adds a new perspective to previous investigations on the relationship between grammar and pragmatics. Recent empirical research has been carried out, for instance, by BARDOVI-HARLIG (2009).	**A4, A5**
2006	Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review* 19, 83–99.	**Kasper** highlights the fact that ILP had long focused on speech acts in isolation. She puts forward a case for employing a CA approach in ILP given that CA can help to explain how occasions for learning develop in interaction. In addition, CA facilitates researchers in identifying that which is relevant to participants in interaction. The CA methodology has also been employed in L2 pragmatic teaching (HUTH & TALEGHANI-NIKAZM 2006).	**A1**
2006	Dufon, M. A. (2006). The socialization of taste during study abroad in Indonesia. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 91–119.	**DuFon**'s study of the socialisation of taste by learners of Indonesian during a sojourn in the target speech community examined the residence abroad as a socialisation process using diary data and ethnographic methods. In so doing, it represented an early investigation adopting a language socialisation perspective on research into the effect of a stay abroad, a perspective which has since gained currency (cf. SHIVELY 2011). Prior to this, most research into context had not focused on data collected within the actual learning context itself, but rather on data which had been collected under experimental conditions.	**A2, A6**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
2006	Huth, T. & C. Taleghani-Nikazm (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research* 10, 53–79.	**Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm**, like LIDDICOAT & CROZET (2001), adopted CA in an interventional study of learner pragmatics, an area in which cognitive approaches long reigned. Their learners, American learners of German, were provided with naturally-occurring instances of L2 social interactions based on CA findings. The focus of the analysis was on complimenting behaviour, and pointed to the effectiveness of teaching L2 conversational sequences in heightening L2 learners' cultural awareness. However, negotiating cross-cultural differences remained a problem, as did learners' desire to reveal their own cultural identity.	**A1, B1, D**
2007	Barron, A. & M. Warga (eds.) (2007). Acquisitional pragmatics in foreign language learning. Special Issue. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4.2, 113–118.	This special issue focused on the acquisition of pragmatic L2 competence by foreign language learners. The six empirical studies included looked at the acquisition of certain speech acts in a variety of L2s using a range of methodologies. The focus was on the effect of proficiency and the influence of context (study abroad) on acquisition.	**A2, A4, A6**
2007	Walters, F. S. (2007). A conversation-analytic hermeneutic rating protocol to assess L2 oral pragmatic competence. *Language Testing* 24, 155–183.	This paper reported on a pilot test employing CA as a basis for testing ESL oral pragmatic competence. The study centred on two raters trained in CA. These applied a holistic rubric to responses on a test of oral pragmatic competence. Despite not attaining statistical reliability, the CA approach to testing was found to be useful.	**A1, B2**
2007	Taguchi, N. (2007). Task difficulty in oral speech act production. *Applied Linguistics* 28, 113–135.	This experimental study introduced SLA research on task difficulty to research on interlanguage speech act productions. **Taguchi**, by investigating the conditions which may facilitate or impede learner productions, pioneered an innovative process approach to speech act productions. The empirical study examines requests and refusals produced in a roleplay by native speakers of English and Japanese students of English at two proficiency levels. Productions were investigated for overall appropriateness, planning time and speech rate.	**A1, A2**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
2007	Matsumura, S. (2007). Exploring the aftereffects of study abroad on interlanguage pragmatic competence. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4.2, 167–192.	**Matsumura** was one of the first studies to explore the after-effects of a study abroad period on learners' pragmatic competence. Specifically, the study investigated changes in the perceptions of advice-giving expressions of fifteen Japanese learners of English following a period of study abroad. To this end, a questionnaire was distributed one month, six months and one year following informants' return to the L1 community.	**A2, A6**
2008	Cohen, A. D. (2008). Teaching and assessing L2 pragmatics: What can we expect from learners? *Language Teaching* 41.2, 213–235.	In this article, **Cohen** introduces a project on the CARLA website focusing on the use of a virtual online environment (*Croquelandia*), a means of assessing Spanish pragmatics.	**B2**
2009	Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2009). Conventional expressions as a pragmalinguistic resource: Recognition and production of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning* 59, 755–795.	This study takes up BARDOVI-HARLIG'S (2006) call for a systematic approach to the role of formulas in L2 pragmatic acquisition. Specifically, the paper examines whether learners' low use of formulaic expressions is due to aural recognition. An aural recognition task and an oral production task were employed, and findings revealed recognition to be a necessary but not sufficient condition, it being just one of a number of factors influencing production.	**A5**
2010	Kuriscak, L. M. (2010). The effect of individual-level variables on speech act performance. In A. Martínez-Flor & E. Usó-Juan (eds.), *Speech act performance. Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 23–40.	**Kuriscak** addresses the dearth of research highlighted by KASPER & SCHMIDT (1996) on the effect of individual factors on interlanguage pragmatic competence and provides an overview of the effect of personality (extraversion), aptitude and motivation on learner productions.	**C**
2010	Su, I. (2010). Transfer of pragmatic competence. *The Modern Language Journal* 94, 87–102.	**Su**'s study is specifically focused on the bi-directionality of transfer at the pragmatic level. Using a discourse completion task (DCT), her informants, intermediate and advanced Chinese EFL learners, were found to produce more conventionally indirect requests in their L1 than other speakers of Chinese, due to the greater directness of requests in English.	**A3**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000462 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEMES
2011	Shively, R. L. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 1818–1835.	This longitudinal study focused on the influence of explicit instruction on learners' openings and requests in naturally-occurring data. As such, it was one of the first studies to investigate the effect of pre-departure instruction on a study abroad period. Data was gathered from seven undergraduate students and the informants made naturalistic audio recordings of themselves interacting in service encounters on three occasions during this time. Further data included weekly journals and interviews. **Shively**, in her analysis, continued the tradition started by such researchers as DUFON (2006), taking the influence of language socialisation on interlanguage pragmatic competence into consideration.	**A1, A2, A6, B1**
2011	Bardovi-Harlig, K. & M.-T. Bastos (2011). Proficiency, length of stay, and intensity of interaction, and the acquisition of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 8.3, 347–384.	**Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos** provided a new perspective on the influence of context on the acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence. Rather than simply investigating the influence of length of stay in the L2 speech community, these researchers included a further variable: the intensity of interaction during a sojourn. Using a methodology involving an aural recognition task with conventionalised expressions, a production task yielding formulaic speech act realisations, and a background questionnaire, they revealed that the intensity of interaction had a significant effect on the recognition and production of conventional expressions. Length of stay, on the other hand, was shown to have no significant effect on either recognition or production.	**A2, A5, A6**

[1] Canale, M. & M. Swain (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1.1, 1–47.

[2] Authors' names are shown in small capitals when the study referred to appears in this timeline.

[3] Schumann, J. H. (1978). Second language acquisition: The pidginization hypothesis. In E. Hatch (ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 256–271.

[4] Sinclair, J. M. & R. M. Coulthard (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.

[5] Niezgoda, K. & C. Roever (2001). Pragmatic and grammatical awareness: A function of the learning environment? In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 63–79.

[6] Schauer, G. A. (2006). Pragmatic awareness in ESL and EFL context: Contrast and development. *Language Learning* 56, 269–318.

[7] Xu, W., R. E. Casea & Y. Wang (2009). Pragmatic and grammatical competence, length of residence, and overall L2 proficiency. *System* 37, 205–216.