Pragmatics-Grammar Interface in Pragmalinguistic Awareness and Learning

TAKAHASHI Satomi

Key words: 語用論、文法、語用言語学的気づき、学習、依頼
pragmatics, grammar, pragmalinguistic awareness, learning, request

Abstract

The present study, an extension from Takahashi's previous studies (2012, 2013, 2015), explored the possibility and degree of grammatical knowledge of Japanese learners of English as a foreign language (EFL), as resources for the awareness and learning of complex bi-clausal request forms in the implicit input. The data source for this study was the same previous participants. For the current analysis, the participants were screened further to enable comparison between *Provision* learners who could notice and learn bi-clausal forms and *Non-Provision* learners who could only notice the target forms. Furthermore, unlike the previous studies, an analysis of the concrete instances of their dictation (or detection) performance as an awareness source enabled the identification of target forms that were "fully" detected during the dictation task. The results revealed that learners with sound grammatical knowledge could more likely detect the target forms fully, specifically, at the early stage of the dictation task. The study also identified some learners with similar grammatical competence with full detection results, but with differential learning outcomes (i.e., Provision vs. Non-Provision) possibly because Non-Provision learners lack a deeper analysis of form-function relations of the target forms in the pragmatic input.

1. Introduction

In her 1999 seminal paper, Bardovi-Harlig recommended that interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) research should focus more explicitly on the relationship between ILP and grammar. Specifically, she underscored the need for exploring how particular grammatical features at a particular stage of second language (L2) development would activate the emergence of particular pragmalinguistic features. The new research agenda was proposed against the traditional ILP research that had centered on comparing pragmatic competence of L2 learners with that of native speakers (NSs) or learners with other first language (L1) backgrounds, rather than examining "acquisition" or "development" of L2 pragmatic competence. Moreover, these comparative studies adopted the methodology that almost exclusively employed advanced-level learners, which entailed the consistent finding that high L2 grammatical competence does not ensure corresponding high pragmatic competence. This observation also supported the contention that grammar and pragmatics are separate and autonomous subsystems of communicative competence, without recognizing the interface between them.

Based on the claim for the necessity of examining the pragmatics–grammar interface from a developmental perspective, Bardovi-Harlig (1999) further argued that grammatical competence may not be a sufficient condition for pragmatic development, but it may be a necessary condition. With this claim, she emphasized cumulative empirical evidence supporting the critical role of grammatical knowledge in developing pragmatic competence.

In Takahashi (2012, 2013, 2015), efforts were initiated to investigate the effects of motivation and listening proficiency as variables of individual differences (ID) on pragmalinguistic awareness and learning of complex request forms. Listening proficiency and some of the motivation subscales were found to predict awareness, but not learning, of the target request head acts. More importantly, the findings further suggested learners' insufficient grammatical knowledge might affect their awareness of the target forms and consequently their learning of them; however, these previous studies have failed to probe for clear and substantial evidence for this possibility. In an effort to clarify the role of grammar in ILP in line with the research agenda proposed by Bardovi-Harlig (1999), this study aims to explore the possibility and degree of learners' knowledge of particular grammatical features constraining their pragmalinguistic awareness and learning.

髙橋里美　TAKAHASHI Satomi

2. Background

2. 1. Pragmatics–grammar interface: Theoretical background

Developmental issues in ILP were initially addressed by Kasper and Schmidt (1996), who argued for the necessity of shifting traditional comparative research in ILP to research exploring acquisitional aspects of ILP. Bardovi-Harlig (1999) reiterated their assertion, specifically proposing that ILP researchers investigate the relation of the development of the grammatical and pragmatic systems longitudinally or cross-sectionally, by including learners with various L2 proficiency levels, thus de-emphasizing the almost exclusive focus on advanced-level learners prevalent in previous one-shot comparative research (see also Bardovi-Harlig, 2012, 2013 for the consistent claim). Within this research framework, Bardovi-Harlig particularly emphasized the need to investigate the role of grammar in developing L2 pragmatics, rather than the opposite direction, based on the findings of previous ILP studies that strongly implied the critical role of grammar for pragmatics: for example, a robust pragmatic development may be ensured by acquiring the knowledge of the mitigation functions of past tense, progressives, modals (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1993; Dittmar & Terborg, 1991; Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986; House & Kasper, 1981), and embedding (Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1987; Takahashi, 1996). She suggested that the impact of these grammatical features on L2 pragmatics should be explored more rigorously; based on the outcomes from these empirical endeavors, she believed that we could conclusively claim whether grammatical competence is truly a necessary condition for L2 pragmatic competence, albeit not an essentially sufficient condition for ILP as already evidenced in advanced-level learners' infelicities in L2 pragmatics.

An examination of the integrated grammatical development with emergent pragmatic competence was also attempted by Kasper and Rose (2002) but from wider perspectives (see also Kasper, 2001 for an overview). Their comprehensive review of ILP studies revealed two strands of studies that may provide the base for interpreting the relationship between grammar and pragmatics. One of them is represented by "pragmatics precedes grammar" studies; they reported cases in which learners use pragmatic functions in L2 even before their acquisition of the linguistic forms for realizing these functions. A well-known example in this strand of studies is Schmidt's (1983) *Wes*; he was able to develop substantially his pragmatic ability while maintaining minimal grammatical knowledge. This strand essentially argues for the primacy of pragmatics and thus the independence of grammatical knowledge from pragmatics.

The second strand comprises "grammar precedes pragmatics" studies; they documented findings that implicated learners' acquisition of an L2 grammatical feature

prior to its pragmalinguistic functions. Kasper and Rose (2002) further divided this second category of studies into three varieties. The first variety illustrates learners' knowledge of particular grammatical features, but their inability to use these features according to particular pragmatic functions (e.g., learners know embedding structures in English, but do not know that politeness or mitigation functions can be realized with such structures (Takahashi, 1996, 2001)). The second variety indicates learners' knowledge of particular grammatical forms and their pragmalinguistic functions, but with non-conventionalized target usage (e.g., learners' advanced grammatical knowledge enables them to convey accurately their refusal intention, but the produced forms reflect negative pragmatic transfer and are thus non-target-like (Takahashi & Beebe, 1987)). The third variety demonstrates learners' knowledge of particular grammatical features and their corresponding pragmatic functions, but with sociopragmatically-inappropriate application of the form-function relations (e.g., learners can produce grammatically accurate and functionally appropriate expressions for refusals, but they are addressed to interlocutors for whom the particular refusal utterance is not relevant (Robinson, 1992)). Of the three varieties of the "grammar precedes pragmatics" strand, the first variety may most seriously address the crucial role of grammatical knowledge in L2 pragmatics because it clearly demonstrates that inadequate grammatical knowledge creates unsuccessful form-function mappings. In view of this, this first variety best illustrates the central argument of Bardovi-Harlig's (1999) research agenda (Kasper, 2001; Kasper & Rose, 2002). More importantly, as Takahashi's (2012, 2013, 2015) findings were most relevantly explained by inadequate form-function mappings in pragmalinguistic awareness, this first variety would be the basis for exploring the pragmatics–grammar interface in this study.

2. 2. Empirical evidence for "grammar precedes pragmatics"

After her 1999 study, Bardovi-Harlig conducted a series of studies by focusing on conventional expressions as a pragmalinguistic resource (Bardovi-Harlig, 2008, 2009; Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011; Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012; Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman, & Vellenga, 2015). Among them, Bardovi-Harlig (2009) and Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011) directly addressed the issue of a pragmatics–grammar interface. In other words, though their specific goals were varied, both studies explored whether the knowledge of conventional expressions (i.e., grammatical competence) is critically involved in the formulation of these expressions, that is, the one part of pragmalinguistic competence.

Bardovi-Harlig (2009) aimed to investigate whether learners' low production of certain conventional expressions (e.g., *I'm just looking, Nice to meet you, Would you mind…?*) is triggered by their lack of familiarity with these expressions. The assumption here was that differential familiarity with target conventional expressions causes differential

understanding of the grammatical features; therefore, such possibly varying grammatical knowledge may differentially constrain learners' production of these target expressions. Familiarity with the target conventional expressions was assessed through an aural recognition task, and it was operationalized as the frequency estimates of learners' hearing the target forms in their daily lives (*I often/sometimes/never hear this*) (see Bardovi-Harlig, 2008 for the decontextualized written recognition task). Learners' production of these expressions was measured in a computer-delivered production task. Both tasks were completed by 122 learners of English as a second language (ESL) and 49 NSs of English. The results revealed that recognition of or familiarity with the conventional expressions predicted the use of these forms; however, learners' low production of these expressions may have been influenced by other factors. Bardovi-Harlig, thus, concluded that recognizing an expression with a certain degree of familiarity is a necessary condition but not sufficiently to be the only condition for production (see Geyer, 2007 for similar findings on contrastive expressions in Japanese). This 2009 study is suggestive to the present study as Bardovi-Harlig's "recognition" is aligned with the notion of "noticing" or "awareness" in pragmatic input; therefore, the familiarity of target forms needs to be included in the research design of the current study.

Recognition and production of conventional expressions were treated from different perspectives in Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011). They investigated the effects of proficiency, length of stay, and intensity of interaction on the recognition and production of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. The target ESL learners were the same as those in Bardovi-Harlig (2009); therefore, they were considered host-environment learners of English. In logistic regression models, the intensity of interaction, which was assessed by learners' self-report of weekly English use outside class, significantly influenced recognition of these expressions, and both proficiency and intensity of interaction significantly affected the production of the targets. A notable finding suggests the great impact of intensity of interaction on L2 pragmalinguistic development; namely, a greater intensity of interaction obviously provides learners with more opportunities to access the target expressions, thereby increasing their familiarity with those expressions. The conclusion from this 2011 study, thus, further supports the critical role of formal familiarity in L2 pragmatics.

2. 3. Pragmalinguistic awareness and learning: Implications for grammar

In an effort to explore the relationships between ID variables and pragmalinguistic awareness and learning in an implicit (or inductive) input condition, Takahashi (2012, 2013, 2015) conducted a series of studies with Japanese EFL learners. The focused IDs

髙橋里美　TAKAHASHI Satomi

were motivation and listening proficiency. The target pragmalinguistic features were bi-clausal request forms (e.g., "I was wondering if you could VP"); all of them were "request head acts" with some internal modification devices. These complex forms were not fully mastered by Japanese EFL learners, even those at the advanced level, as attested in my previous studies (Takahashi, 1996, 2001); this tendency was also verified at the outset of the studies.

The pretest-posttest design was adopted to achieve the research goals of Takahashi (2012, 2013, 2015). Within the framework of Schmidt's (1990, 1993, 1994, 1995, 2001) noticing hypothesis, Takahashi defined the notion of "awareness" as the "conscious detection of targets and subsequent subjective experience." The "subjective experience" was equated with learners' *interest* in their attentional targets, whereas "conscious detection" was quantified through learners' *detection capacity* based on their dictation performance of the target request forms in the treatment input. Pragmalinguistic awareness was then operationalized as the awareness scores obtained through the summation of learners' *interest* in and *detection capacity* for the target forms in the pragmatic input. With regard to "learning," it was defined as learners' consistent use (or production) of target "sentence stems" or their variants in new contexts, and it was operationalized as the gain scores obtained by subtracting the scores of the pretest discourse completion test (pre-DCT) from those of the posttest DCT (post-DCT).

Takahashi (2012) concentrated on investigating the effects of the ID variables on learners' awareness of bi-clausal request forms. The analysis with structural equation modeling revealed that two of the four motivation subscales and listening proficiency predicted learners' pragmalinguistic awareness of the target forms, particularly, the listening proficiency variable. Continuing from Takahashi (2012), Takahashi (2013) explored the causal relationship between the ID factors, awareness, and learning by expanding the final structural model of Takahashi (2012). The path analysis indicated that learners' awareness of the target bi-clausal request forms did not lead to learning (or production) of these head-act forms. Moreover, it was found that motivation and listening proficiency predicted only the learning of internal modifiers (e.g., the softener "just" or intensifiers "really" and "at all"). Takahashi (2015) analyzed the same data from a different perspective. By combining the two influential motivation factors and listening proficiency, three "learner profiles" were identified, which was treated as the predictor variable for awareness and learning. The results of a one-way repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed that the learner profiles constrained awareness of target bi-clausal request forms, but not their learning of bi-clausal forms. In the 2015 study, the qualitative data obtained from learners' awareness journals and the follow-up questionnaires on their posttest performance were further analyzed, which supported the findings from the

quantitative analysis.

Takahashi concluded from these three studies that while learners did notice the target request forms in the input, with varying degrees of awareness across participants and forms, their awareness of the targets did not trigger substantial learning of bi-clausal head acts, though there were variations among learners. Considering the strong effect of listening proficiency, Takahashi speculated that a lack of listening skills might constitute the primary cause for this phenomenon. Specifically, learners' incomplete sentence recognition (in dictation) might have blocked their deeper analysis of form-function relationships in the input. In fact, quite a few learners voiced concerns about their limited listening proficiency in both the awareness and posttest sessions through the awareness journals and follow-up questionnaires (Takahashi, 2015). As one of the explanations for the obtained findings, Takahashi also asserted that the complexity of bi-clausal request forms might have prevented learners from deeply analyzing form-function relationships in the treatment input; this is highly likely considering learners' eventual mastery of internal modifiers that have less complex structures. Again, learners confirmed in their feedback the possibility of this explanation (Takahashi, 2015). Takahashi, thus, argued for a possible critical role of grammatical knowledge in an accurate form-function analysis of complex forms during input processing; namely, learners need to have sufficient knowledge of grammatical components of the target structures (e.g., tense, aspect, modals) and/or of the structures themselves when confronting pragmatic input. In the end, the inadequate form-function analysis at the awareness phase might lead to learners' failure to internalize bi-clausal forms as their repertoire for the posttest performance. As a result, if grammatical knowledge is partly responsible for this inadequacy, it should be empirically verified. Only through this research endeavor, we could understand who can and cannot learn target pragmalinguistic forms.

3. Research question and design

This study aims to investigate the possibility and degree of grammatical knowledge of Japanese EFL learners as resources for their awareness of target bi-clausal request forms provided in the implicit input and their learning of these complex forms. This is an explanatory study toward our deeper understanding of the nature of pragmatics–grammar interface. Therefore, the following research question is addressed: "Do Japanese EFL learners' grammatical knowledge differentially constrain their awareness of target bi-clausal request forms in the implicit input and their learning of these forms?"

The above research question is to be pursued within the framework of Takahashi (2012, 2013, 2015) as data on grammatical competence related to the target forms were

髙橋里美　TAKAHASHI Satomi

also collected from the same participants. Takahashi (2012, 2013, 2015) found that a large number of participants failed to learn (or produce) bi-clausal request forms at the posttest although they had noticed the target forms in the treatment input, albeit with differential degrees of awareness. The method of the role of grammatical competence, then, is to scrutinize the relationship between grammatical knowledge and awareness observed among learners who *both* steadily noticed and produced the target forms (i.e., Provision learners) and compare the observed tendency with that of learners who steadily noticed but did *not* produce them (i.e., Non-Provision learners). With this approach, we can ascertain how grammatical knowledge facilitates form-function analysis during the input processing, which is assumed to affect subsequent learning. Therefore, the analysis of the study is consistently implemented in the framework of comparing the Provision group and the Non-Provision group, by selecting learners who had relatively high level of awareness.

To address the research question above most relevantly, the current analysis centered on the content of learners' dictation performance with an intensive examination of the extent to which learners' grammatical knowledge is reflected in concrete instances of their dictation or detection performance as the source for awareness. Specifically, as focused learners have relatively high awareness and thus are better at detecting the target forms, the focus is on target forms that were "fully" detected during the dictation performance.

With regard to grammatical features to be assessed in this study, based on my previous studies (Takahashi, 1996, 2001, 2005) and Bardovi-Harlig (1999, 2009), it was decided to include the past tense, progressives, modals, and subjunctives, all of which are crucial determinants for successful and appropriate realization of request strategies. Furthermore, as attested in Bardovi-Harlig (2009) and Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011), learners' familiarity with target forms or structures adequately reflects their grammatical competence. In this study, therefore, "structural familiarity" should also be focused on and treated as an important constituent of learners' grammatical knowledge. The target request forms for the awareness session (four experimental situations) in Takahashi (2012, 2013, 2015) are listed in Table 1; thus, familiarity is assessed for the following three kinds of forms:

"possible" form: "Is it possible to VP" and its variant

"appreciate" form: "I would appreciate it if you would/could VP" and its variant

"wonder" form: "I wonder if you could VP" and its variant

Table 1. Target Request Forms for the Awareness Session (Reproduced from Takahashi (2013))

Situation	Target Forms
Appointment	Would it be possible to change that appointment to later in the day? (Mitigated-preparatory question) I would really appreciate it if we could change the meeting time. (Mitigated-want statement)
Conflicting Schedule	I was wondering if you could let me write a term paper instead of doing the actual exam. (Mitigated-preparatory statement) I was wondering if there is any chance that you'd let me write a term paper. (Mitigated-preparatory statement)
Reference Book	I was wondering if you would let me keep it. (Mitigated-preparatory statement) Would it be at all possible if I could keep it? (Mitigated-preparatory question)
Recommendation	I was just wondering if you could write me another letter of recommendation. (Mitigated-preparatory statement) I was just wondering if it would be at all possible if you could write the letter. (Mitigated-preparatory statement)

4. Method

4. 1. Participants

The participants in Takahashi (2012, 2013, 2015) were 154 Japanese college students majoring in sociology and humanities. They were first-year students who were placed in the advanced level of the general English program at the university. From the total, 50 students could not complete all the data eliciting tasks; thus, the analysis used the data from the remaining 104 students. The mean age was 18.75 (SD = 1.094). They all had received formal English instruction in Japan for seven to eight years.

As the study was intended to examine the grammatical features of learners who could steadily notice the target request forms, an attempt was made to identify learners who were far less likely to notice the target forms and eliminate their data from the analysis. To this end, a cluster analysis was performed on the total awareness scores (the detection capacity scores + the interest scores) (N = 104) for the four experimental situations obtained from Takahashi (2012, 2013, 2015). Ward's method of hierarchical clustering was adopted to cluster the data using PASW Statistics 18. The analysis yielded two clusters: the Aware group (N = 60) (mean awareness = 36.134, SD = 7.166) and the Less-Aware group (N = 44) (mean awareness = 16.402, SD = 5.788).[1] At this stage, the Less-Aware group was eliminated from the further analysis.

By focusing on the Aware group, another cluster analysis was further performed on

the detection scores and the interest scores, the components of the "awareness" construct in Takahashi's studies. The analysis based on Ward's method revealed the following three clusters:

Group 1 (N = 22): High Detection (mean = 15.905, SD = 3.016)
+ High Interest (mean = 27.690, SD = 3.673)

Group 2 (N = 24): Mid Detection (mean = 11.491, SD = 2.853)
+ Low Interest (mean = 18.993, SD = 1.950)

Group 3 (N = 14): Low Detection (mean = 7.843, SD = 2.212)
+ High Interest (mean = 26.250, SD = 2.937)

Although learners in these three groups were judged to have relative higher awareness in the original sample, they specifically differed with respect to their detection of and interest in the target request forms in the treatment input.[2] In particular, the identified profiles demonstrated that Group 1 learners' target detection was the highest, followed by Group 2 and Group 3, respectively.

In each group, learners who could provide at least one bi-clausal request form at the post-DCT were assigned to the "Provision." For learners who could not provide bi-clausal forms at the posttest, those who surpassed the means for both their detection and interest scores were placed in the "Non-Provision." With that, an effort was made to balance the "Provision" and the "Non-Provision" groups in terms of the degree of awareness and the number of participants. Consequently, 34 learners were selected for the analysis in this study (see Table 2 for the selected participants).

Table 2. Participants Selected for the Analysis

Group	Participants (identification number)	
	Provision	Non-Provision
Group 1: High Detection + High Interest	7, 69	37, 83, 85, 112, 114, 117, 131, 139
Group 2: Mid Detection + Low Interest	8, 21, 29, 38, 122, 129	16, 32, 50, 90, 95, 116, 123, 143
Group 3: Low Detection + High Interest	121, 138, 141	75, 93, 94, 106, 113, 126, 135

4. 2. Materials

4. 2. 1. Pretest and posttest measures

Video DCTs were developed specifically for this study and uploaded to a server for Internet use in classrooms. The four experimental situations selected for the pre-DCT and post-DCT were comparable in terms of the degrees of requestive imposition: They were all high-imposition situations in which the use of bi-clausal request forms were most appropriate. In each DCT, the participants were asked to respond orally to an English NS who initiated the conversation, and their responses were digitally recorded (see Takahashi, 2013 for more information on the development of the video DCTs) (see Appendix for the situational descriptions for the pre- and post-DCTs).

4. 2. 2. Materials for the awareness session

Video-dictation (VD) exercises were developed for the awareness session. Role-play dialogs between NSs of English were videotaped for six situations, in four of which the target bi-clausal request forms were provided (see Table 1). The remaining two were contrasting or filler situations, which were intended to elicit mono-clausal forms (e.g., Would/Could you VP?) as the most pertinent forms. Three forms were prepared for the VD materials, with two situations per form. These VD materials were uploaded to a server and accessible in classrooms.

In the VD task for each situation, participants completed three dictation activities (Dictations 1, 2, and 3), in which they were asked to write down any interesting NS expressions that were distinctly different from theirs. As the four situations were identical with those assessed in the pre-DCT, the VD tasks essentially presented noticing-the-gap activities. It was assumed that participants wrote down perceived most interesting expressions in Dictation 1. They were allowed to focus on the same expressions as targets during the three dictation activities as long as they felt they could not fully detect the particular expressions (up to three times per dictation). The participants used different colored pencils in the three activities: black, red, and blue for Dictations 1, 2, and 3, respectively. They were also asked to indicate their degree of interest in each of the focused expression on a seven-point rating scale (see Takahashi, 2012 for more information on the development of the VD materials).

4. 2. 3. Materials probing grammatical knowledge

As part of the post-DCT follow-up activities, a written grammar questionnaire was constructed to elicit retrospectively participants' responses with respect to their grammatical knowledge related to the target forms prior to the awareness session. There

高橋里美　TAKAHASHI Satomi

were two parts: Parts A and B. In Part A, learners' structural familiarity with the following three kinds of structures (and their variants) was examined: "wonder" (*I wonder if you could VP*), "possible" (*Is it possible to VP?*), and "appreciate" (*I would appreciate it if you would/could VP*). Part B was intended to probe the extent to which learners could understand the following four grammatical features related to politeness manifested in the target forms: "past tense" (the past tense to mitigate requestive force; e.g., *I was wondering if you could VP*), "progressives" (progressives to mitigate requestive force; e.g., *I am/was wondering if you could VP*), "modals" (modals to mitigate requestive force; e.g., *Would it be possible to VP?/ Could you VP?*), and "subjunctives" (subjunctives to mitigate requestive force; e.g., *I would appreciate it if you would VP*).

For both parts, an assessment of the particular aspects of grammatical competence was implemented on a four-point rating scale (1 = did not at all understand; 2 = did not sufficiently understand; 3 = somewhat understood; 4 = sufficiently understood).

4. 3. Procedures

Data were collected in regular general English classes taught by the author during the Fall semester 2008 and the Spring semester 2009. The three-week awareness (treatment) sessions were conducted by using the three forms of the VD materials, the order of which was counterbalanced across the participants. The participants took the pre-DCT one week prior to the first awareness session, whereas the post-DCT was administered one week after the third awareness session. One week after the post-DCT, the grammar questionnaire was given to the participants (along with the follow-up questionnaire for the posttest performance).

4. 4. Data analysis

In this study, data were analyzed individually for each of the 34 participants. The transcribed data from the post-DCT (and the pre-DCT) were coded for the request head acts based on Takahashi's (2001) "categories of request strategies." The post-DCT data thus provided information on whether or not learners had learned (produced) bi-clausal forms and, if they did, information on what request forms the learners used at the post-exposure phase.

With regard to the data on the dictation performance obtained during the three awareness sessions, only the request forms that learners detected, if any, were scrutinized. For each of them, based on the color of pencils, I identified words or phrases that were written down in Dictations 1 (black), 2 (red), or 3 (blue). This served to determine if and how the target request forms were "fully" detected. Specifically, a full detection meant that both the sentence stem and the embedded clause (conveying the propositional content

of request) were *adequately* written down. Therefore, for target forms that had ambiguous word order or many missing elements, the judgment for "adequately" was not granted. Furthermore, if a full detection were accomplished during Dictation 1, we could claim for a higher level of full detection. It should be noted here that learners' *interests* in the target request forms were not analyzed in this study as they are not directly involved in the assessment of the dictation performance and therefore the judgment on full detection. Furthermore, in the subsequent sections, the term "awareness" could be narrowly defined as "detection," and these two terms will be used interchangeably.

The grammar questionnaire provided us with information on the degree of learners' understanding of the structure of the target forms (Part A: three items) and the four grammatical features (Part B: four items) prior to the awareness sessions. For each participant, the items rated with values 1 and 2 (on the rating scale) were newly rated as "low (grammatical knowledge or structural familiarity)" and those with values 3 and 4 as "high (grammatical knowledge or structural familiarity)." For the seven items, the frequencies of "low" and "high" were calculated, and the value (high/low) with the higher frequency was decided to represent the participant's overall grammatical ability.

5. Results and discussion

5. 1. Detection and grammatical knowledge

For each selected participant for this study, the fully detected target request forms during the VD (treatment) task and their total were identified. An attempt was further made to find out in which dictation session—Dictations 1, 2, or 3—a full detection of the forms was achieved. It was assumed that a full detection of the target bi-clausal forms during the first single dictation task would require more sound grammatical knowledge related to the target forms, compared to the one across the two or three dictation sessions (and this is a matter of the *level* or *quality* of full detection), and the higher frequency of such fully detected forms would entail more stable learning of them. To explore this possibility, based on the findings from the grammar questionnaire, each participant's overall grammatical knowledge related to the target forms was estimated (low or high), along with a specific inspection of his/her familiarity with the target forms. This was followed by examinations of any associations between participants' grammatical knowledge and their full detection of the target forms and the differences in the observed associations between the Provision and Non-Provision learners. The results for each participant group are summarized in Tables 3 to 5.

Table 3. Treatment Task Performance and Grammatical Knowledge for Group 1
(High Detection + High Interest)

Performance Features		Participants									
		7 [P]	69 [P]	37 [N-P]	83 [N-P]	85 [N-P]	112 [N-P]	114 [N-P]	117 [N-P]	131 [N-P]	139 [N-P]
Fully detected target forms		pos 1	*app 1	*pos 2	pos 2	won 2	app 1	*pos 1	app 1	pos 1	app 1
		app 1	*won 2	app 1	app 1		won 1	*app 1	*won 3	*app 1	won 3
		*won 4		*won 2	won 3			won 4		won 3	
Overall grammatical knowledge	High	√	√	√		√	√	√			
	Low				√				√	√	√
Forms with high structural familiarity		**pos**	pos	**pos**	won	pos	pos	**pos**	pos	**pos**	(N/A)
		won	app	app		won	app	**app**	won	**won**	
			won	**won**				won			

Notes. [P] = Provision (Participants who provided bi-clausal forms in the post-DCT); [N-P] = Non-Provision (Participants who did not provide bi-clausal forms in the post-DCT).
pos = "possible" ("Is it possible to VP?"); app = "appreciate" ("I would appreciate it if you could VP"); won = "wonder" ("I wonder if you could V").
Number after the form type = The number of the forms detected during the treatment task (The total number of the target forms: pos: 2, app: 1, won: 5).
* = The forms fully detected during Dictation 1 for the treatment task (Not applicable to all situations).
Underline = The forms used in the post-DCT.
Bold = The forms that were sufficiently understood by the participants (i.e., those rated with value 4 in the grammar questionnaire).

Table 4. Treatment Task Performance and Grammatical Knowledge for Group 2
(Mid Detection + Low Interest)

Performance Features		Participants													
		8 [P]	21 [P]	29 [P]	38 [P]	122 [P]	129 [P]	16 [N-P]	32 [N-P]	50 [N-P]	90 [N-P]	95 [N-P]	116 [N-P]	123 [N-P]	143 [N-P]
Fully detected target forms		app 1	*app 1	app 1	*app 1	*won 2	won 4	pos 1	*app 1	*won 2	*won 2	*app 1	pos 1	pos 1	app 1
		won 1	*won 2	won 3	won 3			won 2	*won 1			won 2	app 1	*app 1	won 1
												won 1	won 2		
Overall grammatical knowledge	High		√	--	√	√		√	√	--	--	√		√	√
	Low	√		--			√			--	--		√		
Forms with high structural familiarity		**pos**	app	--	pos	pos	app	pos	pos	--	--	**pos**	won	app	pos
		won	**won**		won	won		app	app			won		won	**app**
								won	won						**won**

Notes. [P] = Provision (Participants who provided bi-clausal forms in the post-DCT); [N-P] = Non-Provision (Participants who did not provide bi-clausal forms in the post-DCT).
-- = No information obtained.
pos = "possible" ("Is it possible to VP?"); app = "appreciate" ("I would appreciate it if you could VP"); won = "wonder" ("I wonder if you could V").
Number after the form type = The number of the forms detected during the treatment task (The total number of the target forms: pos: 2, app: 1, won: 5).
* = The forms fully detected during Dictation 1 for the treatment task (Not applicable to all situations).
Underline = The forms used in the post-DCT.
Bold = The forms that were sufficiently understood by the participants (i.e., those rated with value 4 in the grammar questionnaire).

Table 5. Treatment Task Performance and Grammatical Knowledge for Group 3 (Low Detection + High Interest)

Performance Features		Participants									
		121 [P]	138 [P]	141 [P]	75 [N-P]	93 [N-P]	94 [N-P]	106 [N-P]	113 [N-P]	126 [N-P]	135 [N-P]
Fully detected target forms		won 1	app 1	won 1	won 2	pos 1	app 1	app 1	app 1	won 1	won 1
						*app 1	won 1	won 2	*won 1		
Overall grammatical knowledge	High	√	--	√	√	√			√	√	√
	Low		--				√	√			
Forms with high structural familiarity		**pos**	--	pos	pos	**pos**	pos	pos	app	**pos**	pos
		app		app	app	**app**	won		won	won	won
		won			won						

Notes. [P] = Provision (Participants who provided bi-clausal forms in the post-DCT); [N-P] = Non-Provision (Participants who did not provide bi-clausal forms in the post-DCT).
-- = No information obtained.
pos = "possible" ("Is it possible to VP?"); app = "appreciate" ("I would appreciate it if you could VP"); won = "wonder" ("I wonder if you could V").
Number after the form type = The number of the forms detected during the treatment task (The total number of the target forms: pos: 2, app: 1, won: 5).
* = The forms fully detected during Dictation 1 for the treatment task (Not applicable to all situations).
Underline = The forms used in the post-DCT.
Bold = The forms that were sufficiently understood by the participants (i.e., those rated with value 4 in the grammar questionnaire).

髙橋里美　TAKAHASHI Satomi

As the selected participants were previously confirmed to have relatively high awareness, they all noticed some of the target bi-clausal request forms with "full" detection. As expected, the number of full detections varied from one group to another, with Group 1 showing the highest frequency of full detections; Group-1 participants also demonstrated a variety in fully detected target forms. However, assuming comparability in each group, the participants in the same group demonstrated similar features or tendencies regarding the kinds of forms fully detected and the number of such forms, regardless of whether they successfully provided the target forms at the post-DCT (Provision) or not (Non-Provision). In fact, some participants in both Provision and Non-Provision categories in the same group equally succeeded in fully detecting the target forms in Dictation 1 alone.

However, when we examined the involvement of grammatical knowledge in the full detection, unique configurations emerged in each participant group, though they still could not explain the differences in the posttest performance at this stage of analysis. Namely, learners who had higher grammatical knowledge might be able to detect fully the target bi-clausal forms during the first dictation task alone. Moreover, the two observations were made based on learners' structural familiarity. First, learners with higher grammatical knowledge tended to report a larger number of cases in which their

assessment of familiarity with the target bi-clausal forms was quite high. Second, when learners demonstrated a sufficiently high degree of familiarity with a certain bi-clausal form, they tended to detect successfully the target form of the same type in the treatment input, in particular, during the first dictation; for Provision learners, the frequency of such successful detection was relatively high (particularly the "wonder" forms), and one of these bi-clausal forms was actually used in the post-DCT. Note that all of the points mentioned above are specifically illustrated, for example, in the data from Participants #7 (Group 1, Provision), #37 (Group 1, Non-Provision), #114 (Group 1, Non-Provision), #21 (Group 2, Provision), #32 (Group 2, Non-Provision), and #123 (Group 2, Non-Provision). At the same time, we should note that there are exceptions. For instance, Participants #38 (Group 2, Provision) and #95 (Group 2, Non-Provision) fully detected the "appreciate" form during the first dictation though they did not report that they were sufficiently familiar with this form. Furthermore, Participant #121 (Group 3, Provision) reported her high familiarity with the "wonder" form and she was able to detect this form in the input; however, a bi-clausal form that was not targeted in this study was used in the post-DCT. However, the overall tendency demonstrates the role of learners' grammatical knowledge in pragmalinguistic awareness, supporting what we call a "grammar–awareness" interface.

5. 2. Patterns for pragmatics–grammar interface

On closer inspection of the results in Tables 3 to 5, five major patterns emerged from the observed variations with respect to relationships between grammatical knowledge, dictation performance, and posttest performance, as shown below:[3]

Pattern A: + Grammar / + Full detection / Provision
Pattern B: + Grammar / + Full detection / Non-Provision
Pattern C: − Grammar / − Full detection / Non-Provision
Pattern D: + Grammar / − Full detection / Non-Provision
Pattern E: − Grammar / + Full detection / Non-Provision

In order to explore how learners' grammatical knowledge constrains their learning (or producing) bi-clausal structures via detection (awareness), the above patterns were analyzed in the framework of comparing Pattern A (leading to Provision) with the remaining four patterns (leading to Non-Provision).

5. 2. 1. Pattern A (+ Grammar / + Full detection / Provision)
This pattern indicates that learners with adequate grammatical knowledge related to

髙橋里美　TAKAHASHI Satomi

the target request forms may be able to detect fully the target forms in the input, which may lead to their learning bi-clausal forms (or producing their variants). Participant #7 (Group 1) showed a representative case for this pattern (see Table 6). She reported that she understood all the grammatical features except the "appreciate" form. Her high familiarity with the "possible" and "wonder" forms and her adequate understanding of "past tense," "progressives," "modals," and "subjunctives" could have contributed to her excellent dictation performance for all the situations in the VD task. As the examples of her dictation performance presented in Table 6 clearly indicated,[4)] she succeeded in detecting the sentence stems for the "possible" and the "wonder" forms in Dictation 1; the remaining parts were also sufficiently written down (in Dictations 2 or 3). Her higher listening skills could have also affected this superior performance. However, in view of her less successful performance for the "appreciate" target, which she said she did not sufficiently understand, we could conclude that grammatical knowledge is critical for pragmalinguistic awareness. It should be noted that this participant produced the "wonder" form at the post-DCT. The most pertinent explanation for this would be that her grammatical knowledge of "wonder" had further facilitated her form-function analysis, or more precisely, her form-function-context analysis of this form in processing the input. Besides, she repeatedly encountered this form in the treatment input and processed it with full detection, which provided her with more opportunities to implement the form-function-context analysis for the "wonder" form, thus successfully consolidating this form into her pragmalinguistic knowledge.

Table 6. Grammatical Knowledge and Task Performance for Pattern A
(+ Grammar, + Full Detection, Provision): Case of Participant #7

Grammatical Knowledge	"possible" "wonder" / Past tense Progressives Modals Subjunctives
Dictation Performance	Examples of Pattern-A detection: <Appointment> ● Umm, would it be possible to change that appointment to later in the day? ● So, I would really appreciate it if we (> you) could (> can) change the – the meeting time. <Recommendation> ● But, I was just wondering if you could write me another letter of recommendation. <Reference Book> ● But I was wondering if you would let me keep it.
Posttest Performance	Provision: "wonder"

Notes. Underline = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 1; Wavy line = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 2; Dotted line = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 3.
(>) = A word that the participant wrote down in place of the target word.
Words/phrases without being marked = The target words/phrases that the participant did not write down.

5. 2. 2. Other patterns

Pattern B（＋Grammar／＋Full detection／Non-Provision）represents learners with sufficient grammatical knowledge who are able to notice successfully the target bi-clausal forms in the input but without eventually learning (or producing) them. The nature of the "grammar–awareness" link is similar to that for Pattern A; thus, learners characterized by this pattern showed outstanding dictation performance, as shown in the case of Participant #114 (see Table 7).[5] For example, it would be reasonable to claim that her knowledge of the "possible" and "appreciate" forms as well as "modals" and "subjunctives" facilitated her detection of the "possible" and "appreciate" target forms. (The reason for "Non-Provision" in Pattern B will be considered later in this section.)

On the other hand, Pattern C (– Grammar / – Full detection / Non-Provision) indicates that insufficient grammatical knowledge entails a smaller number of full detection and the failure of full detection in Dictation 1, and this observation is reflected in the performance by Participant #139, for example (see Table 8). The similar tendency was attested for Pattern D (+ Grammar / – Full detection / Non-Provision) regarding the nature of full detection. Although the learners possessed sound grammatical knowledge, their abilities for full detection of the target forms, particularly in the first dictation, were relatively low, as shown in the performance by Participant #112 (see Table 9). This would primarily be due to their lower listening proficiency. Moreover, Pattern D could not confirm the critical role of grammar in pragmalinguistic awareness. In either case, Patterns C or D, learners

Table 7. Grammatical Knowledge and Task Performance for Pattern B
(+ Grammar, + Full Detection, Non-Provision): Case of Participant #114

Grammatical Knowledge	"possible" "appreciate" "wonder" / Modals Subjunctives
Dictation Performance	Examples of Pattern-B detection: <Appointment> ● Umm, would (> will) it be possible to change that appointment to later in the day? ● So, I would really appreciate it if we could (> can) change the – the meeting time. <Recommendation> ● But, I was just wondering if you could write me (> need) another letter of recommendation. ● I was just wondering if it (> you) would be at all possible if you could write the letter.
Posttest Performance	Non-Provision: mono-clausal

Notes. Underline = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 1; Wavy line = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 2.
(>) = A word that the participant wrote down in place of the target word.
Words/phrases without being marked = The target words/phrases that the participant did not write down.

failed to learn or produce bi-clausal forms; however, in view of the smaller number and lower level of full detection, this outcome is not surprising.

Learners in Pattern E (– Grammar / + Full detection / Non-Provision) demonstrate full detection of the target request forms in the treatment input even without sufficient

Table 8. Grammatical Knowledge and Task Performance for Pattern C
(– Grammar, – Full Detection, Non-Provision): Case of Participant #139

Grammatical Knowledge	Modals
Dictation Performance	Examples of Pattern-C detection: <Appointment> ● [stem – incomplete] Umm, would (>what) it (>if) be (>you) <u>possible to change</u> that (>the) <u>appointment</u> <u>to</u> <u>later</u> in (>on) <u>the day</u>? <Conflicting Schedule> ● [stem – incomplete] Yeah. I was <u>wondering if you could let me write a term paper instead of doing</u> the actual <u>exam</u>. ● [stem – incomplete] So, I was (>as) <u>wondering</u> if there is <u>any chance</u>, any chance that you'd let (>love) <u>me</u> write a (>to) <u>term paper</u>.
Posttest Performance	Non-Provision: mono-clausal

Notes. Underline = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 1; Wavy line = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 2.
(>) = A word that the participant wrote down in place of the target word.
Words/phrases without being marked = The target words/phrases that the participant did not write down.

Table 9. Grammatical Knowledge and Task Performance for Pattern D
(+ Grammar, –Full Detection, Non-Provision): Case of Participant #112

Grammatical Knowledge	"possible" "appreciate" "wonder" / Past tense Modals Subjunctives
Dictation Performance	Examples of Pattern-D detection: <Appointment> ● [stem – incomplete] Umm, <u>would it</u> (>you) <u>be possible to change</u> that (>the) appointment to later in (>on) <u>the day</u>? <Recommendation> ● But, <u>I was just wondering if you could write</u> me another letter of recommendation. <Reference Book> ● But <u>I was wondering if you would let me</u> (> that I) <u>keep it</u>. ● [stem – incomplete] Would (>When) it (>if) <u>be at all possible if I could keep it</u>?
Posttest Performance	Non-Provision: mono-clausal

Notes. Underline = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 1; Wavy line = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 2; Dotted line = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 3.
(>) = A word that the participant wrote down in place of the target word.
Words/phrases without being marked = The target words/phrases that the participant did not write down.

grammatical knowledge. This pattern also does not support the critical involvement of grammatical knowledge in pragmalinguistic awareness, but as the exact opposite of Pattern D. Participant #83 may provide the representative case for this pattern (see Table 10). She appeared to perform the dictation task satisfactorily. However, a closer look at her dictation performance revealed no cases of full detection in Dictation 1 alone. A possible explanation would be that some ID factors, probably motivation, might deprive her of opportunities to concentrate on the dictation task, which might eventually lead her to struggle to write down words and phrases throughout the three dictation sessions. Aside from motivation, any learners without adequate grammatical knowledge could likely detect the target forms perceptually or mechanically, thereby virtually enhancing their dictation performance. In view of these possibilities, the surface-level shallow processing without a sufficient analysis of the form-function relations of the target forms might have resulted in Pattern-E participants' nonuse of bi-clausal forms at the posttest. Furthermore, the similar explanation of "surface-level shallow processing" could probably be applied to Pattern-B participants regarding their posttest performance (Non-Provision). Namely, while they attained higher levels of full detection, as shown by Participant #114, it might be mechanical in nature, which is essentially awareness at the level of noticing (i.e., the "conscious registration of an event" (Schmidt, 1995, p. 29)), rather than awareness at the level of understanding (i.e., the "recognition of a general principle, rule or pattern"

Table 10. Grammatical Knowledge and Task Performance for Pattern E
(– Grammar, + Full Detection, Non-Provision): Case of Participant #83

Grammatical Knowledge	"wonder" / Past tense Modals
Dictation Performance	Examples of Pattern-E detection: <Appointment> ● Umm, would it be possible to change that (> the) appointment to later in (> on) the day? ● So, I would really appreciate it if we (> you) could (> can) change the – the meeting time. <Recommendation> ● I was just wondering if it (> you) would be at all possible if you could write the letter. <Reference Book> ● Would it be at all possible if I could (> to) keep it?
Posttest Performance	Non-Provision: mono-clausal

Notes. Underline = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 1; Wavy line = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 2; Dotted line = The target words/phrases that the participant wrote down in Dictation 3.
(>) = A word that the participant wrote down in place of the target word.
Words/phrases without being marked = The target words/phrases that the participant did not write down.

(Schmidt, 1995, p. 29)).

6. General discussion and conclusion

In response to the research question of this study, the obtained findings, overall, demonstrated that Japanese EFL learners' grammatical knowledge differentially constrain their awareness of target bi-clausal request forms in the implicit input and their learning of these forms. This explanatory study specifically focused on whether and in what way grammatical knowledge could be the base for learners' full detection of the target request forms in the treatment input. As a general trend, learners with sound grammatical knowledge could fully detect the target forms, in particular, during the first dictation task. The most insightful finding would probably be the influence of structural familiarity on pragmalinguistic awareness. Namely, learners' adequate familiarity with bi-clausal forms enables them to detect the target forms of the same types fully in the input; moreover, Provision learners tended to use, at the posttest, one of the variants of bi-clausal forms with which they claimed were familiar. These findings support the claims by Bardovi-Harlig (2009) and Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011) with respect to the effects of recognition/familiarity on production of conventional expressions.

Furthermore, five major patterns on the relationships between grammatical knowledge, dictation performance, and posttest performance were identified from the variations found in learners' dictation performance. The analysis of these patterns showed that learners with sufficient grammatical knowledge tended to detect fully the target forms in the input and use bi-clausal forms in their posttest performance (Pattern A). This finding stresses the critical role of grammar; however, some cases (i.e., Patterns D and E) contradict this observation. One of our prime concerns here is learners who successfully noticed the target forms in the input because of adequate grammatical knowledge; some of them could use bi-clausal forms at the posttest (Provision) (Pattern A), but others could not (Non-Provision) (Pattern B). As a possible explanation, despite the same level of grammatical competence and thus the same level of full detection, learners characterized by these two patterns might differ in their depth of processing (Craik & Lockhart, 1972) for analyzing form-function relations of the target forms (and probably the involvement of grammar in such an analysis). In the end, Non-Provision learners' full detection could have essentially manifested surface-level noticing, that is, awareness at the level of noticing, rather than awareness at the level of understanding. When confronting implicit pragmatic input, such surface-level noticing does not ensure self-initiated deeper analysis of form-function mappings toward autonomous learning and could have been triggered by various other ID factors, including motivation and listening proficiency (see Takahashi,

髙橋里美　TAKAHASHI Satomi

2013, 2015 for similar observation). The very limitation of this study is the failure to investigate how grammar interacts with various other ID factors and how these factors as a whole are involved in the form-function analysis of the input. Future research, thus, should consider a more comprehensive framework that allows the collection of more robust evidence for the pragmatics–grammar interface.

Notes

1) A one-way ANOVA was performed with "group" as the between-subject variable (two levels) to verify the group difference. It was found that these two groups were significantly different in the total awareness scores: $F(1, 103) = 225.471$, $p < .0001$.

2) A one-way ANOVA performed with "group" as the between-subject variable (three levels) showed that these three groups were significantly different in the total detection capacity scores ($F(2, 59) = 37.360$, $p < .0001$) and the total interest scores ($F(2, 59) = 57.315$, $p < .0001$). Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test as a post-hoc test indicated that all the group differences were significant at $p < .001$ or $p < .0001$ for the detection capacity dimension. The HSD for the interest dimension, however, verified significant differences between Groups 1 and 2 ($p < .0001$) and between Groups 2 and 3 ($p < .0001$) but did not between Groups 1 and 3 ($p = .324$).

3) The plus (+) and minus (–) symbols do not indicate that the particular features are present or absent; rather, they show the tendency of increase or decrease in the level (grammatical knowledge, full detection) and frequency (full detection).

4) Regarding the dictation performance shown in Tables 6 to 10, the words and phrases that learners could detect were indicated with underlines (Dictation 1), wavy lines (Dictation 2), or dotted lines (Dictation 3) on the original wordings of the target forms.

5) For strict comparison with Participant #7 (Group 1) in Pattern A, examples are taken from the participants in Group 1 for the remaining four patterns.

References

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

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2008). Recognition and production of formulas in L2 pragmatics. In Z.-H. Han (Ed.), *Understanding second language process* (pp. 205-222). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2009). Conventional expressions as a pragmalinguistic resource: Recognition and production of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Language*

髙橋里美　TAKAHASHI Satomi

Learning, 59, 755-795.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2012). Pragmatics in second language acquisition. In S. M. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 147-162). London/New York: Routledge.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2013). Developing L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning, 63 (Suppl. 1),* 68-86.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Bastos, M.-T. (2011). Proficiency, length of stay, and intensity of interaction, and the acquisition of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 8,* 347-384.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Vellenga, H. E. (2012). The effect of instruction on conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *System, 40,* 77-89.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1993). Learning the rules of academic talk: A longitudinal study of pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15,* 279-304.

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

Blum-Kulka, S, & Levenston, W. A. (1987). Lexico-grammatical pragmatic indicators. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 9,* 155-170.

Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 11,* 671-684.

Dittmar, N., & Terborg, H. (1991). Modality and second language learning. In C. A. Ferguson & T. Huebner (Eds.), *Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories* (pp. 347-384). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. W. (1986). "I very appreciate": Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics, 7,* 167-185.

Geyer, N. (2007). Self-qualification in L2 Japanese: An interface of pragmatic, grammatical, and discourse competence. *Language Learning, 57,* 337-367.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1981). Politeness markers in English and German. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* (pp. 157-185). The Hague: Mouton.

Kasper, G. (2001). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied Linguistics, 22,* 502-530.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18,* 149-169.

Robinson, M. A. (1992). Introspective methodology in interlanguage pragmatics research. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as native and target language (Technical report, No. 3)* (pp. 27-82). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Schmidt, R. (1983). Interaction, acculturation and the acquisition of communicative competence. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and second language*

acquisition (pp. 137-174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

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

Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper, & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. *AILA Review, 11,* 11-26.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning (Technical report #9)* (pp. 1-63). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18,* 189-223.

Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K. Rose, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 171-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takahashi, S. (2005). Pragmalinguistic awareness: Is it related to motivation and proficiency? *Applied Linguistics, 26,* 90-120.

Takahashi, S. (2012). Individual differences and pragmalinguistic awareness: A structural equation modeling approach. *Language, Culture, and Communication, 4,* 103-125.

Takahashi, S. (2013). Awareness and learning in second language pragmatics. *Language, Culture, and Communication, 5,* 53-76.

Takahashi, S. (2015). The effects of learner profiles on pragmalinguistic awareness and learning. *System, 48,* 48-61.

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. M. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal, 8,* 131-155.

Appendix

Situations for the discourse completion tests (Reproduced from Takahashi (2013))

Test	Situation	Description
Pre-DCT	Appointment	A student asks the professor to reschedule an appointment because he/she desperately needs to go to a dentist around the same time.
	Conflicting Schedule	A student asks the professor to allow him/her to submit a term paper for course credit, instead of taking a written exam, because he/she needs to participate in an ice hockey tournament scheduled on the same day.
	Reference Book	A student asks the professor to postpone the date of returning a reference book that he/she borrowed before because he/she wants to keep it for two to three more days to complete a paper.
	Recommendation	A student asks the professor to write one of the recommendation letters required for admission to a university in the U.K.
Post-DCT	Paper Due	A student asks the professor to extend the due date for the term paper because he/she has been busy with the final exams for other courses and needs a few more days to complete the paper.
	Wrap-up Party	A student asks the professor to attend an end-of-the-semester party because a classmate is scheduled to leave the seminar to study abroad next semester.
	Feedback	A student asks the professor to read his/her revised paper again and give more detailed comments on it so that it can be submitted for publication.
	Make-up Exam	A student asks the professor to give a make-up exam for the course because he/she had a bad cold and therefore missed the final exam.

髙橋里美　TAKAHASHI Satomi