Chapter 4

Measuring L2 pragmatic development in the study abroad context

Todd A. Hernández

Marquette University

Although it is often assumed that study abroad (SA) provides an ideal environment for second language (L2) pragmatic development, research has demonstrated that students' lack of consistent exposure to the target language imposes limitations on such development (Barron 2003, Kasper & Rose 2002, Shively 2010). Further, studies have found that even highly motivated SA are often unaware of how to take full advantage of the SA environment to strategically develop their pragmatic competence (Cohen & Shively 2007, Hernández 2016, Shively 2010). Given this background information, it is clear that programs must develop reliable models for assessing the effects of the SA experience on pragmatic development and other L2 outcomes as well.

I begin this chapter with an overview of pragmatic competence in the SA context. This chapter then focuses on methods of assessing L2 pragmatic development in SA environments. I review and provide examples of research that employs a wide range of assessment methods, from discourse completion tasks (DCTs) and controlled production tasks to role-plays and more open-ended production tasks and naturalistic data. In addition, retrospective verbal reports, language contact profiles, and journal entries are discussed as tools that can inform and improve SA participants' learning. I then discuss studies that have assessed the impact of pedagogical intervention on SA students' L2 pragmatic development. I conclude this chapter with a discussion of the implications of SA assessment of pragmatic development and outline directions for future research.

1 Introduction

Pragmatic competence, a core feature of communicative competence and a central goal of foreign language instruction (Bachman & Palmer 1996, Canale &

Swain 1980), refers to "one's knowledge of linguistics, norms, and social conventions, and one's ability to use these knowledge bases in a socially-bound interaction" (Taguchi 2015: 1). Second language (L2) learners interested in achieving native-like competence in a target language must acquire two distinct yet related knowledge bases: pragmalinguistic knowledge, or knowledge of the specific forms and linguistic strategies involved in the performance of a speech act (e.g., how to refuse an invitation), and sociopragmatic knowledge, or knowledge of the social norms of a culture and how they influence interactional patterns (Thomas 1983).

Study abroad (SA), a formal educational experience by a student in a target language country, is often considered an ideal context for L2 pragmatic development because it has the potential to provide SA learners with access to large amounts of input and interaction with native speakers (Hernández 2010, Ren 2018, Vande Berg et al. 2012). SA is "characterized by an uninstructed (i.e., implicit) component that may or may not combine with an instructed (i.e., explicit) component" (Sanz 2014: 1). More than in the foreign language classroom, L2 learners have frequent opportunities during SA to use the target language to perform a wide range of speech acts or communicative functions (e.g., apologies, compliments, requests, refusals) that have real-world consequences (Shively 2011). Although previous research has shown that SA has a positive impact on L2 pragmatic development for some learners, there is considerable individual variation in outcomes (e.g., Barron 2006, Bataller 2010, Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker 2015, Hernández 2018b, Shively & Cohen 2008). SA assessment research has identified several factors that contribute to this variation: "quantity and quality of contact with the L2, length of stay, living situation, density of L2 speaking social networks, and individual characteristics (e.g., proficiency, motivation, gender, age, identity, dispositions)" (Pérez Vidal & Shively 2019: 355). Learner agency has also been proposed as having an influence on L2 pragmatic development (LoCastro 2003, 2012). That is, SA learners may choose not to adopt target pragmatic norms when the norms contradict their social identity (e.g., Bataller 2010). Finally, the fact that SA students often do not receive corrective feedback from native speakers about pragmatics and are thus frequently unaware that their language use does not conform to host culture norms represents yet another challenge to L2 pragmatic development in the SA context (Hernández & Boero 2018b, Shively 2010).

This chapter offers an overview of studies that have measured L2 pragmatic development in the SA context. The first section discusses several assessment methods that have been employed to measure SA participants' pragmatic competence. A review of the existing literature on uninstructed and instructed L2

pragmatic development follows. Some suggested avenues of future research are then given.

2 Data collection methods for assessing L2 pragmatic competence in SA

Given the social nature of pragmatic competence, one of the challenges researchers face in measuring pragmatic knowledge concerns collecting data "that closely reflects L2 learners' language use in social contexts" (Taguchi 2018: 7). While experimental data are often criticized for their lack of authenticity, a disadvantage of naturalistic data is their lack of generalizability or comparability (Taguchi 2018, Taguchi & Roever 2017). Data collection methods commonly used to assess SA participants' L2 pragmatic competence include: written discourse completion tasks (DCTs) (e.g., Cohen & Shively 2007, Hernández 2016, 2018a, Hernández & Boero 2018a, Shively & Cohen 2008); oral DCTs (ODCTs; e.g., Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker 2015, Halenko 2018, Hernández 2021, Taguchi et al. 2016) and multimedia elicitation tasks (METs; e.g., Schauer 2004); role-plays (e.g., Bataller 2010, Hernández 2018b, Woodfield 2012); audio recordings of tasks performed abroad (e.g., Hernández & Boero 2018a, Morris 2017); journal entries (e.g., Dufon 1999, Hernández 2018b, Shively 2011); naturalistic data (e.g., Dufon 1999, Shively 2011, 2015); retrospective verbal reports (RVRs; e.g., Hernández 2018a, Ren 2014, Woodfield 2012); and native speaker perceptions of pragmatic appropriateness (e.g., Cohen & Shively 2007, Hernández 2016, 2018a, 2021, Hernández & Boero 2018a, Li 2014, Shively & Cohen 2008, Taguchi 2011).

DCTs, sometimes referred to as written production questionnaires, have been one of the most frequently used methods to measure L2 pragmatic development in the SA context (Félix-Brasdefer 2010, Taguchi 2018). Because DCTs are an indirect measure of pragmatic speaking ability, the data do not necessarily reflect what participants would actually say in a particular situation. Instead, this assessment method measures what they think that they would say (Golato 2003, Shively & Cohen 2008). Nevertheless, the DCT format offers several advantages compared to other similar measures, as outlined by Shively & Cohen (2008) and affirmed by other researchers:

- the written format of the DCT allows for the inclusion of a large number of participants;

- data elicited by all SA participants from the same instrument facilitate pretest to posttest comparisons;

- this method allows the researcher/practitioner to manipulate sociolinguistic variables (e.g., participants, context, social distance, and imposition) to measure how such factors may influence L2 learners' speech act production in different situations (Kasper & Rose 2002, Taguchi 2018, Taguchi & Roever 2017);

- the written DCT is less time-consuming than gathering naturally-occurring data or employing role-plays. Similarly, a greater number of speech act scenarios can be included in a DCT (Taguchi 2018).

Table 1 provides a description of the request scenarios that appeared in Shively & Cohen's (2008) DCT. As the authors indicate, each scenario captures social and situational variation based on three factors: social status, social distance, and degree of imposition. The scenarios themselves also provide important background information about the setting, topic, interlocutor relationships, and the goal of the interaction (Taguchi 2018).

Shively & Cohen's (2008) DCT used a multiple-rejoinder approach requiring the students to fill in the blanks of a dialogue that contained several responses from an interlocutor. The following is a sample request scenario adapted from their study:

Paper Extension: You find a great bargain airfare for this weekend only, which you want to make use of in order to visit good friends in a somewhat distant city. In order to take advantage of this deal, you need to ask your professor, Dr. Rodríguez, for an extension on a paper that you were going to work on this weekend, and which is due next week.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Mira, es que creo que ya tuviste mucho tiempo para trabajar en este proyecto durante el fin de semana. No deberías haber esperado hasta el último momento para terminarlo.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Lo siento, pero no puedo darte más tiempo para entregar este trabajo. No creo que ir a visitar a unos amigos sea una buena excusa para pedir más tiempo.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Bueno, la verdad es que no me gusta hacer este tipo de cosas.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Bueno, está bien, pero solamente esta vez.

Table 1: Description of Shively & Cohen's (2008) request scenarios on their DCT

Vignette	Social status	Social distance	Degree of imposition
Speak Slower: A student asks a professor to speak slower because they cannot understand him.	High	Mid	Mid
Paper Extension: A student asks a professor for an extension on a paper so that they can visit friends.	High	Mid	Mid
Airplane Seat: A student asks an older passenger to change seats with his or her friend.	High	High	High
Less Food: A student asks a host mother to give him less food for dinner.	High	Low	Low
Leaving for School: A student asks a 15-year old host sister to get ready earlier so that they can continue walking to school together without the student arriving late.	Low	Low	High

Role-plays are the second assessment method. Similar to DCTs, role-plays allow for the manipulation of social variables while eliciting spoken data through simulated interactions between two or more interlocutors who act out predefined roles (Félix-Brasdefer 2010, Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker 2017, Kasper 2000). Considered a more valid assessment tool for measuring L2 learners' pragmatic competence than DCTs, this method has gained increasing interest because it allows participants to engage in real-time negotiation and interaction (Bataller 2010, Bataller & Shively 2011). In addition, intonation, repetition, pauses, listener responses, and turn-taking are important pragmatic features of natural speech that can be captured with role-play data (Turnbull 2001). In terms of use, the

participant reads a description of a situation and is asked to respond as if she or he were in that real situation. Role-plays consist of two types: closed and open (Kasper & Dahl 1991). In a closed role-play, the participant responds to a situation with one turn, and without a response from the interlocutor. In an open role-play, while the roles of the interlocutors are specified, the participant may use as many turns as he or she needs to complete the situation.

Although traditional DCTs provide a written description of the setting, the speakers, and the goal of the interaction, they have often been criticized for lacking the extralinguistic features (e.g., gestures or personal distance) that one would expect when performing a speech act in the real world (Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker 2017, Rockey et al. 2020). To address this issue, some researchers have designed computer-based ODCTs or METs that offer rich audiovisual and contextual information in the situation prompt (e.g., Culpeper et al. 2018, Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker 2017, Schauer 2004). As such, ODCTs better simulate authentic interactions than traditional DCTs or written production questionnaires (Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker 2015, Halenko 2018, Hernández 2021, Ren 2014, 2019, Taguchi et al. 2016). Schauer's (2004) MET, consisting of 16 scenarios focusing on requests, controlled the timing and nature of the audio and visual input provided to participants through a computer-based presentation format. Similarly, Schauer's (2009) MET controlled for interlocutor effects (e.g., tone of voice). In a UK-based SA program for ESL learners, Halenko (2018) employed an ODCT to assess the effects of pragmatic instruction on learners' ability to formulate English apologies. The scenarios featured a range of animated interlocutors and problems which the learners had to address by responding in single turn interactions. In a similar study, Hernández (2021) employed an ODCT consisting of five situations to measure the effects of a pedagogical intervention on SA participants' Spanish apologies. Figure 1 shows one of the ODCT scenarios from Hernández (2021). The scenario itself was adapted from Shively & Cohen's (2008) DCT.

Naturalistic audio recordings, the fourth assessment method, have also been employed to measure L2 pragmatic development in the SA context (Bataller & Shively 2011, Dings 2014, Dufon 1999, Shively 2011, 2013, 2015). Shively's (2011) SA participants made audio recordings of themselves while participating in service encounter interactions with service providers in Spain. In advocating for the use of naturalistic data for L2 pragmatics research, the author suggested that the service encounters analyzed had real-life interactional and psychological consequences. Similarly, according to Bataller & Shively (2011), naturally occurring data better capture how SA students interact in real-life encounters than do role-plays or production questionnaires. Although naturalistic data might represent

During an elegant dinner with a friend's family in Spain you accidentally spill your glass of red wine on the tablecloth. You want to apologize to your friend's mother. She is about 45 years old and you have not met her before.

Figure 1: ODCT scenario from Hernández (2021)

a more valid measure of SA students' pragmatic competence than other methods, several practice challenges exist in their application (e.g., comparability and unpredictability of data; time-consuming nature of data collection).

RVRs, the fifth assessment method, consist of obtaining verbal reports from a learner after completion of a task while information is still available in the learner's short-term memory (Félix-Brasdefer 2010). This procedure provides insights into the cognitive processes that learners employ while performing a task, such as information on their planning of a speech act, their language of thought, and their choice of language forms (Ren 2014, Woodfield 2012). RVRs are considered by some as essential for determining speech act performance because "one may learn what the respondents actually perceived about each situation (e.g., what they perceived about the relative role status of the interlocutors) and how their perceptions influenced their responses" (Cohen 2004: 321). Woodfield (2012) employed RVRs to investigate the perceptions of SA students with regard to their performance of two role-plays eliciting status-equal and status-unequal requests. The RVRs indicated that the students paid attention to linguistic form, sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic knowledge, and politeness. The RVRs also suggested that it was often difficult for students to select appropriate forms to meet the goal of their interactions. Based on these findings, Woodfield concluded that RVRs help reveal learners' current sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic knowledge while informing researchers of the linguistic difficulties that learners face during speech act production.

Shifting to the sixth assessment method, some researchers have also employed native speaker perceptions of appropriateness as a measure of L2 learners' pragmatic competence (e.g., Halenko 2018, Hernández 2016, 2018a, 2021, Hernández & Boero 2018a, Li 2014, Shively & Cohen 2008, Taguchi 2011). Taguchi (2006) defined pragmatic appropriateness as "the knowledge of the conventions of com-

munication in a society, as well as linguistic abilities that enable learners to communicate successfully" (2006: 513). Criteria often used to assess appropriateness have included aspects of language use, level of formality, directness, politeness, word choice, and grammar (Taguchi 2011). Table 2 shows the appropriateness rating scale for requests designed by Shively & Cohen (2008) and subsequently used by Hernández (2016, 2018a) and Hernández & Boero (2018a). The reader interested in the speech act of apologies is directed to Shively & Cohen (2008) for that rating scale.

Table 2: Shively & Cohen's (2008) pragmatic appropriateness rating scale for requests

Rating	Descriptor
5	I would happily comply with the speaker's request.
4	I would comply with the speaker's request, but somewhat reluctantly.
3	I would comply with the speaker's request, but reluctantly.
2	I would comply with the speaker's request, but only very reluctantly.
1	I would not want to comply with the speaker's request.

SA participants' journal entries, the seventh assessment method, have been used in several studies to investigate L2 learners' developing awareness of pragmatic norms (e.g., Dufon 1999, Hernández 2018b, Shively 2011). As the eighth and final assessment method described in this chapter, audio recordings of tasks performed during the SA program have the potential to provide formative feedback to SA students and thereupon enhance their language acquisition. In Hernández & Boero (2018a), participants were given tasks designed to strategically develop their pragmatic competence. Task performance was assessed by the researchers and explicit feedback was given to the L2 learners "to draw their attention to mismatches between their language use and pragmatic choices and those of the host culture" (2018a: 396). DCTs have been one of the most frequently used methods to assess L2 pragmatic development in SA contexts for their ease of administration and ability to manipulate contextual variables (Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker 2017, Rockey et al. 2020). To address some of the disadvantages of this instrument, researchers have begun to adopt other methods for evaluating pragmatic competence, such as role-plays, ODCTs, and naturalistic data, among others. Each also has its advantages and disadvantages. This chapter now shifts to a discussion of uninstructed and instructed L2 pragmatic development in SA.

3 Uninstructed L2 pragmatic development in SA

Although studies on the development of pragmatic competence in the SA context have tended to focus on the investigation of speech acts (Kasper & Dahl 1991, Ren 2018), other areas have also been researched: address forms (e.g., Dufon 1999, Hassall 2013, 2015a,b); conversational style (e.g., Cordella 1996); humor (Shively 2013); interactional competence (e.g., Dings 2014, Masuda 2011, Shively 2015, 2016, Taguchi 2014a); impoliteness (Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker 2017); conversational implicature (e.g., Taguchi 2008a,b); and pragmatic routines (e.g., Alcón-Soler & Sánchez Hernández 2017, Osuka 2014). Table 3 lists all existing research concerning uninstructed L2 pragmatic development during SA, published 1996 to 2021. Studies are organized by eight pragmatic features. Of these, the eighth, speech acts, is further subdivided into ten individual speech acts. For each study, the table presents author information (in alphabetical order), the target language, assessment methods employed by the researcher(s), and the duration of the SA program.

Table 3: Studies on uninstructed pragmatic development in SA

Authors	Lang.	Assessment method	SA prog. dur.
Pragmatic Feature 1: *Address forms*			
Dufon (1999)	Ind	Naturalistic audio, recordings, DCT, journals	Semester
Barron (2006)	Ger	DCT	1 year
Hassall (2013)	Ind	DCT, journals, interviews	6 weeks
Hassall (2015a)	Ind	DCT, journals, interviews	6 weeks
Hassall (2015b)	Ind	DCT, journals, interviews	6 weeks
Kinginger (2008)	Fre	Language awareness interviews, journals, observations, role-plays	Semester
Pragmatic Feature 2: *Conventional expressions*			
Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos (2011)	Eng	Recognition and production tasks, language contact questionnaire	Different lengths
Pragmatic Feature 3: *Conversational implicature*			
Taguchi (2008a)	Eng	Pragmatic comprehension and lexical tests, language contact questionnaire	4 months
Taguchi (2008b)	Eng	Listening task, language contact questionnaire	5–7 weeks

Authors	Lang.	Assessment method	SA prog. dur.
Pragmatic Feature 4: *Conversational style*			
Cordella (1996)	Spa	ODCT	Semester
Iwasaki (2008)	Jpn	Oral proficiency interviews	1 year
Pragmatic Feature 5: *Humor*			
Bell et al. (2014)	Eng	Informal conversations	10–12 months
Kinginger (2015)	Chi	Field notes, interviews, audio recordings	Summer
Shively (2013)	Spa	Naturalistic audio recordings	Semester
Pragmatic Feature 6: *Impoliteness*			
Félix-Brasdefer & McKinnon (2017)	Spanish	Impoliteness events	Semester
Pragmatic Feature 7: *Interactional competence*			
Dings (2014)	Spa	Audio recordings	1 year
Ishida (2010)	Jpn	Naturalistic audio recordings	1 year
Masuda (2011)	Jpn	Audio recordings	6 weeks
Shively (2015, 2016)	Spa	Naturalistic audio recordings	Semester
Taguchi (2014a)	Jpn	Audio recorded conversations	12 weeks
Pragmatic Feature 8: *Speech acts*			
Apologies			
Barron (2019)	Ger	Corpus linguistics	10 months
DiBartolomeo et al. (2019)	Spanish	ODCT	
Hernández (2018a)	Spa	DCT	4 weeks
Kondo (1997)	Eng	DCT	1 year
Schauer (2006, 2009)[a]	Eng	Video and questionnaire task	9 months
Shively & Cohen (2008)	Spa	DCT, language contact questionnaire	Semester
Warga & Schölmberger (2007)	Fre	DCT	10 months

Authors	Lang.	Assessment method	SA prog. dur.
Compliments			
Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker (2015)	Spa	ODCT	8 weeks
Fukasawa (2012)	Eng	ODCT	5 months
Hoffman-Hicks (1999)	Fre	DCT	16 months
Conventional and nonconventional speech acts			
Taguchi et al. (2016)	Chi	ODCT	3 months
Giving advice			
Matsumura (2001, 2003)		Judgment task	1 year
Gratitude			
Cheng (2005)		DCT	Different lengths
De Pablos Ortega (2008)	Spa	Questionnaire	3 months
Greetings and leave-takings			
Hoffman-Hicks (1999)	Fre	DCT	16 months
Kinginger (2008)	Fre	Language awareness, interviews, journals, observations, role-plays	Semester
Offers			
Barron (2003, 2007)	Ger	DCT, RVRs, questionnaire	1 year
Opinions			
Taguchi (2011)	Eng	ODCT	Cross-sectional
Refusals			
Barron (2003, 2007)	Ger	DCT, RVRs, questionnaire	1 year

Authors	Lang.	Assessment method	SA prog. dur.
Félix-Brasdefer (2004)	Spa	Role-plays, RVRs	1–30 months
Félix-Brasdefer (2013)	Spa	Role-plays, RVRs	8 weeks
Ren (2013)	Eng	ODCT	1 year
Ren (2014)	Eng	ODCT	10 months
Schauer (2006, 2009)	Eng	Video and questionnaire task	9 months
Requests			
Barron (2003, 2006)	Ger	DCT	1 year
Bataller (2010)	Spa	Role-plays	Semester
Shively (2011)	Spa	Role-plays, naturalistic data	Semester
Cole & Anderson (2001)	Eng	DCT	10 months
Czerwionka & Cuza (2017b)		ODCT, judgment task	6 weeks
Czerwionka & Cuza (2017a)		ODCT	6 weeks
Han (2005)	Eng	ODCT	5 months to 5 years
Hernández (2016)	Spa	DCT, language contact questionnaire	4 weeks
Li (2014)	Chi	ODCT	Semester
Magnan & Back (2006)	Fre	Role-plays	Semester
Ren (2019)	Chi	Role-plays	Cross-sectional
Rodríguez (2001)	Spa	Judgment task, RVRs	Semester
Schauer (2004)	Eng	MET/ODCT	1 year
Schauer (2006, 2009)	Eng	Video and questionnaire task	9 months
Schauer (2007)	Eng	MET/ODCT	9 months
Shively & Cohen (2008)	Spa	DCT, language contact questionnaire	Semester
Taguchi (2011)	Eng	ODCT	Cross-sectional
Vilar Beltrán (2014)	Eng	DCT, questionnaire	Differentn lengths
Woodfield (2012)	Eng	Role-plays, RVRs	Semester

Authors	Lang.	Assessment method	SA prog. dur.
Suggestions			
Schauer (2006, 2009)	Eng	Video and questionnaire tasks	9 months
Pragmatic Feature 9: *Pragmatic routines*			
Alcón-Soler & Sánchez Hernández (2017)	Eng	DCT	Semester
Osuka (2014)	Eng	ODCT	Semester
Roever (2012)	Eng	Web-based multiple choice	Different lengths
Taguchi (2014b)	Jpn	ODCT	Different lengths

[a] While Schauer (2006, 2009) focused on perception of appropriateness of requests in English, apologies, refusals, and suggestions were also investigated.

4 Development of receptive pragmatic competence in SA

This section provides an overview of studies that have investigated L2 learners' development of receptive pragmatic competence in SA programs. SA participants made gains in their comprehension of leave-taking expressions (e.g., *Au revoir.* 'Goodbye') and address forms in French (Kinginger 2008), recognition of routine pragmatic formulae in English (Alcón-Soler & Sánchez Hernández 2017, Roever 2012) and Japanese (Osuka 2014), and perception of speech acts in English (Vilar Beltrán 2014, Schauer 2006, 2009). In addition, increased pragmatic awareness regarding Spanish requests has also been observed (Czerwionka & Cuza 2017b, Rodríguez 2001). Rodríguez's (2001) investigation is particularly interesting because the author compared SA students with "at-home" learners over the course of a semester. Although data collected from a judgment task and RVRs demonstrated that both groups of learners improved their receptive ability of requests, no significant differences were found between the two groups. In another study on the acquisition of receptive skills, Taguchi (2008a,b) found that ESL learners' gains in speed of comprehension of conversational implicatures over five months abroad were associated with self-reported language contact. Similarly, in Matsumura's (2001) study, the improvements ESL learners made in their choice of appropriate advice-giving expressions were attributed to the amount of self-reported exposure to English. Meanwhile, Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos (2011) found

that self-reported language contact had a positive effect on learners' recognition and production of conventional expressions in L2 English. Length of residence, on the other hand, had no effect. The authors concluded that the quality of social contact while abroad was more important than length of residence when it comes to the development of conventional expressions.

5 Development of productive pragmatic competence in SA

As shown in Table 4, requests are the most investigated speech act in research on uninstructed L2 pragmatic development during SA (e.g., Bataller 2010, Han 2005, Hernández 2016, Shively & Cohen 2008). Researchers have examined other speech acts as well (e.g., Félix-Brasdefer 2004, 2013, Hernández 2018a, Hoffman-Hicks 1999, Schauer 2006, Schauer 2009). Employing the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project Coding Manual (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989) and Brown & Levinson's (1987) politeness theory as frameworks, several researchers have looked at how SA participants use (in)direct strategies, internal and external mitigation, formulas, semantic strategies, and deictic orientation in their speech acts before and after the SA program.

Regarding apologies, some researchers have reported gains during SA (Warga & Schölmberger 2007), whereas others have found little development of this particular speech act (e.g., Hernández 2018a, Kondo 1997, Shively & Cohen 2008). One finding is conclusive: consistent with what has been observed for other areas of L2 learners' pragmatic competence, the development of SA participants' apologies is subject to significant individual variation. Using a DCT, Kondo (1997) measured the development of L2 English apologies by Japanese high school learners before and after their academic year in the United States. The findings indicated that the participants became more target-like post-SA by shifting from overuse of Expressions of Apology (e.g., 'sorry') to greater use of Explanations (e.g., I was late because there was an accident). Other forms of mitigation were also increased. Hernández (2018a) found that 18 SA students did not improve several features of their Spanish apologies after short-term (4 weeks) SA. Students overused the expression of apology or illocutionary force indicating device (IFID), *lo siento* ('I'm sorry'), on pre- and posttest DCTs. In contrast, they employed IFID Intensification (e.g., Lo *siento de verdad.* 'I'm truly sorry') and the agentless construction in the Acknowledgement of Responsibility strategy (e.g., *Se me olvidó …* 'I forgot') less frequently than the native speakers. Hernández concluded that exposure to target language input during SA may well be insufficient for participants "who have the expectation of acquiring the pragmatic features of the host community"

(2018a: 616). As such, the author argued that SA programs should incorporate explicit information about pragmatics into pre-departure orientation and again over the course of the experience abroad. Given the results of this study and others, pragmatic instruction might be particularly beneficial to SA participants in short-term programs.

SA research indicates that L2 pragmatic development does not always occur in a linear fashion, as Warga & Schölmberger's (2007) study of seven Austrian learners of French who studied for ten months in Quebec demonstrated. Three major developmental patterns were observed. First, SA participants became more target-like by reducing their use of Excuses and Justifications. Contrastively, the second development consisted of several shifts in the opposite direction of the target norm (e.g., increase in the use of two upgraders in one IFID). Third, during their program abroad the SA learners did not change their frequency of use of IFIDs, which they employed more frequently than the native speakers. An additional finding was the participants' overuse of *malheureusement* ('unfortunately') before SA. The authors suggested that they had transferred this strategy from their L1. During the second and third data collection times, the students decreased their use of *malheureusement* and replaced it with target language chunks. By the fourth time, learners had begun to replace these target-like chunks with a more controlled and creative pragmatic performance. At this stage, the SA participants had combined native-like strategies with elements from their L1. The authors concluded that at the final stage of acquisition, the L2 learners would have target-like control of this feature. Employing corpus-based methods, Barron (2019) investigated the development of L2 apologies by SA participants who spent ten months in Germany. The overuse of explicit IFIDs and single routine chunks were two of the pragmatic features that remained non-target-like over time.

Turning to L2 request development, studies have found that SA participants improve in some aspects of their request behavior, as other features remain the same (e.g., Barron 2003, Barron 2006, Bataller 2010, Cole & Anderson 2001, Han 2005, Shively & Cohen 2008). In their investigation of the requests and apologies of 67 American SA participants over the course of a semester, Shively & Cohen (2008) found that although students improved their pragmatic appropriateness in some speech act scenarios, their formulation of requests and apologies was often non-target-like and at times even inappropriate. Two factors had a significant impact on specific speech act improvement: (1) the amount of time an SA participant spent speaking the target language outside of class with a fluent speaker of the L2, and (2) having extended conversations with the host family. Bataller (2010) examined 31 US students' requests in service encounters in a semester program

in Spain. Results showed that SA participants overused non-target-like forms on the pre- and posttests, such as query permission (e.g., *¿puedo tener una Coca-Cola?* 'can I have a Coke?'), need statements (e.g., *necesito* 'I need'), unmitigated direct requests (e.g. *quiero comprar otros zapatos* 'I want to buy other shoes'). In addition, they did not increase their use of simple interrogatives (e.g., *¿me pones un café?* 'will you give me a coffee?') or mitigated indirect request forms (e.g., *quería cambiar estos zapatos* 'I wanted to exchange these shoes'), which were the native Spanish speakers' preferred strategies. Based on these findings, Bataller concluded that pragmatic instruction should be explicitly taught in SA programs so that students be made aware of the target pragmatic features and norms of the host culture.

Using an ODCT, Li (2014) examined how language proficiency influenced the development of pragmatic knowledge, as measured by appropriateness ratings, and processing ability, as measured by planning time and speech rate. In this study, American learners in both an Intermediate and Advanced group were rated as pragmatically more appropriate in their L2 Chinese request production after a semester sojourn abroad. Neither group reduced planning time. The Advanced group improved their speech rate, whereas the Intermediate group did not. Findings suggest that the broader pragmatic and linguistic knowledge base of the Advanced group helped them take advantage of the SA environment and thus continue to develop their processing ability and pragmatic knowledge. In a study on request development during short-term SA, Hernández (2016) found that SA participants' use of verbal downgrading (e.g., conditional or imperfect to express politeness or hedging) and external modification (e.g., explanations or justifications for a request) did not change from pre- to posttest. In addition, participants overused speaker-oriented forms (e.g., *¿Puedo tener …?* 'Can I have?') both before and after SA – a phenomenon which researchers suggest is due to L1 transfer given that speaker-oriented requests are the norm in English (Félix-Brasdefer 2007, Márquez Reiter 2000, 2002, Pinto 2005). In his study, Hernández also measured the relationship between SA students' amount of language contact and their request development. No significant relationships were found, however. The author concluded that traditional short-term SA experiences might not provide participants with adequate opportunities for practicing the target language in the host community. Similarly, Taguchi's (2011) study on L2 English requests suggests that pragmatic gains made in SA may not be retained by L2 learners in the long-term.

Refusals are another speech act that have received substantial attention in the SA literature (Barron 2003, 2007, Félix-Brasdefer 2004, 2013, Ren 2014). Employing role plays, Félix-Brasdefer (2004) examined the relationship between SA par-

ticipants' development of Spanish refusals and their length of stay in the target language country. He found that learners with longer SA experiences (30 months abroad) had stronger control of mitigation in refusal sequences than those learners who had spent less time abroad. In a similar study, SA participants did not significantly improve their Spanish refusals after a much shorter program of eight weeks (Félix-Brasdefer 2013). Ren (2014) investigated the cognitive processes of advanced English language learners studying abroad for one academic year. Participants were given eight ODCT scenarios eliciting status-equal and status-unequal refusals in English. The results of the RVRs showed that, over time, learners paid increasingly more attention to sociopragmatics in context while increasing their pragmatic knowledge.

Employing an ODCT, Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker (2015) compared SA participants' production of compliments in Spanish during an eight-week summer program in Mexico with students enrolled in an "at-home" context. Compliments involved four situations with differing degrees of social distance and power. The SA group showed some change with regard to one of the seven compliment strategies: *Qué* ADJ/ADV NP ('What ADJ/ADV NP'). In addition, the SA participants more frequently employed *padre* ('cool'), an adjective type often used when making compliments in Mexican Spanish. In contrast, the AH group did not show significant change from pre- to posttest. Both groups overused *Me* [*gusta*, *encanta*] NP (I ['like, love'] NP). The authors attributed the L2 learners' overreliance on this structure to three factors: (1) transfer (the English equivalent of this structure is frequent in English), (2) instruction (the dative Spanish structure is emphasized in the language curriculum), and (3) Andersen's (1990) One-to-One Principle, which suggests that in the initial stages of language acquisition L2 learners tend to associate a structure with one function. Based on their findings, Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker concluded that "foreign language teaching as it stands is not sufficient to prepare learners to improve their pragmatic knowledge in specific areas, such as speech acts and other interactional routines. Although incidental learning in an SA setting helps improve the learner's pragmatic competence, instruction in pragmatics before and during SA maximizes their learning experience. That is, without specific focus on both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic information and exposure to relevant pragmatic input, learners are not prepared to approach appropriate interactions with NS in the target language context" (2015: 85).

Despite their importance for an L2 learners' communicative competence, conversational style, address forms, and humor are three underrepresented areas in the SA literature (Cordella 1996, Iwasaki 2008, Pérez Vidal & Shively 2019, Shively 2011). Cordella (1996) found that SA students who had spent time abroad acquired

a confrontational style of speaking (e.g., cooperative overlap, challenging questions, and interruptions) similar to that of the native Spanish speakers. Hassall (2013, 2015b,a) examined the development of Indonesian address terms by Australian SA participants during a summer program abroad. Although the learners acquired new address terms for the vocative slot, their knowledge of terms for the pronoun slot increased only modestly. The author concluded that the SA students would have benefitted from pre-departure pragmatic instruction about address terms with opportunities to notice, reflect on, and discuss the L2 norms for their usage. With regard to L2 humor, Shively (2013) followed an SA learner who developed his ability to be funny through participation in social interaction and feedback with age peers during one semester in Spain. Other studies (Bell et al. 2014, Kinginger 2015) have also found a positive effect for SA on L2 humor development.

Several studies have documented how L2 learners develop their interactional competence during SA (e.g., Dings 2014, Ishida 2010, Masuda 2011, Shively 2015, Shively 2016, Taguchi 2014a). Taguchi (2014a) investigated the development of interactional competence by L2 learners of Japanese during their semester abroad in Japan. She found that over time her 18 SA participants increased their use of incomplete sentences, an important interactional resource in Japanese conversations because of its function in the joint construction of talk. Shively (2015) examined listener responses (LRs) in Spanish during SA. She defined LRs as brief verbal responses (e.g., *claro* 'right,' 'of course', *ya* 'right') employed by a listener to provide feedback or support to the speaker, but which do not represent an attempt to take the floor or control topic development. LRs perform a wide range of functions essential for shaping ongoing discourse and developing intersubjectivity with the speaker: acknowledgement, understanding, receipt of previous talk, agreement, and evaluation. An analysis of 8,310 LRs revealed that over time the SA students shifted their use of speaker and listener responses in conversations with their native Spanish speaker interlocutors. However, because the SA group did not adopt allo-repetitions (e.g., repetition of all or part of a previous utterance) as a LR – an important interactional resource more frequent in Spanish than in English – Shively suggested that learners' attention should be drawn to this particular strategy and other LR tokens through pedagogical intervention.

Taguchi et al. (2016) examined the effects intercultural competence and amount of social contact had on the development of pragmatic knowledge by 109 American college learners of Chinese participating in a semester program in Beijing. An ODCT consisting of 24 scenarios, a social contact questionnaire, and the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (Kelley & Meyers 1995) were administered to participants pre- and post-program. Several important findings emerged from

their analysis: First, the SA learners improved their speech act scores from pre- to posttest. Second, cross-cultural adaptability and social contact had a significant impact on pragmatic development. These findings are noteworthy because they suggest that to some extent SA participants' individual characteristics (e.g., in this case their intercultural competence) influence their access to opportunities for language practice and subsequent increases in pragmatic knowledge, thus, accounting for some of the variation observed in SA pragmatic outcomes research.

6 Instructed L2 pragmatic development in SA

Studies on uninstructed L2 pragmatic development in SA environments have demonstrated that some students make progress in acquiring the pragmatic norms of the host culture (e.g., Shively & Cohen 2008). At the same time however, not all L2 learners improve their pragmatic competence (e.g., Bataller 2010, Hernández 2018a, Shively & Cohen 2008). Even fewer acquire native-like pragmatic ability. Social contact is one of several factors that has been identified as contributing to SA participants' pragmatic development. Length of stay represents another important factor that may affect acquisition. SA students in short-term programs are at a potential disadvantage because of the inadequate exposure to the target language. Exacerbating these disadvantages, researchers have observed that even highly motivated students are often unaware of how to take full advantage of the SA environment for developing their pragmatic competence (Cohen & Shively 2007, Hernández & Boero 2018a, Shively 2010). As a result, in order to maximize outcomes, some researchers have advocated for the integration of classroom-based pragmatic instruction into SA programs because explicit instruction has been found to promote learners' pragmatic development (Martínez-Flor & Usó-Juan 2006).

Pragmatics instruction in SA contexts has tended to employ an awareness-raising approach to developing pragmatic competence (Halenko & Jones 2017, Hernández & Boero 2018a,b, 2019, Martínez-Flor & Usó-Juan 2006, Shively 2010). According to Schmidt (2001), there must be conscious noticing of a given target feature in the input for acquisition to occur. In the case of pragmatics, L2 learners must notice and understand not only linguistic form, but also pragmalinguistic function (Morris 2017). Because previous studies have shown that left to their own devices SA participants often lack the strategies to take full advantage of the SA context for developing their pragmatic skills (Cohen & Shively 2007, Hernández 2016, 2018a, Pérez Vidal & Shively 2019, Shively 2010, Shively & Cohen 2008), researchers have begun to investigate the effects of pre-departure

and in-country pedagogical intervention on L2 learners' pragmatic development. Table 4 lists all extant research assessing the impact of pedagogical intervention on SA participants' pragmatic competence, published between 1996 and 2020. Studies are organized by three pragmatic features. The third feature, speech acts, is thereupon subdivided into four individual speech acts. For each study, the table presents author information (in alphabetical order), the target language, assessment methods employed by the researcher(s), and the duration of the SA program.

7 Instructed pragmatic development in SA: Development of receptive pragmatic competence

To date only two empirical studies that the author is aware of have investigated the effects of explicit pragmatic instruction on developing receptive skills of students in the SA context (Bouton 1999, Henery 2015). Consisting of six hours of instruction, Bouton's (1999) pedagogical intervention was effective in helping SA participants acquire conversational implicatures in English. Henery (2015) found that SA students who received guidance from an instructor developed their metapragmatic awareness of French (i.e., address forms and understanding of contextual factors that inform language choices) more than those participants who did not receive guidance. Her findings suggest that SA programs should encourage students to make linguistic observations during their time abroad while an expert instructor guides and scaffolds their interpretations.

8 Instructed pragmatic development in SA: Development of productive pragmatic competence

Existing research assessing the impact of pragmatics instruction on SA students' productive pragmatic skills suggests that pragmatics instruction is beneficial (e.g., Cohen & Shively 2007, DiBartolomeo et al. 2019, Halenko 2018, Hernández & Boero 2018a,b, Morris 2017, Shively 2011). Employing DCTs, Cohen & Shively (2007) examined the impact of pedagogical intervention on 86 US students' acquisition of requests and apologies during a semester abroad in a French or Spanish-speaking country. In their pre-departure orientation, the experimental group received presentation, discussion, and practice activities on learning how to perform speech acts in the target language. Participants responded to practice scenarios, and then compared their answers to those of their peers. Next,

Table 4: Studies on instructed pragmatic development in SA

Authors	Language	Assessment method	SA prog. duration
Pragmatic Feature 1: *Address forms*			
Henery (2015)	French	Awareness interviews	Semester
Pragmatic Feature 2: *Conversational implicatures*			
Bouton (1999)	English	Questionnaire	1 year
Pragmatic Feature 3: *Speech acts*			
Apologies			
Cohen & Shively (2007)	French/ Spanish	DCT, language contact questionnaire	Semester
Halenko (2018)	English	ODCT	Summer
Hernández (2021)	Spanish	ODCT	4 weeks
Complaints			
Russell & Vásquez (2018)	Spanish	DCT	Semester prior to SA
Compliments			
DiBartolomeo et al. (2019)	Spanish	ODCT	5 weeks
Mir (2020)	Spanish	ODCT	4 weeks
Requests			
Cohen & Shively (2007)	Spanish	DCT	Semester
Halenko & Jones (2011)	English	DCT	12 weeks
Halenko & Jones (2017)	English	ODCT	6 months
Hernández (2018b)	Spanish	Role-plays, journals	6 weeks
Hernández & Boero (2018a)	Spanish	DCT, RVRs	4 weeks
Hernández & Boero (2018b)	Spanish	Role-plays	5 weeks
Hernández & Boero (2019)	Spanish	DCT	4 weeks
Morris (2017)[a]	Spanish	DCT	10 weeks
Russell & Vásquez (2018)	Spanish	DCT, comprehension-based assessment	Semester prior to SA
Shively (2011)	Spanish	Naturalistic recordings	Semester
Winke & Teng (2010)	Chinese	ODCT, journals	8 weeks

[a]Morris's (2017) DCT focused on requests. Greetings, invitations, closings, and refusals were also measured.

the students compared their responses to native speakers of French or Spanish who had also completed the same speech act scenarios. While abroad, the experimental group wrote reflective e-mail journals about their language learning during the SA experience. The control group did not receive instruction on speech acts nor did they write journal entries. Although both groups increased their use of target-like speech act strategies, as measured by a production questionnaire, there was no significant effect for the intervention. Based on these findings, Cohen and Shively concluded that pragmatics instruction should consist of a more extensive intervention during pre-departure orientation. While abroad, SA participants should also be given practice activities that encourage noticing and reflection on pragmatic features.

In a study employing naturalistic data, Shively (2011) reported on the service encounter requests of seven SA students who spent a semester in Spain. A total of 131 audio recordings between the SA participants and service providers in Spain were analyzed. Results showed that the students shifted from speaker-oriented requests (e.g., *¿puedo tener un café?* 'Can I have a coffee?') to greater use of hearer oriented (*¿me pones un café?* 'Will you give me a coffee?') and elliptical forms (e.g., *un café, por favor* 'A coffee, please'). In their journal entries and in interviews with the researcher, the SA learners attributed their improvement to the explicit information about pragmatics they received during the first and fifth weeks of the semester and to socialization with the host community.

Halenko & Jones (2017) assessed the impact of pre-departure instruction on SA participants' production of requests by Chinese learners of English. Requests were measured by an ODCT administered as a pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest. Findings indicated that explicit instruction had a significant effect on the immediate posttests. Significant attrition was found on the delayed posttests, however. The authors concluded that regular, repeated metapragmatic instruction might have had a more positive impact on SA students' acquisition of pragmatic features than the practice given to them within a short time period.

In a similar study, Halenko (2018) investigated the efficacy of an ODCT for assessing and improving the spoken communication skills of Chinese learners of ESL during their UK-based SA program. ESL learners were assigned to either an experimental group who received computer-assisted explicit instruction on apologies, or a control group that did not receive instruction. The instruction followed Usó-Juan's (2010) five stages of awareness-raising and communicative practice. In stage one, learners were introduced to the linguistic and cultural aspects of the speech act of apologizing. During stage two, they were presented with the formulaic expressions used to offer apologies. In the third stage, the researcher provided the learners with authentic scenarios designed to encourage

reflection on aspects associated with Brown & Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, such as power, distance, and imposition – and their relationship to speech act production. ESL learners then engaged in communicative practice in stage four, followed by teacher-led discussion and feedback in stage five. ODCT data showed that computer-assisted explicit instruction and practice was indeed an effective tool for developing and assessing the SA participants' pragmatic development of L2 apologies.

Morris (2017) examined the effects of a task-based intervention on the pragmatic development of twelve SA participants during a ten-week program in Spain. Pragmatic development was measured by pre- and posttest DCTs, audio recordings of tasks performed in the target culture community, and self-reflections of task performance. Participants demonstrated significant gains in pragmatic competence (e.g., giving directions and ordering meals in Spanish) on the DCT and in their task completion. Similarly, their reflections showed increased awareness of the pragmatic features introduced to them during the entire pedagogical intervention. Using an ODCT and journaling, Winke & Teng (2010) measured the impact of task-based pragmatics instruction during an SA program in China. SA participants improved their use of formulaic expressions in speech act production. In addition, students' journal entries revealed developing awareness of Chinese pragmatics.

Hernández & Boero (2018a) found a positive effect for pragmatics instruction in the short-term SA context. Prior to departure, 15 SA participants received explicit instruction on requests, then guided practice with authentic input and awareness-raising activities, output practice, and subsequent group discussion and feedback. In Spain, they performed four simulated tasks that required them to make requests. The tasks varied in terms of social distance, social status, and degree of imposition. Next, the SA participants responded to questions that encouraged reflection about the appropriateness of their request strategies. Feedback was also given. In addition to significant gains on posttest DCTs, RVRs demonstrated that specific sociopragmatic factors and pragmalinguistic strategies targeted during the intervention informed learners' cognition during speech act planning and production.

In another investigation on short-term SA, Hernández & Boero (2019) employed DCTs to measure participants' request making in two service encounter scenarios. The first scenario was ordering a drink at a café. The second involved exchanging a pair of shoes without having the receipt. The SA participants made significant gains in both scenarios. Hernández & Boero (2018b) found that the positive effects of their pragmatic intervention extended to students' request production in role-plays. In addition, most of the gains were retained in delayed

posttests administered five weeks after the conclusion of the SA program. The authors attributed the SA participants' gains in the long term to the repeated exposure to pragmatics instruction that the L2 learners received during their entire time abroad. Employing role-plays, Hernández (2018b) examined the effects of pedagogical intervention on SA participants' requests during a six-week program in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Findings again demonstrated that explicit pragmatic instruction combined with in-country pragmatic data gathering tasks contributed to the students' L2 pragmatic development.

Russell & Vásquez (2018) examined the impact of a web-based tutorial (WBT) on 13 US students' pragmatic development during the semester prior to studying abroad in Spain. Findings indicated that the SA participants slightly increased their use of pragmatically appropriate strategies on the posttest production questionnaire, especially in the area of conventional politeness formulae to frame a complaint. Pre- and posttest scores on a comprehension-based assessment revealed that their ability to comprehend or notice appropriate pragmatic strategy use in Spanish also improved. The authors concluded that instruction on specific grammatical features taught in context prior to the WBT – such as the past subjunctive and conditional mood in Spanish – may help students formulate more appropriate hedges and downgraders in their speech act production. DiBartolomeo et al. (2019) reported on SA students' compliments and apologies after five weeks in Mexico. Over the course of their time abroad, participants received pragmatic instruction on compliments but not on apologies. Most of the SA learners improved their use of compliments. In contrast, few students adopted the native norms for apologies in Spanish. The authors concluded that the pragmatic instruction was responsible for the differential outcomes observed at the time of the posttests.

Hernández (2021) considered multiple measures of pragmatic knowledge in his investigation on the effects of pedagogical intervention and short-term SA on the development of L2 Spanish apologies. Students who spent four weeks in different SA programs in Spain were randomly assigned to an experimental group (*n* = 9) or a control group (*n* = 9). Prior to departure, the experimental group received explicit pragmatic instruction on how to formulate apologies. During SA, they performed two task scenarios designed to improve their pragmatic competence. The control group did not receive explicit pragmatic instruction, nor did they perform the tasks. L2 pragmatic development was assessed by an ODCT consisting of five apology scenarios. The ODCT data demonstrate that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group in three measures of pragmatic development: appropriateness ratings by native speakers, strategy

use, and speech rate. The agentless construction in the Acknowledgement of Responsibility strategy (e.g., *Se me cayó* 'I dropped') and IFID Intensification (e.g., *Lo siento de verdad.* 'I'm truly sorry'), two problematic structures for L2 Spanish learners, were among the features that the experimental group increased on the posttests. The experimental group also reduced their use of the single chunk *lo siento* 'I'm sorry' while expanding their IFID repertoire (e.g., *Perdóneme.* 'Excuse me'). In contrast, the control group did not improve their apologies during SA, often overusing routine expressions.

Mir (2020) examined the impact of pedagogical intervention on SA participants' L2 Spanish compliments during a four-week program in Spain. Data were collected by an ODCT consisting of eight complimenting scenarios. Over the course of the first two weeks, 20 students received explicit instruction on Spanish pragmatics, with a focus on speech act of compliments and compliment responses. Next, they were asked to conduct ethnographic research in the host community. Activities included: (1) asking their host families to perform several role-plays, which the students recorded and thereupon transcribed; (2) recording, transcribing, and analyzing conversations in the host community; and (3) practice employing compliments and compliment responses with host family members. For all three tasks, the SA participants shared the information they gathered from the native informants in subsequent class discussions focusing on pragmatics. Weekly journal entries were also employed to provide learners with further opportunities to discuss and interpret the pragmatic data. The ODCT data show that the explicit classroom-based pragmatic instruction combined with the ethnographic work helped the SA participants develop target-like complimenting strategies (e.g., *Que* + ADJ/NP construction) on the posttests.

Although studies on instructed L2 pragmatic development have predominantly focused on pragmatic speaking ability, Alcón-Soler (2015) conducted a unique study on the assessment of writing skills in L2 English. Specifically, the author investigated the impact of pragmatics instruction on learners' ability to mitigate requests in e-mail communication with their instructors. The experimental group received instruction on e-mail requests in which their attention was drawn to request forms, sociocultural norms, and discourse structure in academic e-mail communication. In addition, this group was provided with practice and feedback. The control group did not receive instruction but did exchange e-mails with their instructor. Although the quantitative analysis showed that both groups improved on the posttests, the qualitative analysis revealed that the experimental group had a more developed understanding of the relationship between forms and context.

Shively (2010) provided the most comprehensive model to date for teaching pragmatics prior to, during, and after SA. During pre-departure, SA participants learn the relevance of pragmatics for SA. The primary goal of this stage is to build the L2 learners' confidence in the target language so that they can maximize their SA experience. Participants' attention is drawn to the pragmatic norms (e.g., norms about interaction in the target language) of the host culture. Communicative practice with speech acts is another core component of Shively's pre-departure stage. While abroad, SA students are encouraged to notice, reflect, and consider pragmatic features in out-of-class data gathering activities and with the guidance of an instructor or program director. The post-SA component of this model involves facilitating former SA students' "social interaction in the target language and continued development of the skills acquired in both the pre-departure and in-country stages" (2010: 123).

9 Conclusions and future directions

In this chapter, I have provided an overview of studies that have measured L2 pragmatic development in SA contexts. First, I discussed the major assessment methods that have been employed to measure pragmatic knowledge in the SA environment. I then reviewed the existing scholarship on SA participants' acquisition of pragmatic competence in both uninstructed and instructed environments. The SA literature has demonstrated that some L2 learners improve some aspects of their pragmatic competence while participating in a sojourn abroad of a semester or more. Other pragmatic features develop slowly or are difficult to acquire through exposure alone. One important insight gained from assessment on SA students' L2 pragmatic development is that pedagogical intervention before and during SA has the potential to enhance pragmatic learning. Furthermore, as participation in short-term SA increases (Institute of International Education 2017), more studies should assess the impact that these programs have on participants' L2 pragmatic ability. Research suggests that students in these programs would benefit from instruction on pragmatic features during pre-departure orientation and subsequent opportunities to notice, practice, reflect on, and receive feedback about speech patterns during the SA program (e.g., Hernández 2021, Hernández & Boero 2018a,b).

With respect to assessment methods, researchers have begun to shift away from written production questionnaires or DCTs, which are perceived as having lower validity compared to other measures of pragmatic competence (Félix-Brasdefer 2010, Pérez Vidal & Shively 2019). ODCTs and role-plays are two such

measures that may be better suited for capturing L2 learners' language use in social contexts. Although Rockey et al. (2020) did not focus on SA participants' pragmatic competence, their study on technology-enhanced (TE) DCTs demonstrates how researchers might employ a mobile application to increase the validity of traditional DCTs in SA contexts as well. In their study, the use of a TE-DCT accessed by a phone application provided students not only with important linguistic and extralinguistic cues, but it also allowed them to employ these same features in their own responses. Based on this data, the authors argued that the use of mobile applications was an ecologically valid way to measure one type of pragmatic ability. In addition to issues surrounding increased face and content validity, TE-DCTs would also enhance researchers' ability to collect L2 pragmatic data from SA participants in different programs. RVRs also offer a potentially rich source of data about how SA learners perceive social and cultural variables associated with different speech acts. Naturalistic data, for their part, allows programs to investigate how SA participants make use of their pragmatic skills in authentic situations. Asking SA participants to become data gatherers is one approach to obtaining authentic interactional data (e.g., Shively 2011). A second approach is to analyze how students use the target language in social media and chat applications such as Facebook, Instagram, or WhatsApp (Pérez Vidal & Shively 2019).

In terms of directions for future research, a worthwhile avenue of investigation would be to use a simulated 3-D SA environment (e.g., with actors from the target language country and simulated situations and surroundings) as pre-departure practice, and also as a method for measuring participants' L2 pragmatic competence before and after an SA program. Given the increasing interest in SA programs with service learning, internships, volunteering, and work placement (e.g., an SA program designed for nurses; Engineers without Borders), research in this area is especially relevant. Similarly, researchers could combine this assessment method with measurements of stress or situational anxiety – an approach that has been identified in recent discussions about pragmatics in the SA context (Pérez Vidal & Shively 2019).

Most of the research on uninstructed L2 pragmatic development in SA has focused on speech acts (e.g., Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker 2015, Hernández 2016, 2018b, Ren 2014, 2019, Shively & Cohen 2008). Although these studies have contributed important information about what SA students can and cannot acquire during their time abroad, other aspects of pragmatics should also be investigated. L2 learners' interactional competence (e.g., discursive abilities, discourse marker use, backchanneling) and pragmatic processing ability (e.g., Hernández 2021, Li 2014) are two areas that merit further attention.

It should also be noted that the difficulties of measuring L2 pragmatic competence are exacerbated by the fact that some L2 learners may consciously use a non-target-like feature because they know it is correct even though it is not pragmatically appropriate. Barron (2003) referred to this phenomenon as the "playing it safe" strategy. Finally, language contact and motivation are often identified as important predictors of language acquisition in the SA context. However, with the exception of a few studies (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos 2011, Hernández 2016, Matsumura 2001, Shively & Cohen 2008, Taguchi 2008a,b), research on how students' self-reported language contact or social networks influence L2 pragmatic development is underrepresented. Research that measures how individual differences influence the path of L2 pragmatic development that an SA learner takes in acquiring pragmatic competence during SA represents another important line of investigation.

The positive effects of pragmatics instruction on SA participants' developing pragmatic competence are promising. The focus of these studies has also been on speech acts, however. More research is needed on the impact of explicit classroom-based pragmatic instruction on other pragmatic features as well. Further, few studies have examined the impact of an intervention that takes place both before and during SA (e.g., Hernández 2021, Hernández & Boero 2018a, Shively 2011). Given that these interventions seem to be more beneficial for SA students' pragmatic development than pre-departure-only instruction, additional studies are justified. At the same time, further research on pedagogical interventions that encompasses not only these two important SA stages (pre-departure and in-country), but also examines post-SA pragmatic development is also warranted. Finally, assessment of L2 pragmatic development in SA has demonstrated that the "at-home" foreign language curriculum does not adequately prepare L2 learners to improve "their pragmatic knowledge in specific areas, such as speech acts and other interactional routines" (Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker 2015: 85). A language curriculum that targets the development of learners' pragmatic competence well before SA and then continues to build on this knowledge in predeparture and during the program itself will help SA participants maximize their learning experience. Systematic assessment of SA outcomes will undoubtedly assist with this effort.

References

Alcón-Soler, Eva & Ariadna Sánchez Hernández. 2017. Learning pragmatic routines during study abroad: A focus on proficiency and type of routine. *Atlantis* 39(2). 191–210.

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

Andersen, Roger W. 1990. Models, processes, principles and strategies: Second language acquisition inside and outside the classroom. In Bill VanPatten & James F. Lee (eds.), *Second language acquisition: Foreign language learning*, 45–68. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bachman, Lyle F. & Adrian S. Palmer. 1996. *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen & Maria-Thereza Bastos. 2011. Proficiency, length of stay, and intensity of interaction, and the acquisition of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 8. 347–384.

Barron, Anne. 2003. *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Barron, Anne. 2006. Learning to say "you" in German: The acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in a study abroad context. In Margaret A. DuFon & Eton E. Churchill (eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts*, 59–88. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Barron, Anne. 2007. 'Ah no honestly we're okay': Learning to upgrade in a study abroad context. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4(2). 129–166.

Barron, Anne. 2019. Using corpus-linguistic methods to track longitudinal development: Routine apologies in the study abroad context. *Journal of Pragmatics* 146. 87–105.

Bataller, Rebeca. 2010. Making a request for a service in Spanish: Pragmatic development in the study abroad setting. *Foreign Language Annals* 43(1). 160–175.

Bataller, Rebeca & Rachel L. Shively. 2011. Roleplays and naturalistic data in interlanguage pragmatic research: Service encounters during study abroad. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching* 2(1). 15–50.

Bell, Nancy D., Stephen Skalicky & Tom Salsbury. 2014. Multicompetence in L2 language play: A longitudinal case study. *Language Learning* 64. 72–102.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House & Gabriele Kasper (eds.). 1989. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (Advances in Discourse Processes 31). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Bouton, Lawrence F. 1999. Developing nonnative speaker skills in interpreting conversational implicatures in English: Explicit teaching can ease the process. In Eli Hinkel (ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning*, 47–70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Cheng, Stephanie Weijung. 2005. *An exploratory cross-cultural study of interlanguage pragmatic development of expressions of gratitude by Chinese learners of English.* University of Iowa. (Doctoral dissertation).

Cohen, Andrew D. 2004. Assessing speech acts in a second language. In Diana Boxer & Andrew D. Cohen (eds.), *Studying speaking to inform second language learning*, 302–327. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cohen, Andrew D. & Rachel L. Shively. 2007. Acquisitions of requests and apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of study abroad and strategy-building intervention. *Modern Language Journal* 91. 189–212.

Cole, Simon & Aaron Anderson. 2001. Requests by young Japanese: A longitudinal study. *The Language Teacher* 25. 7–11.

Cordella, Marisa. 1996. Confrontational style in Spanish arguments: Pragmatics and teaching outlook. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 9(2). 148–162.

Culpeper, Jonathan, Alison Mackey & Naoko Taguchi. 2018. *Second language pragmatics: From theory to research.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Czerwionka, Lori & Alejandro Cuza. 2017a. A pragmatic analysis of L2 Spanish requests: Acquisition in three situational contexts during short-term study abroad. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 14. 391–419.

Czerwionka, Lori & Alejandro Cuza. 2017b. Second language acquisition of Spanish service industry requests in an immersion context. *Hispania* 100(2). 239–260.

De Pablos Ortega, Carlos. 2008. Análisis sociopragmático del acto de habla expresivo de agradecimiento en español. In Antonio Briz, Antonio Hidalgo, Marta Albelda, Josefa Contreras & Nieves Hernández Flores (eds.), *Cortesía y conversación de lo escrito a lo oral*, 685–691. Valencia: Programa EDICE.

DiBartolomeo, Megan, Vanessa Elias & Daniel Jung. 2019. Investigating the effects of pragmatic instruction: A comparison of L2 Spanish compliments and apologies during short term study abroad. *Letrônica* 12(4). 1–17.

Dings, Abby. 2014. Interactional competence and the development of alignment activity. *Modern Language Journal* 98(3). 742–756.

Dufon, Margaret Ann. 1999. *The acquisition of linguistic politeness in Indonesian by sojourners in naturalistic interactions.* University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Honolulu. (Doctoral dissertation).

Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. 2007. Pragmatic development in the Spanish as a FL classroom: A cross- sectional study of learner requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4. 253–286.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. 2010. Data collection methods in speech act performance: DCTs, role plays, and verbal reports. In Alicia Martínez-Flor & Esther Usó-Juan (eds.), *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical, and methodological issues*, 41–56. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. 2013. Refusing in L2 Spanish: The effects of the context of learning during a short-term study abroad program. In Otilia Martí-Arnández & Patricia Salazar-Campillo (eds.), *Refusals in instructed contexts and beyond*, 147–173. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. César & Maria Hasler-Barker. 2015. Complimenting in Spanish in a short-term study abroad context. *System* 48. 75–85.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. César & Maria Hasler-Barker. 2017. Elicited data. In Anne Barron, Yueguo Gu & Gerard Steen (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of pragmatics*, 27–40. Abingdon, Oxford & New York, NY: Routledge.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. César & Sean McKinnon. 2017. Perceptions of impolite behavior in study abroad contexts and the teaching of impoliteness in l2 Spanish. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching* 3(2). 99–113.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. 2004. Interlanguage refusals: Linguistic politeness and length of residence in the target community. *Language Learning* 54(4). 587–653.

Fukasawa, Emi. 2012. Development of the speech act 'compliment response' and its relation to outside classroom English during study abroad. *Sophia Linguistica* 60. 123–146.

Golato, Andrea. 2003. Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics* 24(1). 90–121.

Halenko, Nicola. 2018. Using computer-assisted language learning (call) tools to enhance output practice. In Christian Jones (ed.), *Practice in second language learning*, 137–163. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halenko, Nicola & Christian Jones. 2011. Teaching pragmatic awareness of spoken requests to Chinese EAP learners in the UK: Is explicit instruction effective? *System* 39(2). 240–250.

Halenko, Nicola & Christian Jones. 2017. Explicit instruction of spoken requests: An examination of pre-departure instruction and the study abroad environment. *System* 68. 26–37.

Han, Sangkyung. 2005. *The interlanguage pragmatic development of the speech act of requests by Korean non-native speakers of English in an ESL setting*. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. (Doctoral dissertation).

Hassall, Tim. 2013. Pragmatic development during short-term study abroad: The case of address terms in Indonesian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 55. 1–17.

Hassall, Tim. 2015a. Individual variation in L2 study abroad outcomes: A case study from Indonesian pragmatics. *Multilingua* 34. 33–59.

Hassall, Tim. 2015b. Influence of fellow L2 learners on pragmatic development during study abroad. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 12. 415–442.

Henery, Ashlie. 2015. On the development of metapragmatic awareness abroad: Two case studies exploring the role of expert-mediation. *Language Awareness* 24. 316–331.

Hernández, Todd A. 2010. The relationship among motivation, interaction, and the development of second language oral proficiency in a study abroad context. *Modern Language Journal* 94. 600–617.

Hernández, Todd A. 2016. Acquisition of L2 Spanish requests in short-term study abroad. *Study Abroad Research in Second Language Acquisition and International Education* 1(2). 186–216.

Hernández, Todd A. 2018a. L2 Spanish apologies development during short-term study abroad. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 8. 599–620.

Hernández, Todd A. 2018b. Language practice and study abroad. In Christian Jones (ed.), *Practice in second language learning*, 197–227. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hernández, Todd A. & Paulo Boero. 2018a. Explicit intervention for Spanish pragmatic development during short-term study abroad: An examination of learner request production and cognition. *Foreign Language Annals* 51. 389–410.

Hernández, Todd A. & Paulo Boero. 2018b. Explicit instruction for request strategy development during short-term study abroad. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching* 5. 35–49.

Hernández, Todd A. & Paulo Boero. 2019. Acquiring pragmatic competence during short-term study abroad: The service encounter request. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching* 10. 45–73.

Hernández, Todd A. 2021. Explicit instruction for the development of L2 Spanish pragmatic ability during study abroad. *System* 96. 1–18.

Hoffman-Hicks, Sheila D. 1999. *The longitudinal development of French foreign language pragmatic competence: Evidence from study abroad participants.* Indiana University, Bloomington. (Doctoral dissertation).

Institute of International Education. 2017. *Open doors: Report on international educational exchange.* http://opendoors.iienetwork.org (20 December, 2021).

Ishida, Midori. 2010. *Development of interactional competence in L2 Japanese during study abroad: The use of modal expressions in recipient actions.* Manoa, Honolulu: University of Hawaii. (Doctoral dissertation).

Iwasaki, Noriko. 2008. Style shifts among Japanese learners before and after study abroad in Japan: Becoming active social agents in Japanese. *Applied Linguistics* 31(1). 45–71.

Kasper, Gabriele. 2000. Data collection in pragmatics research. In Helen Spencer-Oatey (ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures*, 316–369. London: Continuum.

Kasper, Gabriele & Merete Dahl. 1991. Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13(2). 215–247.

Kasper, Gabriele & Kenneth R. Rose. 2002. *Pragmatic development in a second language.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kelley, Colleen & Judith Meyers. 1995. *Cross-cultural adaptability inventory manual.* Arlington, VA: Vangent.

Kinginger, Celeste. 2008. Language learning in study abroad: Case studies of Americans in France. *Modern Language Journal* 92. 1–131.

Kinginger, Celeste. 2015. Language socialization in the homestay: American high school students in China. In Nicole Tracy-Ventura Rosamond Mitchell & Kevin McManus (eds.), *Social interaction, identity and language learning during residence abroad*, 53–74. Amsterdam: EuroSLA.

Kondo, Sachiko. 1997. The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English: Longitudinal study of interlanguage apologies. *Sophia Linguistica* 41. 265–284.

Li, Shuai. 2014. The effects of different levels of linguistic proficiency on the development of L2 Chinese request production during study abroad. *System* 45. 103–116.

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

LoCastro, Virginia. 2012. *Pragmatics for language educators: A sociolinguistic perspective.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Magnan, Sally Sieloff & Michele Back. 2006. Requesting help in French: Developing pragmatic features during study abroad. In Sharon Wilkinson (ed.), *Insights from study abroad for language programs*, 22–44. Boston, MA: Heinle.

Márquez Reiter, Rosina. 2000. *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Márquez Reiter, Rosina. 2002. A contrastive study of conventional indirectness in Spanish: Evidence from Peninsular and Uruguayan Spanish. *Pragmatics* 12. 135–151.

Martínez-Flor, Alicia & Esther Usó-Juan. 2006. A comprehensive pedagogical framework to develop pragmatics in the foreign language classroom: The 6Rs approach. *Applied Language Learning* 16(2). 39–63.

Masuda, Kyoko. 2011. Acquiring interactional competence in a study abroad context: Japanese language learners' use of the interactional particle *ne. Modern Language Journal* 95. 519–540.

Matsumura, Shoichi. 2001. Learning the rules for offering advice: A quantitative approach to second language socialization. *Language Learning* 51. 635–679.

Matsumura, Shoichi. 2003. Modelling the relationships among interlanguage pragmatic development, L2 proficiency, and exposure to L2. *Applied Linguistics* 24. 465–491.

Mir, Montserrat. 2020. Teaching and learning about Spanish L2 compliments in short-term study abroad. *Study Abroad Research in Second Language Acquisition* 5(2). 230–257.

Morris, Kimberly J. 2017. *Learning by doing: The affordances of task-based pragmatics instruction for beginning L2 Spanish learners studying abroad.* University of California, Davis. (Doctoral dissertation).

Osuka, Naoko. 2014. Development of pragmatic routines by Japanese learners in a study abroad context. In Istvan Kecskes & Stavros Assimakopoulos (eds.), *Current issues in intercultural pragmatics*, 275–296. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pérez Vidal, Carmen & Rachel L. Shively. 2019. L2 pragmatic development in study abroad settings. In Naoko Taguchi (ed.), *Handbook of SLA and pragmatics*, 355–371. New York: Routledge.

Pinto, Derrin. 2005. The acquisition of requests by second language learners of Spanish. *Spanish in Context* 2. 1–27.

Ren, Wei. 2013. The effect of study abroad on the pragmatic development of internal modification of refusals. *Pragmatics* 23(4). 715–741.

Ren, Wei. 2014. A longitudinal investigation into L2 learners' cognitive processes during study abroad. *Applied Linguistics* 35. 575–594.

Ren, Wei. 2018. Developing L2 pragmatic competence in study abroad contexts. In C. Sanz & A. Morales-Front (eds.), *Routledge handbook of study abroad research and practice*, 119–133. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ren, Wei. 2019. Pragmatic development of Chinese during study abroad: A cross-sectional study of learner requests. *Journal of Pragmatics* 146. 137–149.

Rockey, Catherine, Jessica Tiegs & Julieta Fernández. 2020. Mobile application use in technology-enhanced DCTs. *CALICO Journal* 37. 85–108.

Rodríguez, Silvia. 2001. *The perception of requests in Spanish by instructed learners of Spanish in the second and foreign-language contexts: A longitudinal study of acquisition patterns.* Bloomington: Indiana University. (Doctoral dissertation).

Roever, Carsten. 2012. What learners get for free: Learning routine formulae in ESL and EFL environments. *ELT Journal* 66. 10–21.

Russell, Victoria & Camilla Vásquez. 2018. Assessing the effectiveness of a web-based tutorial for interlanguage pragmatic development prior to studying abroad. *IALLT Journal of Language Learning Technologies* 48. 69–96.

Sanz, Cristina. 2014. Contributions of study abroad research to our understanding of SLA processes and outcomes: The SALA project, an appraisal. In Carmen Pérez-Vidal (ed.), *Language acquisition in study abroad and formal instruction contexts*, 1–13. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schauer, Gila A. 2004. May you speaker louder maybe? Interlanguage pragmatic development in requests. In Susan H. Foster-Cohen, Michael Sharwood Smith, Antonella Sorace & Mitsuhiko Ota (eds.), *EUROSLA yearbook 4*, 253–273. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schauer, Gila A. 2006. Pragmatic awareness in ESL and EFL contexts: Contrast and development. *Language Learning* 56. 269–318.

Schauer, Gila A. 2007. Finding the right words in the study abroad context: The development of German learners' use of external modifiers in English. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4. 193–220.

Schauer, Gila A. 2009. *Interlanguage pragmatic development: The study abroad context.* London: Continuum.

Schmidt, Richard. 2001. Attention. In Peter Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*, 3–33. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shively, Rachel L. 2010. From the virtual world to the real world: A model of pragmatics instruction for study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals* 43. 105–137.

Shively, Rachel L. 2011. L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43. 1818–1835.

Shively, Rachel L. 2013. Learning to be funny in Spanish during study abroad: L2 humor development. *Modern Language Journal* 97. 930–946.

Shively, Rachel L. 2015. Developing interactional competence during study abroad: Listener responses in l2 Spanish. *System* 48. 86–98.

Shively, Rachel L. 2016. Development of assessments in L2 Spanish in study abroad. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching* 3. 157–170.

Shively, Rachel L. & Andrew D. Cohen. 2008. Development of Spanish requests and apologies during study abroad. *Íkala, revista de lenguaje y cultura* 13. 53–118.

Taguchi, Naoko. 2006. Analysis of appropriateness in a speech act request in L2 English. *Pragmatics* 16. 513–535.

Taguchi, Naoko. 2008a. Cognition, language contact, and development of pragmatic comprehension in a study abroad context. *Language Learning* 58. 33–71.

Taguchi, Naoko. 2008b. The role of learning environment in the development of pragmatic comprehension: A comparison of gains made between EFL and ESL learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 30. 423–452.

Taguchi, Naoko. 2011. Do proficiency and study abroad experience affect speech production? Analysis of appropriateness, accuracy, and fluency. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 49. 265–293.

Taguchi, Naoko. 2014a. Development of interactional competence in Japanese as a second language: Use of incomplete sentences as interactional resources. *Modern Language Journal* 98. 518–535.

Taguchi, Naoko. 2014b. Production of routines in L2 English: Effect of proficiency and study abroad experience. *System* 41. 109–121.

Taguchi, Naoko. 2015. Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. State-of-the-art article. *Modern Language Journal* 98. 518–535.

Taguchi, Naoko. 2018. Data collection and analysis in developmental l2 pragmatics research: Discourse completion test, role play, and naturalistic recording. In Aarnes Gudmestad & Amanda Edmonds (eds.), *Critical reflections on data in second language acquisition*, 7–32. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Taguchi, Naoko & Carsten Roever. 2017. *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taguchi, Naoko, Feng Xiao & Shuai Li. 2016. Effects of interactional competence and social contact on speech act production in a Chinese study abroad context. *Modern Language Journal* 100. 775–796.

Thomas, Jenny. 1983. Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics* 4. 91–112. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.91.

Turnbull, William. 2001. An appraisal of pragmatic elicitation techniques for the social psychological study of talk: The case of request refusals. *Pragmatics* 11. 31–61.

Usó-Juan, Esther. 2010. A sociopragmatic approach. In Alicia Martínez-Flor & Esther Usó-Juan (eds.), *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues*, 237–256. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vande Berg, Michael, R. Michael Paige & Kris Hemming Lou. 2012. Student learning abroad: Paradigms and assumptions. In Michael Vande Berg, R. Michael Paige & Kris Hemming Lou (eds.), *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it*, 3–28. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Vilar Beltrán, Elina. 2014. Length of stay abroad: Effects of time on the speech act of requesting. *International Journal of English Studies* 14. 79–96.

Warga, Muriel & Ursula Schölmberger. 2007. The acquisition of French apologetic behavior in a study abroad context. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4. 221–252.

Winke, Paula M. & Chunhong Teng. 2010. Using task-based pragmatics tutorials while studying abroad in China. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 7. 363–399.

Woodfield, Helen. 2012. Pragmatic variation in learner perception: The role of retrospective verbal report in L2 speech act research. In J. César Félix-Brasdefer & Dale A. Koike (eds.), *Pragmaticvariation in first and second language contexts: Methodological issues*, 209–223. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.