

The Effectiveness of Consciousness-Raising Approach in Interpreting Conversational Implicature Using Audiovisual Input

Fatima Abdulrahman Alsalloom

Department of English Language and Literature, Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

The present study investigates the effectiveness of consciousness-raising approach in interpreting conversational implicature using audiovisual input. The study was conducted on 126 Saudi female students at the Department of English Language and Literature at Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University in Riyadh. The experimental group was deductively and inductively exposed to 12 video extracts on four types of conversational implicature (i.e., *irony*, *indirect criticism*, *manner*, and *relevance*) taken from the American sitcom *Friends*. The control group had no treatment and was instructed from the coursebook. Both groups were given a pre-test and a post-test to complete in the form of multiple-choice discourse completion test. Findings revealed the effectiveness of consciousness-raising approach in facilitating foreign language learners' interpretation of conversational implicature types. In addition, a significant improvement was recorded in the experimental groups' performance in analyzing pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features, which indicates the effectiveness of focused attention directed to these features in context. However, the non-significant improvement recorded in the experimental group's performance in analyzing metapragmatic features implies that focused attention is not necessary in interpreting all pragmatic features and that global attention is more effective in facilitating awareness of the relationship between language and context based on social factors (power and distance) between interlocutors.

Keywords: Consciousness-raising, noticing, awareness, conversational implicature, pragmalinguistic features, sociopragmatic features, metapragmatic features

Introduction

Interlanguage pragmatics is concerned with "the study of nonnative speakers' use and acquisition of pragmatic and discourse knowledge in a second language" (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993, p. 3). Research on interlanguage pragmatics has been focusing on three areas: (a) whether pragmatic features are teachable; (b) whether instruction of pragmatic features is more effective than no instruction; and (c) whether different teaching approaches are effective. With regard to the first and second concerns, there is a common agreement that pragmatic features are teachable in English as a Second Language (ESL) and in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context and that pragmatics instruction is better than no instruction at all (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Lingli & Wannaruk, 2010). However, whether different teaching approaches are effective has been a controversial area of research (Kasper, 1997). As a result of the awareness of the importance of pragmatic features instruction, researchers began to question the best instructional methods, activities and materials that could enhance pragmatic competence inside ESL and EFL classrooms. The present study aims to investigate the effectiveness of applying the consciousness-raising approach in EFL context using audiovisual input in interpreting conversational implicatures.

Pragmatic Competence Research

Pragmatic competence research is concerned with the study of speakers ability to use language for different purposes, listeners ability to understand speakers' real intentions, and the knowledge of rules underlying utterances in a given discourse (Bialystok, 1993). Experimental studies have been conducted to examine the effectiveness of different pedagogical approaches, materials and activities in improving ESL and EFL learners' pragmatic competence inside the classroom (Taguchi, 2011a). Studies investigating the effectiveness of explicit versus implicit approaches have given utmost priority to the explicit approach. The explicit approach aims at directing learners' attention to target forms with the intention of discussing these forms. On the other hand, the implicit approach requires learners to infer the target form and its function without directing their attention to it (Ellis, 2005). Researchers argued that explicit instruction helps develop pragmatic competence faster than implicit instruction (Glaser, 2013; Hulstijn & De Graaff, 1994; Lingli & Wannaruk, 2010; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Kasper, 2001; Rose, 2005). The explicit approach can be applied deductively (didactic), in which learners are provided with an explanation of the target form, or inductively (discovery), in which learners are provided with L2 data that include the target form and are requested to discover the form and how it works on their own (Ellis, 2005). Research contrasting deductive and inductive approaches was inconclusive. Studies have shown conflicting results with regard to which approach, deductive or inductive, is more effective in enhancing learners' pragmatic competence (Glaser, 2016; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Rose & Ng, 2001; Takimoto, 2008).

Research investigating the efficiency of the consciousness-raising approach revealed positive outcomes (Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005; Ghobadi & Fahim, 2009; Kondo, 2004; Martínez-Flor & Soler, 2007; Soler, 2007; Soler & Pitarch, 2010; Takimoto, 2006; Xiao-le, 2011). Although the explicit nature of this approach proved to be effective in developing pragmatic awareness, Rose and Ng (2001) questioned the efficiency of the inductive modification of consciousness-raising tasks in increasing sociopragmatic (speaker intention) awareness. To solve this issue, Ryu (2018) proposed implementing other types of consciousness-raising tasks, such as metapragmatic (relationship between interlocutors) discussion. Several studies (e.g., Birjandi & Derakhshan, 2014; Derakhshan & Arabmofrad, 2018; Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Lemmerich, 2010; Narita, 2012; Pearson, 2001; Takimoto, 2012) revealed the positive impact of metapragmatic discussion in facilitating awareness of pragmatic features in context. The explanatory approach was also applied to foster ESL and EFL learners' pragmatic competence and understanding of target cultural norms. The implementation of this approach showed positive outcomes in facilitating learners' production of a comprehensibly acceptable output in the target language (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

Pragmatic activities were widely applied in pragmatic competence research including consciousness-raising and communicative-practice activities. Ishihara and Cohen (2010) and Kasper (1997) revealed the efficiency of these activities in developing pragmatic competence inside the classroom. Researchers also proposed various teaching materials in pragmatic instruction, including auditory and visual materials (audiovisual input) such as, video clips, films, and television shows. Other materials include Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC), telecollaboration, virtual platforms, websites, and corpora (Belz, 2007; Boxer & Pickering, 1995; Derakhshan & Zangoei, 2014; Ekin, 2013; El-Okda, 2011; Kasper, 1997; Martínez-Flor, 2008; Mirzaei, Hashemian & Khoramshekouh, 2016; Taguchi, 2011a; Vellenga, 2004).

However, with the availability of diverse teaching approaches, activities, and materials in pragmatic competence research, the majority of pragmatic research has been

conducted on speech acts, actions performed through utterances, while little has been done to facilitate learning of conversational implicature features inside ESL and EFL classrooms.

Conversational Implicature Research

Conversational implicature is an essential component of everyday interaction. Speakers communicate meanings via implicature and listeners recognize these meanings via inferences. It is a process through which inferences are made based on the interaction between utterances and the context in which they occur. Grice (1975) was the first to introduce the term *conversational implicature*, which has been further developed by Levinson (1983) and Green (1989) among others. According to Grice (1975), all participants in a conversation expect themselves and others to conform to the *cooperative principle maxims*. The *cooperative principle* states “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (Grice, 1975, p. 45). The *cooperative principle maxims* include the maxim of quantity, quality, relation (relevance), and manner.

The majority of conversational implicature studies (Bouton, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1992; Köylü, 2018; Lee, 2002; Manowong, 2011; Taguchi, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2011b; Taguchi, Li & Liu, 2013) have been conducted to investigate ESL and EFL learners’ ability to interpret these features in the same manner native speakers of English do. A native speaker is defined as an individual who acquires the language in early childhood and maintains the use of the language, someone who has intuitive knowledge of the language and is able to produce fluent, spontaneous discourse (Lee, 2005). In these studies, researchers used English native speakers’ performance as a benchmark for appropriate interpretation of target pragmatic forms. They exposed learners to communicative situations in which conversational implicatures take place without raising their awareness of target pragmatic norms that caused native speakers to interact the way they do in a given context. Comparing ESL and EFL learners’ performance to English native speakers’ and expecting them to recover target pragmatic forms in a native-like manner has been widely criticized in literature (Sykes, 2017). Hence, it is not surprising that the previous studies have yielded conflicting results. Alternatively, a *transnational languaculture* paradigm (Risager, 2007) has been introduced to emphasize a movement away from a native-speaker model, in which the native speaker is used as a representative standard of language and culture. In the *transnational languaculture* paradigm, language and culture transcend beyond the national boundaries. Hence, pragmatic competence development is not measured by comparing ESL and EFL learners’ performance to native speakers’. It requires improving ESL and EFL learners’ skills and strategies inside the classroom to become aware of target language and culture, which in turn, helps facilitate their awareness of why and how speakers of a target language interact the way they do in a given context.

One of the influential approaches in developing pragmatic competence inside the classroom is the consciousness-raising approach, an approach “designed to facilitate learners’ noticing and understanding of the form–context relationship” (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010, p. 113). This approach is grounded in Schmidt’s (1990, 1993a, 1993b, 1994, 1995, 2001) noticing hypothesis, in which he argued that awareness is necessary for second language pragmatic learning to take place. The consciousness-raising approach can be applied in two ways, 1) through discussion of *metapragmatic information* “contextual information analyzed in terms of social status, social distance, and degree of imposition” (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010, p. 103), or 2) by using observational tasks in which learners collect data by performing their own observations of *pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic information*. *Pragmalinguistic information* refers to the linguistic resources speakers choose from to achieve a pragmatic purpose. *Sociopragmatic information* refers to the rules underlying the appropriate application of linguistic forms in a social context (Thomas, 1983).

Conversational implicature literature revealed the significance of explicit instruction using consciousness-raising approach in equipping ESL and EFL learners with the skills that help them interpret conversational implicature appropriately in the classroom. However, little has been done in research to develop these skills. Researchers who utilized the consciousness-raising approach inside ESL and EFL classrooms rarely sensitized learners to pragmalinguistic, sociopragmatic, and metapragmatic features associated with conversational implicatures in context. For example, Abdelhafez (2016), Bouton (1994, 1996), Cignetti and Di Giuseppe (2015), Kubota (1995), and Sagdic and Hirschi (2015) implemented consciousness-raising approach holistically in teaching conversational implicature without directing learners' awareness of each pragmatic feature in context.

In his study, Bouton (1994) investigated the efficiency of explicit instruction in enhancing ESL learners' ability to interpret two types of conversational implicature (formulaic and non-formulaic) inside the classroom. According to Bouton (1994), formulaic conversational implicatures have a typical syntactic or semantic form; hence, they are easy to learn and interpret. Non-formulaic (idiosyncratic) conversational implicatures are mainly dependent on the relationship between a particular utterance and its particular context; as a result, they are more difficult to teach and learn. The study's findings revealed the effectiveness of explicit instruction with formulaic conversational implicatures, such as *pope Q implicature*, *indirect criticism*, *irony*, and *sequence implicature*. However, non-formulaic conversational implicatures such as *relevance-based implicatures* that were initially difficult proved to be resistant to instruction. Kubota (1995) replicated Bouton's (1994) study, this time with EFL learners using awareness-raising tasks. The study consisted of three groups, A, B and Z. In Group A, the researcher explained conversational implicature pragmatic rules; in Group B, learners were given consciousness-raising tasks in a group discussion; and Group Z had no treatment. Two test types were used in this study, a production test and a comprehension test. Findings revealed mixed results. In the production test, the experimental groups A and B performed significantly better than the control group Z, which reflects the effectiveness of implementing both an explicit explanation of rules and consciousness-raising tasks. In the comprehension test, findings showed no statistically significant differences in the accuracy of responses between the experimental groups A and B and the control group Z.

In 1996, Bouton conducted another study to examine whether the skills required to interpret conversational implicatures can be developed more rapidly by focusing on them in the ESL classroom. In this study, the experimental group had a one-hour session throughout six weeks using the consciousness-raising approach. Each type of conversational implicature used in this study was explained to the students, and its uses were discussed. Students were encouraged to come up with their own examples and practice using conversational implicature types inside and outside the classroom. The control group had no treatment. Both groups had a pre- and a post-test before and after the six-week period. The experimental group's performance had no improvement whatsoever in interpreting *minimum requirement rule* and *relevance implicature*. While, *pope Q*, *irony*, *sequence*, and *indirect criticism* proved to be easy to teach and learn inside the ESL classroom. According to Bouton (1996), one possible explanation of these results is that most of the items that are easy to teach and learn are formulaic. On the other hand, *relevance-based implicatures* are non-formulaic and are dependent on the relevant context and cultural elements. Hence, their interpretation cannot be generalized to all *relevance-based implicatures*. Bouton (1996) recommended investigating this type further and providing a formula that underlie the different types of *relevance-based implicatures* in order to systematically teach them inside the ESL classroom. Following Bouton's (1994, 1996) findings, Cignetti and Di Giuseppe (2015) conducted a study to investigate whether explicit-inductive instruction could enhance Argentinian EFL learners' ability to recover formulaic and non-formulaic implicature types. Two intact classes, already-

formed groups as opposed to randomly-assigned groups, were divided into an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group had five treatment sessions that were delivered during general English classes. The sessions lasted for one hour during a three-week period. Data collected using a written multiple-choice test before and after the treatment. After being exposed to explicit-inductive instruction, students in the experimental group showed a significant improvement in their recovery of both types of conversational implicature. As a result, Cignetti and Di Giuseppe (2015) argued against Bouton's (1994) and Broersma's (1994) claim that the formulaic type of implicature is amenable to instruction, whereas the non-formulaic type is resistant to instruction. The researchers proposed that non-formulaic implicatures require a high level of awareness and further analyses on the side of the learner.

In addition, Sagdic and Hirschi (2015) examined the effectiveness of explicit instruction using two different modifications in teaching one type of conversational implicature, *indirect criticism* to ESL learners. Two experimental groups were formed, an explicit-deductive group and an explicit-inductive group. Results showed a significant improvement in the performance of the two groups in the post-test, which suggests the possible effectiveness of different types of instruction in facilitating learners' interpretation of *indirect criticism* correctly and in promoting learners' pragmatic competence inside the ESL classroom. Comparing the two approaches applied in interpreting *indirect criticism*, results revealed no significant differences between the two groups' performance on the post-test. Findings suggest the possibility of applying either treatment with approximately the same proficiency gains (Sagdic & Hirschi, 2015). Moreover, Abdelhafez (2016) applied a four-step explicit instruction of conversational implicatures to explore the efficiency of training EFL learners to interpret conversational implicatures on their pragmatic competence development and language proficiency. The four-step explicit approach consisted of "(1) theory presentation; (2) Gricean analysis of a model conversation; (3) interpretations of implicatures in the model conversation; and (4) group interactions of a range of social interactions" (p. 456). Findings revealed the positive impact of explicit instruction of conversational implicature in developing EFL learners' pragmatic competence and language proficiency.

It can be observed from the above literature that all researchers implemented explicit instruction to raise learners' awareness of conversational implicatures holistically, only one recent study (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2020) incorporated consciousness-raising approach specifically, using metapragmatic awareness. Derakhshan and Eslami (2020) investigated the efficiency of teaching Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners' comprehension of implicatures. Participants were randomly assigned to four groups (metapragmatic awareness, interactive translation, discussion, and control). The three experimental groups outperformed the control group in a multiple-choice implicature listening test. In addition, the metapragmatic awareness group performed significantly better than the other experimental groups. These findings suggest the effectiveness of implementing different methods in promoting EFL learners' ability to comprehend implicatures, and the additional benefit of directing learners' attention specifically to salient pragmatic features in context in developing their skills to interpret implicatures.

Based on the findings of previous studies, Abdelhafez (2016) recommended teaching pragmatics using audiovisual input and raising learners' awareness to when, why, and with whom conversational implicature types are used. Manowong (2011) suggested implementing awareness-raising tasks to introduce learners to cultural and pragmatic variations. The researcher proposed providing learners with rich authentic context extracted from media clips, television shows or movies in order to promote pragmatic competence effectively.

Few studies incorporated audiovisual material in teaching conversational implicatures (Cignetti & Di Giuseppe, 2015; Derakhshan & Eslami, 2020; Köylü, 2018; Sagdic & Hirschi,

2015; Taguchi, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2011b; Taguchi et al., 2013). Cignetti and Di Giuseppe (2015) investigated learners' awareness of conversational implicatures using video scenes and handouts. Students in the experimental group showed a significant improvement in their recovery of conversational implicatures. Derakhshan and Eslami (2020) presented the experimental groups with video extracts containing implicatures taken from the TV series *Friends* and *Desperate Housewives*. The experimental group outperformed the control group in a multiple-choice implicature listening test. Köylü (2018) implemented an audiovisual interpretation task with an oral production component in which learners were given the opportunity to reflect their comprehension of conversational implicatures presented in the video. Participants reported their interpretations orally rather than providing a fixed response. Results indicated that the level of conversational implicature comprehension increased as second language proficiency level increased. Findings also reflected the superiority of a free response approach over a fixed one because the former allows learners to give a clear explanation of their pragmatic competence in conversational implicatures. In addition, Sagdic and Hirschi (2015) investigated the effectiveness of teaching *indirect criticism* to ESL learners using video examples of implicatures both deductively and inductively. Results showed a significant improvement in the performance of the two groups in the post-test. Finally, Taguchi (2005, 2008, 2009, 2011b) conducted a series of studies on ESL and EFL learners to examine their ability to interpret conversational implicatures using audio-recorded conversations. The researcher requested that learners listen to conversations and select the correct interpretation of the target utterances out of four options. Overall results revealed positive outcomes.

However, the majority of conversational implicature research relied on written material, which may lack authenticity. Researchers including Belz (2007), Boxer and Pickering (1995), Derakhshan, Mohsenzadeh, and Mohammadzadeh (2014), Derakhshan and Zangoei (2014), Ekin (2013), El-Okda (2011) Kasper (1997) Martínez-Flor (2008) Mirzaei et al. (2016), Rose (1994), Taguchi (2011a), Vellenga (2004) argued against the implementation of written materials in pragmatics instruction. They claimed that written input is decontextualized, lacks natural conversations, and is based on native-speaker's intuition rather than empirical studies' data on pragmatic norms. They proposed that using audiovisual material instead is beneficial in a number of ways: it provides rich context of cultural and social information to learners, it presents variable settings with different types of interlocutors where the relationship between the speaker and the hearer is clear, and it offers learners with visual and auditory pragmatic cues that enable them to easily comprehend the pragmatic message.

In order to bridge research gaps in intervention studies and extend available literature, the present study aims to investigate the effectiveness of applying the consciousness-raising approach in EFL context using audiovisual input in interpreting conversational implicatures. In this study, consciousness-raising tasks are developed based on Schmidt's noticing hypothesis (1990, 1993a, 1993b, 1994, 1995, 2001) and Grice's (1975) cooperative principle and conversational maxims. The purpose is to examine the efficiency of consciousness-raising tasks in equipping learners with the skills that facilitate their awareness of pragmalinguistic (speaker meaning), sociopragmatic (speaker intention), and metapragmatic (relationship between interlocutors) information associated with conversational implicature in context.

This study attempts to answer the following research questions and hypotheses:

- 1) How effective is consciousness-raising approach using audiovisual input in helping learners interpret conversational implicature correctly?
 - Hypothesis 1: The experimental group's results would improve in the post-test in comparison to the pre-test.

- 2) To what extent does consciousness-raising approach using audiovisual input help learners become aware of salient pragmatic features in native speakers' interaction?
 - Hypothesis 2: The experimental group would improve in all three pragmatic abilities (pragmalinguistic, sociopragmatic, and metapragmatic) in the post-test in comparison to the pre-test.

Method

The researcher adopted a quasi-experimental, pre-test and post-test design and implemented a multiple-choice discourse completion test (MDCT) to collect the primary data in the pre-test and post-test sessions.

Participants

A total of 126 Saudi female students majoring in English at Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University in Riyadh participated in this study. Participants' ages ranged from 21 to 26 years. They were selected from level five at the Department of English Language and Literature. The study was directed toward exploring ways to teach intermediate to advanced-level EFL students; hence, the choice of level five was intentional. With what is expected to be adequate English proficiency, participants should be able to understand English conversational implicatures and provide suitable interpretations of their occurrence in context.

In addition, the researcher intended to apply the study on students taking *Semantics* course, a requisite level five course, in which they are introduced to concepts of meaning in relation to other notions of pragmatics, including conversational implicatures. The researcher worked with five intact classes due to institutional constraints in making random assignment of participants into experimental and control groups. However, to sustain a strong research design, the researcher aimed at maintaining similar variables among participants in all classes. To achieve this purpose, the researcher distributed the instrument to participants from the same level, at the same institution, taking the same course, taught by teachers with the same educational level as the researcher (lecturers and PhD candidates), following the same teaching method in *Semantics* course instruction, and using the same materials. In addition, the researcher distributed a background questionnaire to participants in all classes. The purpose of the questionnaire was to distinguish participants with similar educational backgrounds and exclude participants who have lived or studied in English-speaking communities. Participants who have lived or studied in English-speaking communities were expected to have a higher level of awareness of target language pragmatics and culture. Therefore, they have been eliminated in order to examine the success of the consciousness-raising approach in developing EFL learners' awareness of English language pragmatics and culture inside the EFL classroom.

Two intact classes formed the experimental group and consisted originally of 55 participants, eight of whom have studied or lived in an English-speaking community and were excluded from the study. The final number of participants in the experimental group was 47. Three intact classes formed the control group and consisted originally of 88 participants, nine of whom have studied or lived in an English-speaking community and were excluded from the study. The final number of participants in the control group was 79. All participants had Arabic as their first language.

Instrument

The instrument in this study included a background questionnaire, a pre-test, and a post-test. Attached to the instrument a consent cover letter to inform participants that their

participation is completely voluntary. The pre-test and the post-test were designed in the form of MDCT, a test developed to examine learners' receptive pragmatic ability. It involves situations followed by multiple-choice items to select from the most appropriate response (Chen & Rau, 2013). The study instrument was modelled after Bouton's (1994) conversational implicature instrument and Grice's (1975) conversational implicature examples (Appendix A). Both the pre-test and the post-test contained eight questions. Each question was composed of a situation and a dialogue followed by four multiple-choice items on pragmalinguistic (speaker meaning), sociopragmatic (speaker intention), and metapragmatic (relationship between interlocutors) information involved in formulating conversational implicature types. The dialogues included four types of conversational implicature produced as a result of flouting Grice's (1975) maxims, (non-formulaic) *relevance implicature*, and (formulaic) *indirect criticism*, *irony*, and *manner implicature*. Items in the post-test were exactly the same as those in the pre-test.

The situations in the MDCT were set in a hypothetical American-English-speaking context. In the original test, Bouton (1994) investigated participants' ability to interpret different types of conversational implicature holistically. In this study, the researcher modified the instrument to examine participants' awareness of each pragmatic feature (pragmalinguistic, sociopragmatic, and metapragmatic) individually in context, which in turn facilitates their awareness and interpretation of conversational implicatures meaning.

Validity of the Instrument

To ensure validity and the degree to which the study's instrument measured what it was supposed to measure, the researcher developed the instrument after Bouton's (1994) conversational implicature instrument, which was administered in his two longitudinal studies (1986–1991 and 1990–1993). The instrument also included Grice's (1975) original examples of conversational implicature types (Appendix A). Although the researcher modified some of the scenarios in the original dialogues, the modified instrument was administered to four American-English native speakers to evaluate the content according to what they considered culturally and socially appropriate in an American context.

One of the American-English native speakers noted the difficulty of determining the type of relationship between interlocutors as a result of brief contextual information. Based on the native speaker's feedback, the researcher provided a detailed conversational context. For Question B, in which participants were asked to identify which of Grice's (1975) maxims had been flouted to generate implicature, two American-English native speakers indicated the possibility of having more than one option as the correct answer; as a result, the researcher rephrased the answers to avoid confusion and ensure validity. Another feedback suggested using italics to emphasize stress and intonation and to identify speakers' intentions more clearly. The researcher modified the items accordingly. In addition, three professors majoring in Applied Linguistics at the College of Languages and Translation at Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University revised the instrument and provided their feedback. They all agreed that the instrument was well designed and suggested rephrasing a few multiple-choice items. Based on their feedback, the researcher updated the instrument.

Finally, because the purpose of this test was to measure participants' pragmatic ability and their competence of the concept being tested, the researcher calculated the facility value (difficulty index) of each test item to investigate the degree to which an item was measuring what it was supposed to measure. The higher the value, the easier the item would be (Hughes, 2003). The facility value includes the percentage of learners who answered each item correctly. Items above 90% ($P = 0.90$) are considered too easy and are not worth testing. Items below 10% ($P = 0.10$) are considered too difficult and require revision for possible confusion. Results indicated that all of the test items were of moderate difficulty, ranging

from $P = 0.23$ to $P = 0.86$, as shown in Table 1. These findings reveal the validity of the test items in achieving the purpose of the study.

Table 1

Item Analysis (Facility Value of Each Item)

No.	Facility value	No.	Facility value	No.	Facility value	No.	Facility value
1.A	0.51	3.A	0.33	5.A	0.72	7.A	0.63
1.B	0.64	3.B	0.27	5.B	0.66	7.B	0.29
1.C	0.57	3.C	0.77	5.C	0.69	7.C	0.62
1.D	0.81	3.D	0.68	5.D	0.36	7.D	0.78
2.A	0.34	4.A	0.86	6.A	0.46	8.A	0.48
2.B	0.40	4.B	0.52	6.B	0.56	8.B	0.23
2.C	0.47	4.C	0.69	6.C	0.60	8.C	0.61
2.D	0.72	4.D	0.84	6.D	0.45	8.D	0.35

Reliability of the Instrument

To ensure consistency of the test measurement, the researcher took into consideration a number of points in designing the instrument: (a) the researcher provided explicit instructions on the test so that participants could understand clearly what was expected of them; (b) the researcher identified participants anonymously by their ID number, not name, to ensure more reliable and accurate answers, and (c) the researcher acknowledged that a test that has only a few items does not often represent participants' ability. The more items a test has, the more reliable it becomes (Hughes, 2003). Participants were asked to analyze four types of conversational implicature twice in the test. They were also asked to identify three pragmatic features (pragmalinguistic, sociopragmatic, and metapragmatic) repeatedly in each question. The final point the researcher considered in designing the instrument was the choice of a quantitative method for data collection; an MDCT permits completely objective scoring and avoids bias.

Additionally, the researcher calculated the coefficient of internal consistency using Kuder-Richardson-20 measurement and a split-half method. Results indicated an acceptable level of reliability coefficient (0.78) and a split-half measurement of (0.73) as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Reliability Coefficient of the Instrument

Number of Items	Kuder-Richardson-20 (KR-20)	Split half
32	0.78	0.73

Procedure

In the experimental group, participants were taught conversational implicature through consciousness-raising approach using audiovisual input. The approach applied was based on Murray's (2009) complementary approach in which consciousness-raising can be achieved both deductively and inductively. The control group had no treatment and was instructed from the coursebook. The procedure was conducted in seven sessions over seven

weeks as follows:

In the first session, all participants in the two groups were given a background questionnaire and a 30-minute MDCT to complete (Appendix A). In the pre-test, participants were instructed to read each situation on the test and to choose the items that best represented pragmalinguistic (speaker meaning), sociopragmatic (speaker intention), and metapragmatic (relationship between interlocutors) features involved in formulating conversational implicatures.

Two weeks after the pre-test, the actual treatment was implemented on the experimental group. In the second session, the experimental group was given a 45-minute lesson on conversational implicatures presented deductively. Lesson components included (a) a warm-up session, (b) an explicit explanation of Grice's (1975) maxims and conversational implicature types, (c) exposure to video examples of four conversational implicature types generated as a result of flouting Grice's (1975) four conversational maxims, and (d) an analysis and discussion of the examples with the students (Appendix B).

From the third session until the sixth session, participants were engaged in inductive consciousness-raising tasks on four types of conversational implicature. In the third and fifth sessions, participants were engaged in tasks on *indirect criticism* flouting the maxim of quantity and on *irony* flouting the maxim of quality. In the fourth and sixth sessions, participants were engaged in tasks on *relevance implicature* flouting the maxim of relation and on *manner implicature* flouting the maxim of manner (Appendix C).

The consciousness-raising tasks implemented in this study consisted of four phases. They were designed to raise learners' awareness of conversational implicature types using audiovisual input and were based on consciousness-raising tasks provided by Ishihara and Cohen (2010) for developing pragmatic competence inside the classroom as follows:

- 1) Input exposure phase: In the first phase, participants watched two video extracts taken from the American sitcom *Friends*. The videos contained violations of Grice's (1975) maxims, namely 'flouting' and the generated implied meaning (implicature) as a result.
- 2) Form recognition (pragmalinguistic) phase: The second phase included tasks with mainly linguistic focus. It reflected learners' ability to identify the speaker's meaning. While presenting the video extracts, the researcher distributed transcripts of the video extracts and active-viewing task worksheets (Appendix C). The researcher asked students to work in small groups to identify the conversational implicatures formulas and strategies and the salient pragmatic features associated with them, including the speaker's behavior (gestures, facial expressions, use of space, eye contact, tone of voice) and nuances (e.g., being serious, sarcastic, shocked, confrontational, pessimistic, joking, or sincere) in conveying meaning in the context. The researcher also explained why the literal meaning does not hold in the given context.
- 3) Function recognition (sociopragmatic) phase: The third phase included tasks with mainly social focus. It reflected learners' ability to identify the speaker's intention. In this phase, participants were asked to analyze language and context to determine which of Grice's (1975) maxims has been 'flouted' to generate conversational implicatures and identify the speaker's intention as a result. Participants were also asked to assess the speaker's attainment of their goal and the listener's interpretation.
- 4) Metapragmatic information phase: The fourth phase focused on learners' ability to identify the type of relationship between the interlocutors based on social factors (power and distance) and the effect of these factors on the choice of conversational implicature form and function. Once they had identified conversational implicature form and function in the dialogue, learners were asked to observe the interlocutors' interaction and analyze how social power and social distance between the speaker and

listener influenced the language of conversational implicature in terms of directness, formality, and politeness and the use of conversational implicature strategies in terms of appropriateness.

The treatment material implemented in this study included 12 video extracts on different types of conversational implicature, eight video transcripts, and eight active-viewing task worksheets. The study utilized audiovisual material extracted from the American situational comedy (sitcom) *Friends* (1994-2004), one of the most successful situational comedies in the last decade. The show consisted of 10 seasons portraying stories of a group of friends living in New York (Quaglio, 2009). The active-viewing task worksheets applied in this study were adapted from the Pragmatic Assessment Rubric developed by Ishihara and Cohen (2010) for evaluating learners' receptive pragmatic ability. From the assessment rubric, the researcher selected the questions suitable for measuring pragmalinguistic, sociopragmatic, and metapragmatic abilities to meet the objectives of the study (Appendix C).

One week after the treatment, participants in the experimental group and the control group were given a post-test (Appendix A). The experimental group had 30 minutes to complete the test. The control group had a one-hour session: in the first half of the session, participants were introduced to conversational implicature concept in general from the coursebook without raising their awareness to pragmalinguistic (speaker meaning), sociopragmatic (speaker intention), or metapragmatic (relationship between interlocutors) information involved in formulating conversational implicatures in context. In the second half of the session, participants were given a 30-minute post-test to complete.

Data Analysis

The data collected in this study were analyzed quantitatively using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The mean and standard deviation of the two groups, the experimental group and the control group, were calculated using t-test to examine the efficiency of applying the consciousness-raising approach in directing learners' awareness of conversational implicatures and in developing their pragmatic competence as a result.

The data obtained from the instrument on the ability to interpret pragmalinguistic (speaker meaning), sociopragmatic (speaker intention), and metapragmatic (relationship between interlocutors) features were analyzed and discussed based on Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) Pragmatic Assessment Rubric. The aim was to investigate the extent to which the consciousness-raising approach helped learners become aware of these features in native speakers' interactions.

In assessing learners' receptive pragmatic ability with a focus on language aspects, the researcher aimed to answer the following question: To what extent do learners understand the language as intended by the speaker? The answer to this question is based on participants' choice of vocabulary/phrases, grammatical structures, and strategies for conversational implicature forms (i.e., the selection of formulas and the way they are used).

In assessing learners' receptive pragmatic ability with a focus on social aspects, the researcher aimed to answer the following question: To what extent do learners understand the use of the target language and its likely consequence in a social and situational context? The answer to this question is based on participants' ability to determine the extent to which the speaker's choice of conversational implicature strategy is effective in conveying his or her intention in a particular context, and how the speaker's intention is interpreted by members of the target language community.

In assessing learners' analytical ability of form–context relationship, the researcher examined learners' skills in analyzing how the target language is used in authentic contexts

and how social factors (i.e., social power and social distance) between interlocutors can influence the form and the function of conversational implicature strategies.

Results

The researcher verified the equivalence of the two groups' scores in the pretest using t-test. The aim was to investigate if there were any significant differences between the means of the experimental group and the control group prior to the study (Table 3).

Table 3

T-test results obtained from the experimental group and control group pre-test

Feature	Group	N	Mean*	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig. (0.05)
Pragmalinguistic	Experimental	47	49.20	22.48	0.12	0.905
	Control	79	48.70	22.81		
Sociopragmatic	Experimental	47	41.49	20.04	1.04	0.301
	Control	79	37.82	18.47		
Metapragmatic	Experimental	47	61.70	17.17	0.11	0.915
	Control	79	61.36	16.93		
Social power	Experimental	47	63.03	19.50	0.70	0.488
	Control	79	60.39	21.11		
Social distance	Experimental	47	60.37	22.62	0.50	0.620
	Control	79	62.34	20.53		
Total score	Experimental	47	53.52	16.11	0.42	0.674
	Control	79	52.31	15.11		

* Means were converted into 100 degrees

As displayed in Table 3, the pre-test results show that the performance of both groups was fairly similar before instruction. This is apparent in the mean scores obtained by the experimental group (53.52) and the control group (52.31). The standard deviation shows that participants' performance in both groups was relatively similar, (the experimental group = 16.11) and (the control group = 15.11). The t-value recorded between the two groups was not statistically significant (0.674) at the significance level of 0.05.

In addition, the statistical analysis presented in Table 3 shows that the t-values were non-significant in all three features (pragmalinguistic = 0.905; sociopragmatic = 0.301; metapragmatic = 0.915), as well as the two factors (social power = 0.488; social distance = 0.620). To investigate whether the experimental group's performance improved in the post-test in comparison to the pre-test, the means were calculated using *paired sample t-test* (Table 4).

Table 4

Paired sample t-test results obtained from the experimental group's pre-test and post-test

	Mean*	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig. (0.05)
Pre-test	53.52	16.11	3.02	0.004
Post-test	58.31	16.65		

* Means were converted into 100 degrees

As shown in Table 4, the t-value between the means of the experimental group's pre-test and post-test was significant (0.004) at the significance level of 0.05. This implies the existence of a statistically significant improvement in the overall performance of the experimental group in the post-test (58.31) in comparison to the pre-test (53.52). Findings reflect the efficiency of the pedagogical intervention in developing pragmatic competence inside the EFL classroom. The means were also calculated for the control group in the pre-test and post-test using *paired sample t-test* (Table 5).

Table 5

Paired Sample t-test results obtained from the control group's pre-test and post-test

	Mean*	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig. (0.05)
Pre-test	52.31	15.11	5.58	0.000
Post-test	59.66	17.45		

* Means were converted into 100 degrees

As shown in Table 5, the t-value between the means of the control group's pre-test and post-test was also significant (0.000) at the significance level of 0.05. This indicates the existence of a statistically significant improvement in the overall performance of the control group in the post-test (59.66) in comparison to the pre-test (52.31) without undergoing any treatment.

To examine the extent to which the consciousness-raising approach using audiovisual input helped learners become aware of salient pragmatic features in native speaker's interactions, the researcher investigated whether there was an improvement in the experimental group's performance in the post-test in comparison to the pre-test in each pragmatic feature (pragmalinguistic, sociopragmatic, and metapragmatic). Whether the experimental group's performance has improved in all three pragmatic features in the post-test in comparison to the pre-test, results were calculated using *paired sample t-test* (Table 6).

Table 6

Paired sample t-test results on each pragmatic feature obtained from the experimental group's pre-test and post-test

	Feature	Mean*	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig. (0.05)
Pre-test	Pragmalinguistic	49.20	22.48	3.33	0.002
Post-test		57.71	23.97		
Pre-test	Sociopragmatic	41.49	20.04	2.87	0.006
Post-test		50.27	23.96		
Pre-test	Metapragmatic	61.70	17.17	0.41	0.683
Post-test		62.63	19.48		
Pre-test	Social power	63.03	19.50	1.23	0.223
Post-test		58.78	28.54		
Pre-test	Social distance	60.37	22.62	1.95	0.057
Post-test		66.49	17.51		

* Means were converted into 100 degrees

As displayed in Table 6, the t-values were significant at the significance level of 0.05 in pragmalinguistic feature (0.002) and sociopragmatic feature (0.006). These results indicate the existence of a statistically significant improvement in the experimental group's performance in analyzing speaker meaning and speaker intention in the post-test in comparison to the pre-test. On the other hand, the t-values were non-significant in metapragmatic feature (0.683) in general and in the two social factors, power (0.223) and distance (0.057), in particular. These results indicate a lack of a statistically significant improvement in the experimental group's ability to analyze the effect of social factors between interlocutors on the relationship between language and context in native speakers' interactions. The control group's results were also calculated using *paired sample t-test* to investigate whether there was an improvement in their performance in each pragmatic ability in the post-test in comparison to the pre-test (Table 7).

Table 7

Paired sample t-test results on each pragmatic feature obtained from the experimental group's pre-test and post-test

	Feature	Mean*	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig. (0.05)
Pre-test	Pragmalinguistic	48.70	22.81	4.56	0.000
Post-test		60.23	23.54		
Pre-test	Sociopragmatic	37.82	18.47	4.97	0.000
Post-test		50.16	22.53		
Pre-test	Metapragmatic	61.36	16.93	1.76	0.082
Post-test		64.12	19.27		
Pre-test	Social power	60.39	21.11	2.83	0.006
Post-test		67.05	26.74		
Pre-test	Social distance	62.34	20.53	0.58	0.567
Post-test		61.20	20.44		

* Means were converted into 100 degrees

As shown in Table 7, the t-values were significant at the significance level of 0.05 in pragmalinguistic feature (0.000) and sociopragmatic feature (0.000), which indicate the existence of a statistically significant improvement in the control group's performance in these two features in the post-test in comparison to the pre-test without undergoing any treatment. On the other hand, metapragmatic feature revealed mixed results. The t-value was non-significant at the significance level of 0.05 for metapragmatic feature (0.082) in general and social distance (0.567) in particular, whereas the t-value was significant at the significance level of 0.05 for social power (0.006). These results indicate the existence of a statistically significant improvement in one factor of metapragmatic feature in the control group's performance in the post-test in comparison to the pre-test without undergoing any treatment.

Discussion

The analysis of the pre-test scores allowed the researcher to assert that the performance of the experimental and control groups were fairly similar before the instructional period. The mean scores of both groups showed that their overall performances were quite alike and their abilities to recover different types of conversational implicature were the same.

The major findings of the present study included the following: a) the pedagogical intervention revealed a positive effect on the experimental group's performance in interpreting both types of conversational implicature, formulaic and non-formulaic, and b) an investigation of the experimental group's performance on each pragmatic feature in the post-test revealed a significant improvement in pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities but not in metapragmatic ability.

The first research question in this study addresses the effectiveness of consciousness-raising approach using audiovisual input in helping learners interpret conversational implicature correctly. With regards to the first research hypothesis, findings revealed a significant improvement in the experimental group's overall performance. It can be concluded from these results that the pedagogical intervention was effective in facilitating EFL learners' awareness of conversational implicatures in context, which adds support to available research on the efficiency of explicit-inductive modification in the form of consciousness-raising approach in conversational implicature instruction (Abdelhafez, 2016; Bouton, 1994, 1996; Cignetti & Di Giuseppe, 2015; Derakhshan & Eslami, 2020; Kubota, 1995; Sagdic & Hirschi, 2015). However, the significant improvement recorded in the control group's overall results was surprising because participants did not undergo any treatment. Findings revealed that once learners are aware of the pragmatic concept in general, they are more likely to perceive and understand it (Glaser, 2013; Hulstijn & De Graaff, 1994; Lingli & Wannaruk, 2010; Norris & Ortega, 2000).

In addition, the improved performance in analyzing conversational implicatures in both groups supports researchers argument that some types of implicature are more difficult than others and that formulaic implicatures are easier to teach and learn than non-formulaic implicatures (Bouton, 1994, 1996; Broersma, 1994; Kubota, 1995). The majority of conversational implicature types presented in this study were formulaic which indicates that these types are easily discovered as a result of their saliency in context. These findings support Hulstijn and De Graaff's (1994) argument that the advantage of explicit instruction is greater in the case of complex forms than in the case of simple ones because simple forms are salient enough in the input to be discovered by learners spontaneously with minimal assistance from the explicit instruction. Whereas, in the case of complex forms, explicit instruction saves learners considerable time in discovering their complexities.

The second research question addresses the extent to which consciousness-raising approach using audiovisual input help learners become aware of salient pragmatic features in native speakers' interaction. Participants were exposed to native speakers' interactions with the aim to develop their skills and strategies to analyse target language and culture. They were familiarized with salient pragmatic features (pragmalinguistic, sociopragmatic and metapragmatic) associated with conversational implicature and were explicitly taught how to detect them in context. Hence, exposing participants to native speakers' interactions was not intended to use the native speaker of English as a representative model of appropriate performance. Participants were not expected to recover conversational implicature formulas in the same manner native speakers of English do. The appropriateness of participants' responses in the instrument was measured based on Grice's (1975) cooperative principle and conversational maxims (quantity, quality, relation and manner) as well as Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) Pragmatic Assessment Rubric.

Whether the experimental group has improved in all three pragmatic abilities has been

analysed. Findings of the second research hypothesis revealed a significant improvement in the experimental group's performance in analyzing speaker meaning (pragmalinguistic ability) and speaker intention (sociopragmatic ability). However, no significant improvement was recorded in analyzing the relationship between language and context (metapragmatic ability) in the post-test. Learners were unable to identify the type of relationship between interlocutors based on social power and social distance. The positive improvement in the experimental group's results in pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities reflects the effectiveness of inductive consciousness-raising tasks using audiovisual input in equipping learners with the analytical skills that allow them to discover linguistic and social aspects in native speakers' interactions and to interpret conversational implicatures appropriately as a result. These findings support Derakhshan and Eslami's results (2020) on the positive effect of sensitizing learners to pragmatic features specifically in context by using audiovisual material.

On the other hand, the non-significant improvement in metapragmatic ability in the experimental group's performance in the post-test revealed the difficulty of identifying the type of relationship between interlocutors based on social factors (power and distance) when they are presented inductively in context. These results are in line with the inconclusive findings in research on which modification—deductive or inductive—is more effective in pragmatic instruction (Glaser, 2016; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Rose & Ng, 2001; Takimoto, 2008). In addition, the positive improvement in the control group's performance without undergoing any treatment shed light on the conflict between what specifically in target language input must be attended to achieve learning—whether attention must be specifically focused or global. Results of the present study do not support Schmidt's (2001) argument on the necessity of attending specifically to both the linguistic forms of utterances and the relevant social and contextual features with which they are associated in order to achieve learning. The mixed findings indicate that both types of attention—focused and global—are effective in achieving learning of target pragmatic features (Ishihara and Cohen, 2010; Witten, 2002).

However, these results are preliminary. Much work remains to be done in this area. It should be noted that few studies have been conducted to examine the effectiveness of consciousness-raising approach in interpreting conversational implicatures (Abdelhafez, 2016; Bouton, 1994, 1996; Cignetti & Di Giuseppe, 2015; Kubota, 1995; Sagdic & Hirschi, 2015), and even in available research, consciousness-raising approach has been applied holistically. Researchers rarely sensitized ESL and EFL learners to pragmalinguistic, sociopragmatic, and metapragmatic features associated with conversational implicatures in context. Only one recent study (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2020) has been found to direct learners' attention specifically to pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features in context using metapragmatic awareness, which revealed positive outcomes. Hence, the insignificant improvement in metapragmatic awareness in the present study suggests the need for further investigation in this area.

Conclusion

The present study has pedagogical implications for learners, educators, and syllabus writers of pragmatics. Findings support Murray's (2009) and Wang's (2011) arguments on the pivotal role of directing learners' awareness toward general principles, including Grice's (1975) cooperative principle and the universal conversational maxims. Teaching Grice's conversational maxims and their violations can help learners comprehend the speaker meaning and intention in a given context. Results verify Bouton's (1994) view on the necessity of teaching conversational implicatures explicitly by introducing their different

types and functions. They also support Broersma's (1994) argument on the need for a pedagogical taxonomy of implicature types and a theoretical descriptive work on implicatures. Hence, including conversational implicatures in EFL courses is necessary.

In addition, findings reveal the positive impact of explicit instruction in facilitating conversational implicature interpretation. Teachers are encouraged to implement an explicit-inductive instruction in the form of consciousness-raising approach using audiovisual material to raise learners' awareness of linguistic aspects and social aspects to achieve appropriate interpretation of different types of conversational implicature, formulaic and non-formulaic. Instead of investigating ESL and EFL learners' ability to interpret conversational implicatures in the same manner native speakers do, instructors should teach learners explicitly what conversational implicatures mean, their communicative purpose, what factors to look for in context, and how and when conversational implicatures are used to serve a communicative effect.

Moreover, results of the present study reflect the efficiency of implementing inductive consciousness-raising tasks in providing learners with the analytical tools that allow them to observe linguistic aspects (pragmalinguistic) and social aspects (sociopragmatic) of conversational implicatures in context. However, the non-significant improvement in analyzing metapragmatic aspects may suggest the need for alternative approaches in teaching these features in the EFL classroom, such as holistic instruction through deductive modification.

Finally, language educators and material writers are encouraged to realize the limitations of pragmatic textbooks and develop language learning in authentic contexts. In this study, the researcher implemented active-viewing task worksheets and conversational transcripts extracted from audiovisual material that are readily available to be used by teachers in ESL and EFL classrooms (Appendix C). Learners can interpret the conversational discourse, detect salient language forms, and practice their use in context.

Although findings revealed the positive effect of explicit instruction in pragmatic competence development, the present study had a few limitations. First, due to institutional constraints, the researcher had to work with intact classes rather than randomly assigned groups. Second, the majority of conversational implicature types presented in this study were formulaic, which may have affected the results of both groups positively. Additional research needs to be conducted on non-formulaic implicature type alone to investigate if this type is resistant to instruction. Third, although the present study does not aim to use the English native speaker as a representative model of appropriate performance, exposing participants to English native speakers interactions alone is one of the limitations of this study. Pragmatic research has emphasized a movement away from a native-speaker model, and revealed the pivotal role of *transnational languaculture* paradigm in pragmatic teaching and learning (Sykes, 2017). As a result, future researchers are recommended to raise ESL and EFL learners' awareness of how speakers of English language in general interact with each other and implicate meaning in context. Fourth, the instrument used for this study was a written MDCT. It is important to note that the instrument implemented in this study was constructed following valid and reliable measures. It was modelled based on Bouton's (1994) conversational implicature instrument, which has been administered in his two longitudinal studies (1986–1991 and 1990–1993). The instrument was also modified by American-English native speakers according to what they considered culturally and socially appropriate in an American context. However, written situations do not fully reflect the social and situational information in actual interactions, such as the relationship between interlocutors, the duration of the interaction, and the context and setting of the interaction. In addition, written situations do not reflect the non-verbal cues available in real interactions (e.g. gestures, posture, facial expressions) and paralinguistic elements (e.g. pitch, intonation). Moreover, the pragmatic

strategies performed by interlocutors in natural interactions, such as the sequence of action, coordination between interlocutors and hesitation are not present in described written situations.

Despite the limitations of the instrument, a MDCT appears to be suitable for assessing learners' receptive ability of appropriate pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects in context. This type of test does not elicit what participants think they would say in a particular situation, rather it examines their ability to interpret implicated meaning in a particular situation. Therefore, it would be valuable to replicate the instrument of the present study with an audiovisual active-viewing MDCT in future research. In the experimental treatment of this study, participants were exposed to audiovisual input and were requested to answer active-viewing task worksheets (Appendix C). In the instrument of the present study, participants were given written situations and were requested to select the appropriate answer from multiple-choice items. Hence, it is recommended to replicate the instrument of the present study with an audiovisual active-viewing MDCT in which participants are exposed to audiovisual input and are asked to select the appropriate answer as they actively view the video extracts. If implemented effectively, an audiovisual active-viewing MDCT is expected to achieve positive outcomes. Using audiovisual material provides rich context of cultural and social information, presents variable contexts with different types of interlocutors where the relationship between the speaker and the hearer is clear, and offers visual and auditory pragmatic cues that enable participants to easily comprehend the pragmatic message and provide an instant feedback as they actively watch the material.

References

- Abdelhafez, A. M. (2016). The effect of conversational implicature instruction on developing TEFL students' pragmatic competence and language proficiency. *US-China Education Review*, 6(8), 451-465. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2161-623X/2016.08.001>
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13–32). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Griffin, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from the ESL classroom. *System*, 33(3), 401-415. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.06.004>
- Belz, J. A. (2007). The role of computer mediation in the instruction and development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 27, 45-75. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190508070037>
- Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representation and attentional control in pragmatic competence. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 43-57). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Birjandi, P., & Derakhshan, A. (2014). Pragmatic comprehension of apology, request, and refusal: An investigation on the effect of consciousness-raising video-driven prompts. *Applied Research on English Language*, 3(1), 67-85. <https://doi.org/10.22108/ARE.2014.15479>
- Bouton, L. F. (1988). A cross-cultural study of ability to interpret implicatures in English. *World Englishes*, 7(2), 183-196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1988.tb00230.x>
- Bouton, L. F. (1989). So they got the message, but how did they get it? *IDEAL*, 4, 119-49.
- Bouton, L. F. (1990). The effective use of implicature in English: Why and how it should be taught in the ESL classroom. *Pragmatics and Language Learning Monograph Series*, 1, 43-52.

- Bouton, L. F. (1992). The interpretation of implicature in English by NNS: Does it come automatically without being explicitly taught? *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, 3, 53-65.
- Bouton, L. F. (1994). Can NNS skill in interpreting implicature in American English be improved through explicit instruction? A pilot study. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (pp. 88–109). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Bouton, L. F. (1996). Pragmatics and language learning. *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, 7, 1-20.
- Boxer, D., & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: The case of complaints. *ELT Journal*, 49(1), 44-58.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.1.44>
- Broersma, D. (1994). Do chicken have lips? Conversational implicature in the ESL classroom. *The 8th Annual Meeting of the International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Chen, Y., & Rau, V. (2013). Developing multiple-choice discourse completion tasks as pedagogical materials in L2 pragmatics. *Research Gate*, 106-120.
- Cignetti, L. M., & Di Giuseppe, M. S. (2015). Pragmatic awareness of conversational implicatures and the usefulness of explicit instruction. *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de Lenguas*, (19), 42-70.
<https://doi.org/10.26378/rmlael019282>
- Derakhshan, A., & Arabmofrad, A. (2018). The impact of instruction on the pragmatic comprehension of speech acts of apology, request, and refusal among Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *English Teaching & Learning*, 42(1), 75-94.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-018-0004-6>
- Derakhshan, A., & Eslami, Z. (2015). The effect of consciousness-raising instruction on the pragmatic development of apology and request. *The Electronic Journal of English as a Second Language*, 18(4), 1-24.
- Derakhshan, A., & Eslami, Z. (2020). The effect of metapragmatic awareness, interactive translation, and discussion through video-enhanced input on EFL learners' comprehension of implicature. *Applied Research on English Language*, 9(1), 637-664.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.22108/are.2019.118062.1476>
- Derakhshan, A., & Zangoei, A. (2014). Video-driven prompts: A viable pragmatic consciousness-raising approach in EFL/ESL classrooms. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*, 5(2), 368-380.
- Derakhshan, A., Mohsenzadeh, H., & Mohammadzadeh, S. (2014). The nuts and bolts of teaching implicatures in EFL/ESL contexts: An overview on the role of video-enhanced input. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(5), 13-21. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.5p.13>
- Ekin, M. T. Y. (2013). Do current EFL coursebooks work for the development of L2 pragmatic competence? The case of suggestions. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 1306-1310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.033>
- El-Okda, M. (2011). Developing pragmatic competence: Challenges and solutions. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 13(2), 169-198.
- Ellis, R. (2005). *Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review*. Wellington, Australia: Research Division, Ministry of Education.
- Ghobadi, A., & Fahim, M. (2009). The effect of explicit teaching of English “thanking formulas” on Iranian EFL intermediate level students at English language institutes. *System*, 37(3), 526-537. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.02.010>

- Glaser, K. (2013). The neglected combination: A case for explicit-inductive instruction in teaching pragmatics in ESL. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30(7), 150-150. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v30i7.1158>
- Glaser, K. (2016). News from the pragmatics classroom: Contrasting the inductive and the deductive approach in the teaching of pragmatic competence. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 13(4), 529-561. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2016-0023>
- Green, G. (1989). *Pragmatics and natural language understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203053546>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (pp. 41-58). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811_003
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge university press.
- Hulstijn, J. H., & De Graaff, R. (1994). Under what conditions does explicit knowledge of a second language facilitate the acquisition of implicit knowledge? A research proposal. *AILA Review*, 11, 97-112.
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2010). *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics: Where Language and Culture Meet* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833842>
- Kasper, G. (1997). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center. <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/>
- Kasper, G. (2001). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(4), 502-530. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.4.502>
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic development in a second language. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 52, 1.
- Kondo, S. (2004). Raising pragmatic awareness in the EFL context. *Sophia Junior College Faculty Bulletin*, 24, 49-72.
- Köylü, Y. (2018). Comprehension of conversational implicatures in L2 English. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 15(3), 373-408. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2018-0011>
- Kubota, M. (1995). Teachability of conversational implicature to Japanese EFL learners. *IRLT Bulletin* 9, 35-67.
- Lee, J. J. (2005). The native speaker: An achievable model. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(2), 152-163.
- Lee, J. S. (2002). Interpreting conversational implicatures: A study of Korean learners of English. *The Korea TESOL Journal*, 5(1), 1-26.
- Lemmerich, E. (2010). *An explicit awareness-raising approach to the teaching of sociopragmatic variation in early foreign language learning* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Utah]. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/50519141_An_explicit_awareness-raising_approach_to_the_teaching_of_sociopragmatic_variation_in_early_foreign_language_learning
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge UK.
- Lingli, D., & Wannaruk, A. (2010). The effects of explicit and implicit instruction in English refusals. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Foreign Language Teaching & Research Press)*, 33(3).
- Manowong, S. (2011). The study of ability to interpret conversational implicatures in English of Thai EFL learners. *The Asian Conference on Language Learning Official Conference Proceedings 2011*.138-148. The International Academic Forum, Osaka, Japan.

- Martínez-Flor, A. (2008). Analysing request modification devices in films: Implications for pragmatic learning in instructed foreign language contexts. In *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 245-280). Springer, Dordrecht.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-5639-0_13
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Soler, E. A. (2007). Developing pragmatic awareness of suggestions in the EFL classroom: A focus on instructional effects. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(1).
- Mirzaei, A., Hashemian, M., & Khoramshekouh, A. (2016). L2 learners' enhanced pragmatic comprehension of implicatures via computer-mediated communication and social media networks. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 141-180.
<http://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijal.19.1.141>
- Murray, N. (2009). Pragmatics, awareness raising, and the cooperative principle. *ELT Journal*, 64(3), 293-301. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp056>
- Narita, R. (2012). The effects of pragmatic consciousness-raising activity on the development of pragmatic awareness and use of hearsay evidential markers for learners of Japanese as a foreign language. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(1), 1-29.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.016>
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417-528.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00136>
- Pearson, L. E. (2001). *Pragmatics in foreign language teaching: The effects of instruction on L2 learners' acquisition of Spanish expressions of gratitude, apologies, and directives* [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. University of Texas at Austin.
- Quaglio, P. (2009). *Television dialogue: The sitcom Friends vs. natural conversation*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Risager, K. (2007). *Language and Culture Pedagogy: From a National to a Transnational Paradigm*. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters.
<https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599613>
- Rose, K. R. (1994). Pragmatic consciousness-raising in an EFL context. In L. F. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (pp. 52-63). Urbana IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System*, 33(3), 385-399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.06.003>
- Rose, K. R., & Ng, C. (2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses. *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*, 145, 145-170.
- Ryu, J. (2018). *Pragmatics instruction in Korean as a foreign language programs in the US: Overview of the programs, instructors' beliefs, and pedagogical application* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Arizona]. <http://hdl.handle.net/10150/626659>
- Sagdic, A., & Hirschi, K. (2015). *Teaching Conversational Implicature: Indirect Criticism Through Inductive and Deductive Instruction*. Northern Arizona University.
<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:208814912>
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129-158.
- Schmidt, R. (1993a). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 206-226.
- Schmidt, R. (1993b). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, 21, 42.
- Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. *Consciousness in Second Language Learning*, 11, 237-326.
- Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of

- attention and awareness in learning. *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning*, 9, 1-63.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge University Press.
- Soler, E. A. (2007). Fostering EFL learners' awareness of requesting through explicit and implicit consciousness-raising tasks. *Investigating Tasks in Formal Language Learning*, 221-241.
- Soler, E. A., & Pitarch, J. G. (2010). The effect of instruction on learners' pragmatic awareness: A focus on refusals. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(1), 65-80. <https://doi.org/10.6018/jjes/2010/1/113981>
- Sykes, J. M. (2017). Technologies for teaching and learning intercultural competence and interlanguage pragmatics. In S. Sauro & C. Chapelle (Eds.), *The Handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning* (pp. 118–133). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118914069.ch9>
- Taguchi, N. (2005). Comprehending implied meaning in English as a foreign language. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 543-562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00329.x>
- Taguchi, N. (2008). The role of learning environment in the development of pragmatic comprehension: A comparison of gains between EFL and ESL learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 30(4), 423-452. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263108080716>
- Taguchi, N. (2009). Comprehension of indirect opinions and refusals in L2 Japanese. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *Pragmatic Competence* (pp. 249-274). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110218558.249>
- Taguchi, N. (2011a). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 289-310. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000018>
- Taguchi, N. (2011b). The effect of L2 proficiency and study-abroad experience on pragmatic comprehension. *Language Learning*, 61(3), 904-939. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00633.x>
- Taguchi, N., Li, S., & Liu, Y. (2013). Comprehension of conversational implicature in L2 Chinese. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 21(1), 139-157. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pc.21.1.06tag>
- Takimoto, M. (2006). The effects of explicit feedback and form–meaning processing on the development of pragmatic proficiency in consciousness-raising tasks. *System*, 34(4), 601-614. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.09.003>
- Takimoto, M. (2008). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the development of language learners' pragmatic competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(3), 369-386. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00752.x>
- Takimoto, M. (2012). Metapragmatic discussion in interlanguage pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(10), 1240-1253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.05.007>
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied linguistics*, 4(2), 91-112.
- Vellenga, H. (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely? *TESL-EJ*, 8(2), 1-18.
- Wang, H. (2011). Conversational implicature in English listening comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(5), 1162. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.5.1162-1167>
- Witten, C. M. (2002). *The effects of input enhancement and interactive video viewing on the development of pragmatic awareness and use in the beginning Spanish L2 classroom* [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. University of Texas at Austin.
- Xiao-le, G. U. (2011). The effect of explicit and implicit instructions of request strategies.

Intercultural Communication Studies, 20(1).

Appendix A

Multiple-Choice Discourse Completion Test
Background Questionnaire

1. How old are you?
 - 18 - 20
 - 21 - 23
 - 24 - 26
 - 27+

2. What is your first (native) language?
 - Arabic
 - English
 - Other

3. How many years of formal English instruction have you received?
 - 3 – 4 years
 - 5 – 6 years
 - 7 – 8 years
 - 9 – 10 years
 - More

4. Have you lived in an English speaking country?
 - Yes
 - No

If yes, for how many years? _____

5. Have you studied in an English speaking country?
 - Yes
 - No

If yes, for how many years? _____

6. Have you undertaken TOEFL or IELTS in the past two years? (If yes, indicate your score)
 - TOEFL Yes No _____
 - IELTS Yes No _____

Instructions: This test examines your understanding of the meanings of what speakers say when uttering certain sentences. Presented below is a list of dialogues grounded in the American culture, each dialogue is followed by four multiple-choice items. In item A, I want you to determine what speakers meant by certain linguistic forms (pragmalinguistic ability).

- a. Tim is emphasizing how nice Mary is.
- b. Tim is justifying Mary's behavior to his coworker.
- c. Tim does not like Mary because of what she did.
- d. Tim wants Mary to make new friends.

B. Tim's intention of saying "Mary is a nice friend" in this context is

- a. To avoid being relevant to the topic of the conversation.
- b. To speak truthfully and honestly of Mary.
- c. To provide more information than required.
- d. To speak ironically of Mary.

C. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social power between Tim and his coworker?

- | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|----------|
| > (low) | = (equal) | < (high) |
| a. Tim > coworker | | |
| b. Tim = coworker | | |
| c. Tim < coworker | | |

D. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social distance between Tim and his coworker?

- a. A close friend/ relative
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend
- c. A stranger

3. Two teachers are talking about a student's paper:

Mr. R: Have you finished with Mark's term paper yet?

Mr. M: Yeah, I read it last night.

Mr. R: What did you think of it?

Mr. M: Well, I thought it was well-typed.

A. How did Mr. M like Mark's paper?

- a. He liked it; he thought it was good.
- b. He thought it was important that the paper was well-typed.
- c. He really hadn't read it well enough to know.
- d. He did not like it.

B. Mr. M's intention of saying "Well, I thought it was well typed" in this context is

- a. To criticize Mark's paper indirectly.
- b. To speak honestly of Mark's paper.
- c. To speak ambiguously and confuse the hearer.
- d. To avoid the question.

C. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social power between Mr. R and Mr. M?

- | | | |
|------------------|-----------|----------|
| > (low) | = (equal) | < (high) |
| a. Mr. R > Mr. M | | |
| b. Mr. R = Mr. M | | |
| c. Mr. R < Mr. M | | |

D. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social distance between ^LSEP Mr. R and Mr. M?

- a. A close friend/ relative
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend
- c. A stranger

4. Nina and Ted are having a conversation in the presence of their children.

Ted: Let's get the kids something.

Nina: Ok, but not I-C-E-C-R-E-A-M. (*Spells out the word 'ice cream'*)

A. Which of the following is the closest to what Nina meant by her remark?

- a. Nina sings the word 'ice cream' for the kids to enjoy.
- b. Nina likes it when she and her husband go out with the kids.
- c. Nina doesn't want to get the kids ice cream, but she doesn't want to upset them or make them sad.
- d. Nina wants to surprise the kids and bring them 'ice cream'.

B. Nina's intention of saying "Ok, but not I-C-E-C-R-E-A-M" in this context is

- a. To speak loud and clear for the kids to understand.
- b. To speak metaphorically.
- c. To provide insufficient information.
- d. To speak ambiguously in front of the kids.

C. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social power between Nina and Ted?

> (low) = (equal) < (high)

- a. Nina > Ted
- b. Nina = Ted
- c. Nina < Ted

D. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social distance between Nina and Ted?

- a. A close friend/ relative
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend
- c. A stranger

5. Frank wanted to know what time it was, but he did not have a watch.

Frank: What time is it, Helen?

Helen: The mailman has been here.

Frank: Okay. Thanks.

A. What message does Frank probably get from what Helen says?

- a. She is telling him approximately what time it is by telling him that the mailman has already been there.
- b. By changing the subject, Helen is telling Frank that she does not know what time it is.
- c. She thinks that Frank should stop what he is doing and read his mail.
- d. Frank will not be able to derive any message from what Helen says, since she did not answer his question.

B. Helen’s intention of saying “The mailman has been here” in this context is

- To provide more information than required.
- To provide insufficient information.
- To avoid the question.
- To answer indirectly without being relevant to Frank’s question.

C. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social power between *Frank* and *Helen*?

> (low) = (equal) < (high)

- Frank > Helen
- Frank = Helen
- Frank < Helen

D. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social distance between [SEP] *Frank* and *Helen*?

- A close friend/ relative
- An acquaintance/ not too close friend
- A stranger

6. Lisa: Hi, Anne.

[SEP] **Anne:** Hi Lisa. What's up?

Lisa: I was wondering if I could ask a small favor of you. Would you read my Linguistics 441 paper?

Anne: Gosh, Lisa, I wish I could, but I promised Jack I'd go bowling with him tonight.

Lisa: Yeah. Well, thanks for the help!

A. Which of the following is the closest to what Lisa meant by her remark “Thanks for the help”?

- I understand that you are busy.
- I don’t appreciate your cooperation.
- Thanks for not helping!
- Thanks for your time.

B. Lisa’s intention of saying “Thanks for the help!” in this context is

- To state an ironic comment.
- To reflect her honest gratitude to Anne.
- To speak ambiguously and mislead Anne.
- To change the subject.

C. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social power between *Lisa* and *Anne*?

> (low) = (equal) < (high)

- Lisa > Anne
- Lisa = Anne
- Lisa < Anne

D. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social distance between [SEP] *Lisa* and *Anne*?

- A close friend/ relative

- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend
- c. A stranger

7. Ken bought a new car and Charles came to see it. Charles drove it around for an hour near Ken's house.

Ken: What do you think of this new car?

Charles: Well, the color's fine.

A. How does Charles like Ken's car?

- a. Charles enjoys driving Ken's car.
- b. Charles does not like Ken's car.
- c. Charles knows nothing about cars.
- d. Charles thinks it is a good idea to buy a new car.

B. Charles' intention of saying "the color's fine" in this context is

- a. To complement Ken's car openly and honestly.
- b. To avoid Ken's question.
- c. To criticize Ken's car indirectly.
- d. To speak ironically of the car's color.

C. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social power between Ken and Charles?

> (low) = (equal) < (high)

- a. Ken > Charles
- b. Ken = Charles
- c. Ken < Charles

D. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social distance between Ken and Charles?

- a. A close friend/ relative
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend
- c. A stranger

8. At a recent party, there was a lot of singing and piano playing. At one point Kate sang 'Endless Love'. When someone who had not been at the party asked Sara what song Kate had sung, Sara said: she produced a series of sounds that corresponded closely with the music of 'Endless Love.'

A. Which of the following is the closest to what Sara meant by her remark?

- a. Sara does not remember what Kate sang.
- b. Sara thinks that Kate sang 'Endless Love' beautifully.
- c. Sara thinks that Kate sang very badly, she can't even call it 'singing'.
- d. Sara believes that Kate always sings 'Endless Love'.

B. Sara's intention of saying "she produced a series of sounds that corresponded closely with the music of 'Endless Love'" in this context is

- a. To complement Kate's singing by using too many words.
- b. To speak ironically of Kate's singing.
- c. To avoid being relevant to the topic of the conversation.
- d. To speak indirectly and ambiguously of Kate's bad singing.

C. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social power between *the speaker* and Sara?

- > (low) = (equal) < (high)
- a. Speaker > Sara
 - b. Speaker = Sara
 - c. Speaker < Sara

D. Based on the previous context, what is the level of social distance between *the speaker* and Sara?

- a. A close friend/ relative
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend
- c. A stranger

Thank you!

Appendix B**Introduction to Conversational Implicature Concept****Introduction**

In many languages, people do not often say exactly what they intend to communicate. Sometimes in English, the speaker implies information and expects the hearer to figure out what he or she really means. This kind of indirect meaning is called *conversational implicature*. Hence, *conversational implicature* is a notion of speaker meaning, rather than sentence meaning. However, the problem with *conversational implicature* is how the hearer arrives at the indirect (implicated) meaning of the utterance.

For example,

Sara: What do you think of my dress?

Helen: Well, the color is fine.

Cooperative Principle

Conversational implicature was first introduced by Grice (1975) and maintains that interlocutors must follow a general cooperative pattern in a conversational interaction “make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged”. In other words “be as helpful to your hearer as you can”. According to this principle, people are expected and expect each other to communicate effectively following four basic maxims: quantity (be informative), quality (be truthful), relevance (make what you say relevant), and manner (be clear).

Grice argued that it is only by assuming that people are trying to be cooperative, we can work out how a given utterance is interpreted. We do so by assuming that people apply the conversational maxims in a conversation, and that if they do not, there must be a reason for it.

Breaking the Conversational Maxims

In some contexts, a speaker may fail to apply the conversational maxims (intentionally or unintentionally) for different reasons. One way of breaking the conversational maxims is by flouting one or more of these maxims.

Flouting the Conversational Maxims

When a speaker flouts a maxim, he or she tends to do so intentionally to generate an implied meaning that they expect the hearer to arrive at (conversational implicature).

Flouting Quality Maxim

Quality Maxim: Try to make your contribution one that is true.

Do not say what you believe to be false.

Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

This means – when someone is talking to you, you expect him or her to be truthful.

(Audiovisual example extracted from the American sitcom *Friends*)

Flouting Quantity Maxim

Quantity Maxim: Give the right amount of information.

Make your contribution as informative as is required.

Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

This means – when someone is talking to you, you expect him or her to provide the amount of information that you need – not more or less.

(Audiovisual example extracted from the American sitcom *Friends*)

Flouting Relation Maxim

Relation Maxim: Make your contribution relevant. ^[L]_[SEP]

This means – when someone is talking to you, you expect him or her to say something relevant to the topic of conversation.

(Audiovisual example extracted from the American sitcom *Friends*)

Flouting Manner Maxim

Manner Maxim: Be perspicuous.

Avoid obscurity of expression.

Avoid ambiguity.

Be brief.

Be orderly.

This means – when someone is talking to you, you expect him or her to be clear and orderly.

(Audiovisual example extracted from the American sitcom *Friends*)

Appendix C

Consciousness-Raising Tasks

Active-Viewing Task Worksheet (1)

Instructions: The following videos contain examples of conversational implicatures extracted from the American sitcom *Friends*. Watch the videos and answer the questions below.

Pragmalinguistic Awareness (Speaker Meaning):

1. Read the following transcript and underline the conversational implicature.

- Monica: Hey!
- Rachel: Hey! How'd it go?
- Monica: Oh, my God! It was the best funeral ever! Everyone loved the food and guess what! I even got another funeral for tomorrow. The dead guy from today's best friend. I mean it is like I am the official caterer for that accident.
- Phoebe: Mon, I'm so happy for you!

2. What does the speaker mean by his/her remark? Does the literal meaning make sense in this context?

3. Watch the video clip again and discuss the nuances being expressed (e.g., being serious, sarcastic, shocked, confrontational, pessimistic, joking, or sincere). To what extent is the speaker's behavior (gestures, facial expressions, use of space, eye contact, tone of voice) effective in conveying his or her meaning in this context?

Sociopragmatic Awareness (Speaker Intention):

4. Which of Grice's Maxims has been broken to generate the conversational implicature?

- a. Quantity (be informative)
- b. Quality (be truthful)
- c. Relevance (make what you say relevant)
- d. Manner (be clear)

5. What is the speaker's intention from using the conversational implicature in the given context? Does the speaker succeed in achieving his/her goal?

Metapragmatic Awareness (Relationship between Interlocutors):

6. What is the level of social power (status) between interlocutors?

- a. _____ < (lower than) _____
- b. _____ = (equal to) _____
- c. _____ > (higher than) _____

7. What is the level of social distance between interlocutors?

- a. A close friend/ relative.
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend.
- c. A stranger.

8. Observe the speakers' interaction and analyze how social power (status) and social distance between the speaker and listener influence the language of conversational implicature in terms of (directness, formality, and politeness) and the use of

conversational implicature strategies in terms of (appropriateness).

Active-Viewing Task Worksheet (2)

Instructions: The following videos contain examples of conversational implicatures extracted from the American sitcom *Friends*. Watch the videos and answer the questions below.

Pragmalinguistic Awareness (Speaker Meaning):

1. Read the following transcript and underline the conversational implicature.

- Phoebe: Hey!
- Rachel & Monica: Hi!
- Phoebe: Here, Monica! Look what I got to wear when I play at your restaurant. Ah. Ah. Wait!
- Monica: Um, Phoebe...maybe I wasn't clear before. I really love listening to your music here. But my restaurant, it's sort of an upscale place. I just don't think you should play at the restaurant anymore.
- Phoebe: Oh. Okay. Fine, I'll just... I'll take the hat back.
- Rachel: Hey, so you guys, the funniest thing happened at work the...
- Phoebe: My songs aren't good enough for your restaurant?
- Rachel: Okay. We're still on that.
- Monica: I didn't say your songs weren't good enough.
- Phoebe: Well, then what's wrong with them? What, they don't go with your tiny portions of pretentious food?
- Monica: Tiny portions?
- Phoebe: Yea, well, um, "Excuse me. I ordered the smoked salmon appetizer, but I can't see it! I can't see it!"
- Monica: Phoebe, it's not about quantity.
- Phoebe: well, it's not about quality.
- Monica: Oh, oh, really? You want to talk about quality? Have you ever heard of a "key"? It's what some people sing in!
- Phoebe: Well, at least all my songs don't taste like garlic! Yea, there are other ingredients, Monica!
- Monica: Ok, so that's what we're doing! You know when I'm in a coffeehouse bopping along to one of your songs... I'm wearing earplugs!
- Phoebe: Earplugs or cloves of garlic?

2. What does the speaker mean by his/her remark? Does the literal meaning make sense in this context?

3. Watch the video clip again and discuss the nuances being expressed (e.g., being serious, sarcastic, shocked, confrontational, pessimistic, joking, or sincere). To what extent is the speaker's behavior (gestures, facial expressions, use of space, eye

contact, tone of voice) effective in conveying his or her meaning in this context?

Sociopragmatic Awareness (Speaker Intention):

4. Which of Grice’s Maxims has been broken to generate the conversational implicature?

- a. Quantity (be informative)
- b. Quality (be truthful)
- c. Relevance (make what you say relevant)
- d. Manner (be clear)

5. What is the speaker’s intention from using the conversational implicature in the given context? Does the speaker succeed in achieving his/her goal?

Metapragmatic Awareness (Relationship between Interlocutors):

6. What is the level of social power (status) between interlocutors?

- a. _____ < (lower than) _____
- b. _____ = (equal to) _____
- c. _____ > (higher than) _____

7. What is the level of social distance between interlocutors?

- a. A close friend/ relative.
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend.
- c. A stranger.

8. Observe the speakers’ interaction and analyze how social power (status) and social distance between the speaker and listener influence the language of conversational implicature in terms of (directness, formality, and politeness) and the use of conversational implicature strategies in terms of (appropriateness).

Active-Viewing Task Worksheet (3)

Instructions: The following videos contain examples of conversational implicatures extracted from the American sitcom *Friends*. Watch the videos and answer the questions below.

Pragmalinguistic Awareness (Speaker Meaning):

1. Read the following transcript and underline the conversational implicature.

- Ross: Hey! Has anyone seen my shirt? It is a button-down, like a faded salmon color?
- Monica: You mean your pink shirt?
- Ross: Faded salmon color!

- Monica: No. I haven't seen your pink shirt!
- Ross: Great. Great.

2. What does the speaker mean by his/her remark? Does the literal meaning make sense in this context?

3. Watch the video clip again and discuss the nuances being expressed (e.g., being serious, sarcastic, shocked, confrontational, pessimistic, joking, or sincere). To what extent is the speaker's behavior (gestures, facial expressions, use of space, eye contact, tone of voice) effective in conveying his or her meaning in this context?

Sociopragmatic Awareness (Speaker Intention):

4. Which of Grice's Maxims has been broken to generate the conversational implicature?

- a. Quantity (be informative)
- b. Quality (be truthful)
- c. Relevance (make what you say relevant)
- d. Manner (be clear)

5. What is the speaker's intention from using the conversational implicature in the given context? Does the speaker succeed in achieving his/her goal?

Metapragmatic Awareness (Relationship between Interlocutors):

6. What is the level of social power (status) between interlocutors?

- a. _____ < (lower than) _____
- b. _____ = (equal to) _____
- c. _____ > (higher than) _____

7. What is the level of social distance between interlocutors?

- a. A close friend/ relative.
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend.
- c. A stranger.

8. Observe the speakers' interaction and analyze how social power (status) and social distance between the speaker and listener influence the language of conversational implicature in terms of (directness, formality, and politeness) and the use of conversational implicature strategies in terms of (appropriateness).

Active-Viewing Task Worksheet (4)

Instructions: The following videos contain examples of conversational implicatures extracted from the American sitcom Friends. Watch the videos and answer the questions below.

Pragmalinguistic Awareness (Speaker Meaning):

1. Read the following transcript and underline the conversational implicature.

- Ross: Hi.
Joe: Hi. What's wrong buddy?
Ross: Someone at work ate my sandwich.
Chandler: Well, what did the police say?
Ross: My thanksgiving leftover sandwich. I can't believe someone just ate it.
Chandler: Ross! It's just a sandwich!
Ross: Just a sandwich! Look I am 30 years old, okay? I am going to be divorced twice and I just got evicted! That sandwich was the only good thing going on in my life! Someone ate the only good thing going on in my life!

2. What does the speaker mean by his/her remark? Does the literal meaning make sense in this context?

3. Watch the video clip again and discuss the nuances being expressed (e.g., being serious, sarcastic, shocked, confrontational, pessimistic, joking, or sincere). To what extent is the speaker's behavior (gestures, facial expressions, use of space, eye contact, tone of voice) effective in conveying his or her meaning in this context?

Sociopragmatic Awareness (Speaker Intention):

4. Which of Grice's Maxims has been broken to generate the conversational implicature?

- a. Quantity (be informative)
b. Quality (be truthful)
c. Relevance (make what you say relevant)
d. Manner (be clear)

5. What is the speaker's intention from using the conversational implicature in the given context? Does the speaker succeed in achieving his/her goal?

Metapragmatic Awareness (Relationship between Interlocutors):

6. What is the level of social power (status) between interlocutors?

- a. _____ < (lower than) _____

- b. _____ = (equal to) _____
- c. _____ > (higher than) _____

7. What is the level of social distance between interlocutors?

- a. A close friend/ relative.
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend.
- c. A stranger.

8. Observe the speakers’ interaction and analyze how social power (status) and social distance between the speaker and listener influence the language of conversational implicature in terms of (directness, formality, and politeness) and the use of conversational implicature strategies in terms of (appropriateness).

Active-Viewing Task Worksheet (5)

Instructions: The following videos contain examples of conversational implicatures extracted from the American sitcom *Friends*. Watch the videos and answer the questions below.

Pragmalinguistic Awareness (Speaker Meaning):

1. Read the following transcript and underline the conversational implicature.

- Amy: You know! This is just... This is classic Rachel!
- Rachel: Oh yea... yea, right! Remember in high school when I died and didn’t give you my baby?
- Amy: This might be my one chance to have a child, Rachel! I mean you know that I’ve been so busy focusing on my career.
- Rachel: What? What career?
- Amy: Um, I’m a decorator!
- Rachel: You decorate dad’s office and now you’re a decorator? O.K! I went to the zoo yesterday, now I’m a koala bear!
- Amy: Why can’t you ever be supportive?
- Rachel: Supportive! You want to talk supportive? You didn’t even come and visit me when I was in the hospital having the baby!
- Amy: Oh, yea! Well, you didn’t come to see me in the hospital when I was getting my lips done!
- Rachel: Uh, uhh! I did the first time!

2. What does the speaker mean by his/her remark? Does the literal meaning make sense in this context?

3. Watch the video clip again and discuss the nuances being expressed (e.g., being serious, sarcastic, shocked, confrontational, pessimistic, joking, or sincere). To what extent is the speaker’s behavior (gestures, facial expressions, use of space, eye

contact, tone of voice) effective in conveying his or her meaning in this context?

Sociopragmatic Awareness (Speaker Intention):

4. Which of Grice’s Maxims has been broken to generate the conversational implicature?

- a. Quantity (be informative)
- b. Quality (be truthful)
- c. Relevance (make what you say relevant)
- d. Manner (be clear)

5. What is the speaker’s intention from using the conversational implicature in the given context? Does the speaker succeed in achieving his/her goal?

Metapragmatic Awareness (Relationship between Interlocutors):

6. What is the level of social power (status) between interlocutors?

- a. _____ < (lower than) _____
- b. _____ = (equal to) _____
- c. _____ > (higher than) _____

7. What is the level of social distance between interlocutors?

- a. A close friend/ relative.
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend.
- c. A stranger.

8. Observe the speakers’ interaction and analyze how social power (status) and social distance between the speaker and listener influence the language of conversational implicature in terms of (directness, formality, and politeness) and the use of conversational implicature strategies in terms of (appropriateness).

Active-Viewing Task Worksheet (6)

Instructions: The following videos contain examples of conversational implicatures extracted from the American sitcom *Friends*. Watch the videos and answer the questions below.

Pragmalinguistic Awareness (Speaker Meaning):

1. Read the following transcript and underline the conversational implicature.

- Joey: Hey! How do you spell “suspicious”?
- Chandler: Why?
- Joey: Because I think this character is going to be *suspicious* about stuff.

2. What does the speaker mean by his/her remark? Does the literal meaning make sense in this context?

3. Watch the video clip again and discuss the nuances being expressed (e.g., being serious, sarcastic, shocked, confrontational, pessimistic, joking, or sincere). To what extent is the speaker’s behavior (gestures, facial expressions, use of space, eye contact, tone of voice) effective in conveying his or her meaning in this context?

Sociopragmatic Awareness (Speaker’s Intention):

4. Which of Grice’s Maxims has been broken to generate the conversational implicature?

- a. Quantity (be informative)
- b. Quality (be truthful)
- c. Relevance (make what you say relevant)
- d. Manner (be clear)

5. What is the speaker’s intention from using the conversational implicature in the given context? Does the speaker succeed in achieving his/her goal?

Metapragmatic Awareness (Relationship between Interlocutors):

6. What is the level of social power (status) between interlocutors?

- a. _____ < (lower than) _____
- b. _____ = (equal to) _____
- c. _____ > (higher than) _____

7. What is the level of social distance between interlocutors?

- a. A close friend/ relative.
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend.
- c. A stranger.

8. Observe the speakers’ interaction and analyze how social power (status) and social distance between the speaker and listener influence the language of conversational implicature in terms of (directness, formality, and politeness) and the use of conversational implicature strategies in terms of (appropriateness).

Active-Viewing Task Worksheet (7)

Instructions: The following videos contain examples of conversational implicatures

extracted from the American sitcom *Friends*. Watch the videos and answer the questions below.

Pragmalinguistic Awareness (Speaker Meaning):

1. Read the following transcript and underline the conversational implicature.

- Interviewer: What’s your name?
- Phoebe: Phoebe Buffay.
- Interviewer: How do you spell that? So we can get it right.
- Phoebe: Well, P as in Phoebe, H as in Heebie, O as in Obie, B as in Beebee, and E as in “ello there, mate.”

2. What does the speaker mean by his/her remark? Does the literal meaning make sense in this context?

3. Watch the video clip again and discuss the nuances being expressed (e.g., being serious, sarcastic, shocked, confrontational, pessimistic, joking, or sincere). To what extent is the speaker’s behavior (gestures, facial expressions, use of space, eye contact, tone of voice) effective in conveying his or her meaning in this context?

Sociopragmatic Awareness (Speaker’s Intention):

4. Which of Grice’s Maxims has been broken to generate the conversational implicature?

- a. Quantity (be informative)
- b. Quality (be truthful)
- c. Relevance (make what you say relevant)
- d. Manner (be clear)

5. What is the speaker’s intention from using the conversational implicature in the given context? Does the speaker succeed in achieving his/her goal?

Metapragmatic Awareness (Relationship between Interlocutors):

6. What is the level of social power (status) between interlocutors?

- a. _____ < (lower than) _____
- b. _____ = (equal to) _____
- c. _____ > (higher than) _____

7. What is the level of social distance between interlocutors?

- a. A close friend/ relative.
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend.
- c. A stranger.

8. Observe the speakers' interaction and analyze how social power (status) and social distance between the speaker and listener influence the language of conversational implicature in terms of (directness, formality, and politeness) and the use of conversational implicature strategies in terms of (appropriateness).

Active-Viewing Task Worksheet (8)

Instructions: The following videos contain examples of conversational implicatures extracted from the American sitcom *Friends*. Watch the videos and answer the questions below.

Pragmalinguistic Awareness (Speaker Meaning):

1. Read the following transcript and underline the conversational implicature.

- Phoebe: Oh, hey Mon! Do you still have like your old blouses and dresses from high school?
- Monica: Yea I think I have some around here somewhere. Why?
- Phoebe: Well, it's just maternity clothes are so expensive.

2. What does the speaker mean by his/her remark? Does the literal meaning make sense in this context?

3. Watch the video clip again and discuss the nuances being expressed (e.g., being serious, sarcastic, shocked, confrontational, pessimistic, joking, or sincere). To what extent is the speaker's behavior (gestures, facial expressions, use of space, eye contact, tone of voice) effective in conveying his or her meaning in this context?

Sociopragmatic Awareness (Speaker's Intention):

4. Which of Grice's Maxims has been broken to generate the conversational implicature?

- a. Quantity (be informative)
- b. Quality (be truthful)
- c. Relevance (make what you say relevant)
- d. Manner (be clear)

5. What is the speaker's intention from using the conversational implicature in the given context? Does the speaker succeed in achieving his/her goal?

Metapragmatic Awareness (Relationship between Interlocutors):

6. What is the level of social power (status) between interlocutors?

- a. _____ < (lower than) _____
- b. _____ = (equal to) _____
- c. _____ > (higher than) _____

7. What is the level of social distance between interlocutors?

- a. A close friend/ relative.
- b. An acquaintance/ not too close friend.
- c. A stranger.

8. Observe the speakers' interaction and analyze how social power (status) and social distance between the speaker and listener influence the language of conversational implicature in terms of (directness, formality, and politeness) and the use of conversational implicature strategies in terms of (appropriateness).

