

Teaching the pragmatics of English as an international language: A focus on pragmatic markers

Language Teaching Research

2022, Vol. 26(2) 256–278

© The Author(s) 2021

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/13621688211064933

journals.sagepub.com/home/ltr**Ariadna Sánchez-Hernández** 

Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

Alicia Martínez-Flor

Universitat Jaume I, Spain

Abstract

The current era of globalization and emergence of English as an international language (EIL) has brought about new opportunities for L2 pragmatic learning and teaching. The common view of pragmatic learning as an approximation to native-likeness is changing towards conceiving pragmatic ability as a tool to interact with people of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, the majority of whom are non-native speakers (NNSs) of English. While such reality is widely acknowledged, few attempts have been made to teach pragmatic competence in EIL. Addressing this concern, the present study investigates the effects that a pedagogical intervention on EIL pragmatics has on the oral use of pragmatic markers (PMs): a key tool for successful communication in the current increasingly multicultural and multilingual society. Seventy-three Spanish EFL students were divided into an instructional ($n = 34$) and a control group ($n = 39$). The instructional group received 4 interventional sessions that included (1) awareness of the legitimacy of EIL, (2) meta-pragmatic awareness of pragmatic behavior across the world, (3) task-supported instruction on PMs, and (4) strategy-based instruction. Pragmatic competence was assessed by students' use of PMs in oral academic presentations. The results revealed that the instructional group had more significant changes in the frequency and variety of PMs used than the control one, as they widened the repertoire of PMs uttered in their academic presentations. These findings project the future of pragmatic instruction in EIL and provide directions for reorienting the EIL curriculum towards the integration of L2 pragmatics.

Keywords

EIL, English language teaching, L2 Pragmatics, pragmatic instruction, pragmatic markers

Corresponding author:

Ariadna Sánchez-Hernández, Department of English Studies, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Plaza Menéndez Pelayo, s/n, Madrid, 28040, Spain.

Email: ariadna.sanchez@ucm.es

I Introduction

With almost 2 billion English speakers around the globe – that is, a third of the world's population – the majority of whom (between 75% and 80%) use it as a second or foreign language, there is no doubt that English has acquired the status of international language (Crystal, 2008). It is no longer primarily used in monolingual contexts, but more frequently now in multilingual settings as the vehicle of communication. For instance, English is now used in global business, it is the main tool for the internationalization of education, and it is the most used language in the World Wide Web (Internet World Stats, 2020). In this increasingly multicultural and multilingual context, being pragmatically appropriate is critical (see Sifianou & Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, 2018). For successful communication to take place, individuals need to know how to use English adequately in each situation. Therefore, the need to incorporate instruction in pragmatic competence in the English as an international language (EIL) curriculum seems urgent.

A long tradition of studies in interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) has confirmed that pragmatic competence is teachable, especially through explicit instruction on different pragmatic targets (e.g. Alcón-Soler, 2012; Chen, 2015; Félix-Brasdefer & Cohen, 2012; Nguyen, 2018). The problem is that pragmatic instruction has traditionally been based on second language (L2) and foreign language (FL) pedagogical models, aimed at adhering to a native-speaker (NS) ideal that determines the proficiency of a language learner. Nevertheless, with globalization, such traditional view of language learning as an approximation to native-likeness has changed to conceiving language acquisition as a tool to mediate across linguistic and cultural boundaries. Therefore, the challenge now is to reorient the English as a foreign language (EFL) or English as a second language (ESL) curriculum towards adopting an EIL-informed perspective with pragmatic instruction at the core (see Sánchez-Hernández & Alcón-Soler, 2021; Tajeddin & Alemi, 2021). Such a shift would require (1) moving beyond nativespeakerism to aiming at mutual intelligibility, (2) an expansion of the scope to involve the pragmatic norms of all English speakers across the world, and (3) an attitudinal change by both teachers and students.

Despite the widespread acknowledgement of the need for pragmatic instruction in EIL (McKay, 2009, 2018; Murray, 2012), very few attempts have been made to propose such pedagogical approaches, and they have not gone beyond proposals and theoretical discussions (House, 2012; McKay, 2009; Sánchez-Hernández & Alcón-Soler, 2021; Taguchi & Ishihara, 2018). Hence, the question still remains as to whether the pragmatics of EIL is teachable. To address this concern, the present study investigates the effects of an EIL-informed pedagogical intervention on learners' pragmatic ability in oral academic presentations. More particularly, the instruction focused on pragmatic markers (PMs), a less commonly taught pragmatic aspect that is key for successful communication in the current globalized context.

II Literature review

I Teaching the pragmatics of EIL

Pragmatic competence in EIL involves the ability to communicate in English with other English speakers across Kachruvian circles (Kachru, 1992), that is, in those nations where

English is used as the L1 (e.g. Australia or the US), in those where English is the official L2 or the language used in institutions (e.g. India or Nigeria), and in the rest of countries in the world, where English is used as a FL or lingua franca (e.g. China or Spain). Hence, it entails knowing how to interpret and to use language appropriately given the sociocultural norms and the situation, and being able to negotiate meaning to achieve mutual intelligibility (McKay, 2009, 2018). A key aspect of EIL pragmatics is that it does not replace ESL or EFL models, but expands the scope to encompassing all English varieties, from NSs varieties, to L2 and FL uses, and to localized English varieties such as Spanglish, Chinese English or Hinglish. Thus, rather than arguing for a divorce between EFL/ESL and EIL (see Cogo, 2018), what we propose is to integrate an EIL-informed perspective to enrich the English language teaching curriculum.

Previous scholarly discussion (McKay, 2009, 2018; Murray, 2012; Sánchez-Hernández & Alcón-Soler, 2021; Taguchi & Kim, 2018) has suggested that an EIL-informed perspective to teach pragmatic competence should encompass the following 6 elements: (1) awareness of EIL pragmatic norms; (2) enhancement of interactional competence; (3) a focus on function rather than on form; (4) an attitudinal orientation towards the legitimacy of EIL; (5) promotion of learners' autonomy to critically choose their pragmatic behavior; and (6) attention to the needs of the students.

First of all, ILP research has revealed that awareness of pragmatic norms is a first step in learning pragmatic competence (e.g. Martínez-Flor & Usó-Juan, 2010). Indeed, most of the pedagogical models developed to teach speech acts in interventional studies in L2/FL contexts adopt a consciousness-raising approach. That is, they include awareness-raising activities to make learners aware of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects when performing speech acts. Therefore, to promote EIL pragmatic development it is important to start by exposing students to a variety of EIL input and raise their awareness of the widespread use of the language. As Sánchez-Hernández and Alcón-Soler (2021) explain, corpora provide excellent sources of EIL pragmatic input that reflects authentic language use in context (see also Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman & Vellenga, 2015; Barron, 2019). Some corpora with EIL data include the Vienna–Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE), and the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE). In addition to corpora, a wide range of audiovisual materials illustrates EIL use by different communities of practice (Bruti, 2016; Derakhshan & Eslami, 2020; Khazdouzian, Celaya & Barón, 2020). Both corpora and audiovisual input allow for the development of EIL-specific pedagogical resources to raise awareness of pragmatic behavior across the globe.

Second, interactional competence should be a focus in EIL pragmatic instruction (McKay, 2009). Interactional competence in EIL involves different conversation management strategies that lead to negotiation of meaning and successful communication in English across contexts and interlocutors. Research on the pragmatics of English as a lingua franca (ELF)¹ (see Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey, 2011) as well as intercultural pragmatics scholars (e.g. Kecskes, 2019) have revealed prolific findings on what strategies non-native speakers (NNSs) use in their English interactions with other NNSs and with NSs. Drawing on such findings, McKay (2009) emphasized the need for the EIL curriculum to include practice on repair strategies (e.g. asking for clarification, repetition, rephrasing), conversational routines (to agree and disagree, leave-taking routines, turn-taking), and negotiation strategies (defending a specific idea, suggesting alternatives, reaching consensus), common in ELF communication.

Third, an EIL-informed pragmatics pedagogy should involve a focus on function, rather than on form (Canagarajah, 2014). That is, instead of teaching ‘what’ the particular norms of a given society are, instruction should focus on ‘how’ to negotiate meaning with different interlocutors through accommodation strategies. To this end, different scholars have proposed task-based instruction, which provides students with a wide range of contexts for authentic interactional practice (e.g. sending an email to a professor or phoning a doctor) (Barón, Levkina & Celaya, 2020; Taguchi & Kim, 2018). Alternatively, students may engage in authentic out-of-class communication thanks to different technology-enhanced tools, which include synchronous (e.g. telecollaborative projects, blogs) and asynchronous computer-mediated communication (e.g. emails, discussion forums), synthetic immersive environments (e.g. Second Life) and mobile place-based games (see González-Lloret, 2018, 2019; Taguchi & Sykes, 2013).

A fourth aspect deals with how to orient the attitude of English students and also teachers towards acknowledging the legitimacy of EIL (Taguchi & Ishihara, 2018; Tajeddin, Reza & Shayeghi, 2019; Usó-Juan & Martínez-Flor, 2021). As Tajeddin et al. (2019) explain, some English teachers are willing to learn new teaching practices that account for the plurality of EIL, but the majority are more prone to maintaining NS norms. As the authors imply, equipping teachers with EIL material and teacher training would be helpful to reorient their attitude towards the teachability of EIL. To this respect, Usó-Juan and Martínez-Flor (2021) present a variety of research-based instructional techniques, skills, and strategies to help teachers develop their understanding of EIL pragmatics and how pragmatic competence could be integrated in their teaching practices. In a similar vein, Nguyen and Basturkmen (2021) present a list of evaluation criteria to help teachers select appropriate EIL materials. As for the students, their awareness of the emergence and legitimacy of EIL may be explicitly raised through lectures, activities and class discussions on tolerance for diversity (Matsuda, 2012; Sánchez-Hernández & Alcón-Soler, 2021; Taguchi & Ishihara, 2018).

The fifth element that should be included in the EIL pragmatics curriculum is strategy-based instruction; that is, guiding students into developing their autonomy to learn pragmatic competence by themselves (e.g. Cohen, 2014; Cohen & Ishihara, 2005; Sykes & Cohen, 2018; Taguchi, 2018). A strategy-based approach to EIL pragmatic learning involves raising students’ awareness about the way English is used throughout the globe, and empowering them with the ability to critically choose the pragmatic behavior to carry out according to the given context. To this end, Taguchi (2018) proposed instruction on metacognitive strategies – related to noticing and evaluating the appropriateness of pragmatic behavior –, and cognitive strategies – related to processing pragmatic information, and to building up L2 pragmatic knowledge. Moreover, some studies have proposed an intercultural approach to teaching pragmatics, in which learners are guided into understanding both their own sociocultural norms, and the interlocutor’s ones, in order to be able to strategically mediate between both. For instance, in Nguyen (2018), pragmatic instruction incorporated an intercultural component where students were encouraged to reflect on their own cultural norms and decide for themselves to what extent they wished to adopt L2 norms, adhere to their own L1 norms or blend both. Their performance was not assessed against NS standards but based on situational appropriateness (e.g. a student’s use of L1 norms when interacting in English with a teacher from their own culture was considered acceptable).

The final aspect refers to the fact that there is not a single way to teach EIL that can be applied in all instructional contexts (Taguchi & Ishihara, 2018). As Kecskes (2019) explains, it does not make sense to have an established list of ELF communication strategies as these are likely to vary according to the situation. He sees ELF as a temporary mode of communication, which is socially constructed according to the pragmatic norms at play in specific scenarios. Thus, what seems more practical is to develop the EIL curriculum based on the needs of the students and of the local context. To this end, Sánchez-Hernández and Alcón-Soler (2021) proposed that a first step in the design of an EIL-informed curriculum should be carrying out needs analyses about the students' motivations and necessity to learn English, and also consider the communities of practice they are likely to be engaged in.

With these six elements in mind, a few proposals to teaching EIL pragmatic competence have been presented (House, 2012; McKay, 2009; Sánchez-Hernández & Alcón-Soler, 2021; Taguchi & Ishihara, 2018). Taguchi and Ishihara (2018) put forward some principles that EIL pragmatic instruction needs to include. The first principle involves the use of awareness-raising tasks to provide exposure to different ELF pragmatic uses. Second, students need to be guided into becoming ethnographers, through observation of social interactions in English in their local communities, or through writing a diary about their interactional practices. Third, activities with authentic interactional EIL data should be implemented to develop students' meta-pragmatic awareness and their communication strategies. Finally, learners' accommodation strategies could be enhanced through discussions about the current status of English in the world, as well as about aspects related to respect and empathy. In a similar vein, Sánchez-Hernández and Alcón-Soler (2021) presented a 4-session lesson plan on the use of pragmatic markers in EIL, which involved (1) raising awareness of the legitimacy of EIL, (2) explicit instruction on pragmatic markers, (3) raising meta-pragmatic awareness through cross-cultural comparisons, and (4) task-based pragmatic production.

All in all, the existent proposals to teaching the pragmatics of EIL point out to key principles that should be included in the curriculum. Nevertheless, to our knowledge, there is a lack of empirical evidence of the implementation of such pedagogical interventions. To address this concern, the present study explores the effects that implementing Sánchez-Hernández and Alcón-Soler's (2021) pedagogical proposal had on pragmatic development, and more particularly on the use of PMs in oral academic presentations.

2 Pragmatic markers

PMs such as *well*, *you know*, *yeah* or *I mean* have been broadly defined as short interactional devices that do not carry out specific semantic meanings but which convey significant pragmatic functions in oral and written communication (e.g. Aijmer, 2013; Brinton, 1996; Romero-Trillo, 2012). As such, they may be recognized by removing them from the discourse without altering the original meaning of the message. Different scholars have shown that PMs are a key tool for communicative effectiveness, as they contribute to maintaining 'pragmatic fluency'; that is, the flow and smoothness of a conversation (House, 2009, 2012).

A main property of PMs is their multifunctionality; that is, one PM may have different functions depending on the context in which it is produced (Martín-Laguna, 2020; Martín-Laguna & Alcón-Soler, 2018). Because of this, different approaches to classifying PMs according to their function have been proposed. Some scholars view PMs as serving multiple functions, from speech management to politeness (Fischer, 2006), others argue that PMs have either discursive or interpersonal functions (Ament, Pérez-Vidal & Barón, 2018; Brinton, 1996; Herraiz & Sánchez-Hernández, 2019), while other researchers only distinguish the interpersonal nature of PMs, differentiating between PMs and discourse markers (Magliacane, 2020; Romero-Trillo, 2012). Following Martín-Laguna (2019, 2020), we view PMs as placed in a functional continuum that ranges from textual functions to interpersonal ones. On the one hand, textual functions involve the organization of the discourse so as to facilitate the interpretation of the message (e.g. the use of 'anyway' to change the topic of conversation). On the other hand, interpersonal functions enhance the social interaction between speaker and hearer and help engage the hearer to understanding the speakers' communicative intention (e.g. the use of *you know* to align with the interlocutor).

Different studies on ELF oral interaction have explained the use of PMs by NNSs. In contrast to NSs, NNSs seem to display a wider variability in their PM use, in terms of both frequency and functions. First, they may re-interpret the use of PMs by using them for different purposes (Baumgarten & House, 2010; House, 2009). For instance, House (2009) observed that *you know*, which is mainly used as an interpersonal marker by NSs, was more frequently uttered by NNS (German EFL speakers) for textual purposes. Second, NNS may create their own PMs, especially out of pragmatic transfer from their L1 (Murray, 2012). An example is the PM *in my point of view*, observed in an ELF oral corpus in Mauranen's (2012) study, which was used instead of the more native-like expressions *from my point of view* or *in my view*. Moreover, NNSs may overuse some PMs like *you see*, *you know* or *I mean*, causing distraction to the interlocutor, as Schnritz (2012) pointed out with Arabic EFL learners. Finally, code-switching seems to be a common strategy by NNSs when using PMs, as Edmondson and House (1981) observed with German EFL speakers who frequently inserted *ja* (German for 'yeah/yes') in their speech.

With this in mind, different proposals have been presented to teach PMs, the majority highlighting the need to include (1) explicit instruction on the functions and distributions of PMs, (2) awareness-raising activities to explore the use of PMs in discourse, and (3) production practice through different oral and written tasks (e.g. Fuentes-Rodríguez, 2018; Hernández, 2011; Jones & Carter, 2014). Jones and Carter (2014), for instance, illustrated the benefits of such explicit approach, which they called Present-Practice-Produce (PPP), as opposed to a more implicit one based on Illustration-Interaction-Induction (III), to teach English PMs to Chinese students.

While such approaches have focused on teaching PMs in EFL and other FLs, especially Spanish, to the best of our knowledge, there has not been any previous attempt to teach PMs used in EIL. The pedagogical intervention of this study involves both raising awareness of the PM use by different English speakers across Kachruvian circles and of the students' own PM use, as well as practice in conversation by critically choosing the use of PMs.

III Purpose of the study

The present study attempts to enhance English learners' ability to interact with speakers of diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds through instruction on PMs, a key EIL pragmatic target. As Section II illustrates, different ideas have been proposed to teaching EIL pragmatics, namely (1) raising awareness of EIL pragmatic norms; (2) developing interactional competence; (3) a focus on function; (4) an attitudinal orientation towards the legitimacy of EIL; (5) strategy-based instruction, and (6) conducting needs analyses. Nevertheless, to our knowledge, few attempts have been made to implement such pedagogically-oriented ideas. This study addresses this research gap by exploring the effects that a pragmatic intervention focused on PMs from an EIL perspective may have on Spanish students' pragmatic development. More particularly, two research questions guided the study:

- Research question 1: Does EIL pragmatic instruction affect the use of PMs, in terms of frequency of PMs uttered?
- Research question 2: Does EIL pragmatic instruction affect the use of PMs, in terms of variety of PMs uttered?

IV Method

1 Participants

The study involved 73 undergraduate students of English Studies in their last year of study at a public university in Spain. The sample consisted of 23 males and 50 females, their average age being 20.5. Moreover, their English proficiency level was considered advanced, since they were enrolled in a C2 (according to the CEFR levels) English subject. As for their pragmatic knowledge, none of them had been introduced to pragmatic concepts yet, so there was homogeneity in the low initial level of pragmatic awareness. Finally, although there was some variation in their nationalities (Spanish, Romanian, Chinese, Serbian, Italian and Dutch), all of them were EFL learners.

The sample involved two groups of students: the instructional ($n = 34$) and the control group ($n = 39$). The instructional group included students enrolled in the subject 'Introduction to semantics and pragmatics', while the students in the control group were taking 'Research methods in English linguistics'. Both were elective subjects related to English Linguistics and taught by the same instructor; i.e. one of the main researchers, who had a solid background on EIL and pragmatics.

2 Procedure

Employing a pretest/posttest design, the process of collecting the data took one academic semester; that is 14 weeks, each week consisting of two 2-hour sessions. Table 1 summarizes the data collection procedure.

On the first day of class, a needs analysis was conducted through a survey. It was anonymous, and aimed at gathering information about students' need to develop their pragmatic ability. It consisted of four questions related to where they saw themselves

Table 1. Data collection procedure.

Weeks	Data collection step
Week 1	Needs analysis
Week 2	Regular lessons
Weeks 3–6	Consent form Oral presentations (pre-test)
Weeks 7–8	Regular lessons
Weeks 9–11	Pragmatic instruction of EIL
Weeks 12–13	Oral presentations (post-test)
Week 14	Regular lessons

Note. EIL = English as an international language.

after finishing their university degree, and to what extent they felt their English needed to improve. A qualitative analysis of the answers revealed that students generally wanted to improve their ability to give oral presentations in formal settings to be able to get a job either in Spain or somewhere else in Europe, thus confirming the benefits of instruction in PMs. During the third week of the semester, students in both classes were asked for participation in the study. They were explained and administered a consent form, and were asked to sign it if they voluntarily wished to participate in the study. Such form included their consent to use the data from the needs analysis questionnaire, as well as the recordings of the subsequent oral presentations. Following this, the first oral presentations in the two subjects took place along weeks 3 to 6. Then, the experimental group received pragmatic instruction in weeks 9, 10 and 11. Finally, the second round of oral presentations was carried out during weeks 12 and 13.

3 Pragmatic assessment

To assess pragmatic competence in terms of use of PMs, students were required to give academic oral presentations. These presentations were specifically designed to collect oral data that includes PMs. As previous scholars have pointed out, elicited oral language is an advantageous approach to researching L2 pragmatics as it increases the chances of target pragmatic features occurring while at the same time allowing researcher control over contextual variables (Nguyen, 2019). In this case, some aspects were considered in the instructions of the presentation, in an attempt to elicit a wide range of PMs with textual and interpersonal functions, as it had to:

- Include a revision of an assigned topic. In this monologic part, students organized their discourse to present the ideas through textual PMs. While the topics varied across groups and from pre- to post-test, they were all related to English Linguistics.
- Incorporate an interactive part to promote the use of interpersonal PMs. More particularly, students were required to design and implement different activities (e.g. fill-in the gaps or terminology-matching activities) and class discussions.

- Be in groups of four students, each of them presenting a part of the content. This arrangement promoted engagement in interaction through interpersonal PMs, as well as conversation management strategies through textual PMs. The students were assigned into groups by the instructor, taking into account gender, degree of closeness, and perceived level of engagement in the subject (as measured through attendance and class assignment completion).
- Last about 40 minutes, each student intervening for 10 minutes.

4 Pragmatic instruction²

The pedagogical intervention received by the experimental group consisted of 4 sessions that lasted 2 hours each, and were spread out in 3 weeks (sessions 2 and 3 took place in the same week). The sessions were sequenced following the model proposed by Sánchez-Hernández and Alcón-Soler (2021): (1) awareness of the legitimacy of EIL, (2) meta-pragmatic awareness of pragmatic behavior across the world, (3) task-supported instruction on pragmatic markers, and (4) strategy-based instruction.

a Session 1: awareness of the legitimacy of EIL. The first session aimed at illustrating the global picture of EIL, and reorienting students' attitude towards an acceptance and appreciation of all English varieties. Four main tasks were conducted in this session. First, students watched 8 excerpts of different English speakers from the inner (Canadian, Australian), outer (Indian, Barbados, South Africa) and extended circles (Japanese, German, Russia). Upon each listening, the students were asked to rate their level of comprehension and their perceived appropriateness of each variety. The second task was a class discussion on the importance of exposure to different English varieties. Third, students listened to a conversation between a British college student and an Italian Erasmus student in the UK, and analysed it in terms of salient features of their English (e.g. accent, conversation-management strategies, speech act performance). Additionally, a discussion was conducted on the role of identity, in which students reflected on questions such as 'Is the NNS in disadvantage for not having a NS accent and sociocultural values?', 'Have you ever been in a similar situation?' The fourth task was an activity about matching facts with data about the use of English worldwide. Finally, students had to read 2 texts for homework: an article from the *New York Times* about the use of English across the globe, and a comprehensive reading about pragmatic competence across languages and cultures (Cutting, 2008, pp. 56–74).

b Session 2: meta-pragmatic awareness of pragmatic behavior across the world. The second day of instruction started with a guided discussion of students' reaction towards the *New York Times* text. Once students were aware of the legitimacy of EIL, the next step was to raise their awareness of pragmatic behavior across the world. To this end, they received explicit instruction about pragmatic competence across cultures, which included: (1) the importance of pragmatic competence in EIL, (2) the difference between pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics, and (3) pragmatic competence across languages and cultures (i.e. cross-cultural pragmatics, intercultural pragmatics, and interlanguage pragmatics). To do so, the professor's lecture, based on the homework readings, was complemented

with a series of activities. A first activity involved the identification and discussion of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic failure in an intercultural scenario included in Barron (2003, p. 1). In the second activity, students analysed excerpts on EIL interaction by codifying requests and apologies using Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper's (1989) manual. In the third activity, based on the codifications, students elicited differences in EIL pragmatic competence across culturally-different speakers. Finally, students were assigned a comprehensive reading about PMs for homework (Archer, Aijmer & Wichmann, 2012, pp. 74–82).

c Session 3: task-supported instruction on PMs. Session 3 focused on PMs: their definition, functions, their importance for communication, and their use according to the situation. The session relied on task-supported language teaching, which involved a main focus on understanding the linguistic target (PMs) to be able to successfully perform tasks, as opposed to task-based language teaching, which places the focus on the task itself (Ellis, 2003).

This session involved two parts: explicit instruction and task performance. First, the instruction focused on raising students' awareness of PM use in EIL through peer discussions of video excerpts with EIL speakers, which included celebrities, international students, culturally-diverse workers in a Canadian company, and EU Commission members. These excerpts were obtained from different YouTube sources such as the NorQuest College channel. Then, explicit instruction on PMs was provided via discussion of the homework reading, the professor's lecture, and an activity in which they identified the PMs and their function in different excerpts. Second, two oral tasks were performed in pairs, and were followed by metalinguistic discussions of the students' experience using PMs. The first task aimed at raising students' awareness of the importance and the need of using PMs; it consisted of watching part 1 of a video and reporting what happened to the partner; then, watching part 2 and explaining it again, this time not using PMs. The second task consisted of 4 role plays in situations involving different social distance between the interlocutors (a job interview, a conversation with a sentimental partner, a conversation with a classmate, and a conversation between a student and professor). All in all, during session 3, students were exposed to a wide range of PMs and functions, from textual ones (e.g. *well, I mean, however, then*) to interpersonal ones (e.g. *well, actually, you know, right?*).

For homework, students explored PM use in the MICASE corpus (a publicly available corpus which includes transcriptions of oral academic presentations in English by speakers of diverse nationalities at the University of Michigan). A first corpus activity involved the analysis of frequency and common trends in the use of *now* and *well* as adverbs and as PMs. In the second corpus activity, students explored PM use by NSs, NNSs and Spanish speakers in terms of 5 different functions: (1) starting a presentation, (2) organizing the discourse, (3) finishing the presentation, (4) showing speaker's stance towards the message, and (5) engaging with the audience.

d Session 4: strategy-based instruction. The last session focused on guiding students into critically choosing their pragmatic behavior; that is, strategy-based instruction. The session started with a review of the second corpus activity through a class discussion about PM use

in their L1 as compared with other English varieties. To do so, we used ‘Mentimeter’, a digital board where students co-constructed the classification of PMs they identified.

Then, two activities focused on raising students’ awareness of their own way of using PMs. First, students highlighted the PMs they normally use in a list of PMs with their functions provided by the professor. Second, they classified the PMs they normally use into different textual and interpersonal functions.

Once students were aware of their own use of PMs, the last step focused on pragmatic production; that is, on practicing the use of PMs in an informed way. Students completed a table with the PMs they would like to use in the next oral presentation according to the 5 functions of the second corpus activity (session 3). Finally, students prepared their own 5-minute speech presenting their candidacy for a scholarship to study a Master in Australia, using the PMs they had written down in the previous activity. In groups of 4, they decided on the best speech, basing their evaluations on the amount and variety of PMs used across the 5 functions by their peers.

5 Data analysis

The data gathered from the oral presentations revealed students’ pragmatic ability in terms of use of PMs. The resulting oral corpus consisted of 1,125 minutes of audios, which were transcribed, resulting in a 88,961-word corpus. Next, the transcriptions were subjected to semi-automatic codification of all PMs uttered through the software F4Analyse. A first exploratory codification aimed at eliciting which functions of PMs were present in the corpus. This preliminary codification revealed that the most common textual function was that of discourse continuers (DCs), the most frequent interpersonal function was interlocutor relators (IRs), and then there was a category of PMs which was considered to perform both textual and interpersonal functions; that is, fillers (FIs). In fact, some scholars view fillers as textual PMs, as they act as a delaying strategy to maintain the discourse (e.g. Archer et al., 2012; Brinton, 1996), while others consider they are interpersonal PMs that indicate the speaker’s cognitive process of hesitating. By focusing on these 3 categories, our aims were to analyse PMs which are common in oral academic presentations (given their frequency in our corpus), and to explore PMs ranging along the textual-interpersonal continuum (see Martín-Laguna, 2020; Martín-Laguna & Alcón-Soler, 2018), providing thus a complete picture of PM use. Table 2 illustrates the categories of PMs examined by including their main function and contextualized examples from the corpus.

As reflected in Table 2, the first category, DCs, includes PMs used to introduce new ideas in the discourse. It is important to notice that this category does not include PMs used to develop the same idea by adding information about it. The second category, FIs, involves those PMs that have very little or none propositional meaning but help the smoothness and fluency of speech. Finally, the category of IRs is related to those PMs used to involve the interlocutor in the discourse, by either expressing shared knowledge (e.g. *you know*) or calling their attention (e.g. *let’s, okay?*).

Upon codification, PM use was calculated in terms of frequency and variety of PMs used in each category. To calculate frequency ratios, the number of PMs used in each category by each participant was divided between the total number of words uttered by

Table 2. Categories of PMs examined.

Category	Textual ↔ Interpersonal		
	Discourse continuers (DCs)	Fillers (FIs)	Interlocutor relators (IRs)
Function	To signal continuation of the discourse by adding a new idea.	To provide fluency to the expression of the message.	To involve the interlocutor in the discourse.
Items from corpus	<i>then, alright, okay, and yeah, and about</i>	<i>like, so</i>	<i>you know, okay? Yeah?</i>
Example from corpus	'Okay so the next point is the relation between the paper and what we learned in class.'	'The reason why I selected <i>like</i> 3 different definitions, it's for you to see that it's possible to give the same message by the use of the same words.'	'Basically, it's the benefits of using these sorts of, <i>you know</i> , audiovisual sources to teach a different language.'

the student in a presentation and multiplied by 100. As for variety of PMs, it was analysed by counting the number of different types of PMs used in each category. The whole analysis was revised by the two main researchers to ensure accuracy, and discrepancies were discussed. Finally, statistical analyses were conducted on Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 26.0) to address the two research questions of the study. After analysing the normality of data, which did not confirm a normal distribution (Skewness and Kurtosis were not between -1 and 1 in all cases), a series of Wilcoxon Signed Rank non-parametric tests were used to explore changes from T1 to T2 in each group.

V Results

Research question 1: Does instruction affect the use of PMs, in terms of frequency of PMs uttered?

Research question 1 asked whether pragmatic instruction in EIL made a difference in the frequency of PMs uttered. Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) of the amount of PMs used in each of the 3 categories by the instructional and the control groups, before (T1) and after (T2) the intervention. Moreover, changes from T1 to T2 are indicated in the rows 'Diff.', which stands for the difference between T1 and T2.

As we can see in Table 3, students in the instructional group seemed to decrease the amount of PMs used in their oral presentations, while the control group showed different developmental trends in each PM category, with an overall small decrease in the amount of PMs uttered. Regarding the instructional group, a series of Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests confirmed that the decrease in overall frequency of PMs was not statistically significant for overall PMs uttered ($Z = -1.80$; $p = .07$). Despite such non-significance, we explored this decreasing trend more into detail through additional Wilcoxon Signed

Table 3. Descriptive statistics on frequency of pragmatic markers (PMs) by the instructional and control groups.

		Instructional group: Mean (SD)			Control group: Mean (SD)			
Discourse continuers	T1	1.79 (0.74)	Diff.	-0.32 (0.88)	T1	1.88 (0.81)	Diff.	0.01 (0.90)
	T2	1.47 (0.55)			T2	1.89 (0.70)		
Fillers	T1	0.54 (0.48)	Diff.	0.07 (0.66)	T1	0.57 (0.38)	Diff.	0.04 (0.47)
	T2	0.61 (0.57)			T2	0.61 (0.38)		
Interlocutor relators	T1	0.43 (0.59)	Diff.	-0.23 (0.59)*	T1	0.51 (0.39)	Diff.	-0.05 (0.49)
	T2	0.20 (0.36)			T2	0.46 (0.33)		
Total PMs	T1	2.76 (1.14)	Diff.	-0.48 (1.32)	T1	2.96 (1.02)	Diff.	-0.004 (1.07)
	T2	2.28 (0.91)			T2	2.95 (0.78)		

Note. * Difference is significant at .05.

Rank tests specifically run to explore gains in the different types of PMs, finding that students significantly used less IRs in T2 ($Z = -2.12$; $p = .03$). The decrease in the use of DCs ($Z = -1.74$; $p = .052$) and FIs ($Z = -0.29$; $p = .76$) was however not significant, although given the .05 significance level of the difference in use of DCs may indicate an actual learning trend worth exploring into more detail (c.f. below).

Regarding the control group, Table 3 shows that students slightly decreased their overall use of PMs, and more particularly in the use of IRs, while students seemed to use more DCs and Fs. Nevertheless, a Wilcoxon Signed Rank test revealed that such differences between T1 and T2 were not statistically significant. In other words, students in the control group did not experience significant changes in the amount of PMs used throughout the semester.

To explore the statistically significant findings regarding the instructional group in more detail, we analysed which DCs and IRs were more frequently used before and after the intervention. Table 4 illustrates the absolute frequency of DCs in T1 and T2, as well as the increase or decrease rates.

As shown in Table 4, different trends were revealed. First, the most frequent DCs both in T1 and T2 were *next* (frequency ratio T1 = 0.55; T2 = 0.58) and *and* (T1 = 0.22; T2 = 0.16), used to introduce new ideas, followed by *okay* (T1 = 0.12; T2 = 0.06), *and then* (T1 = 0.12; T2 = 0.10) and *okay so* (T1 = 0.09; T2 = 0.08). Second, the highest decrease scores were observed in the DCs *and* (diff. = 0.6) and *okay* (diff. = 0.05), while the highest increases were shown in the use of *next* (diff. = 0.034) and *and also* (diff. = 0.032). Third, two DCs were only used in T1: *so*, *well*, and *the things is that*. Finally, some other DCs were only used in T2, the most frequent ones being *moving on*, *yet*, *and well*, and *alright so*. As we may observe, students in the instructional group stopped using some DCs with a marked L1 transfer, such as *the thing is that*, and learned to use new DCs to help them organize their discourse.

As for the decrease in the use of IRs, Table 5 shows in a detailed way the changes from T1 to T2 in the frequency of use of the elicited IRs.

We may observe in Table 5 that the most frequent ones both in T1 and T2 were *okay?* (T1 = 0.21; T2 = 0.03), *you know* (T1 = 0.09; T2 = 0.03), and *let's* (as in 'let's see' and

Table 4. Frequency of discourse continuers (DCs) in T1, T2 and difference.

	T1	T2	Diff
moving on	0	0.037	0.037
next	0.551	0.585	0.034
and also	0.014	0.046	0.032
and now	0.032	0.059	0.027
yet	0	0.018	0.018
and well	0	0.014	0.014
then	0.060	0.073	0.013
also	0.009	0.018	0.009
so	0.005	0.009	0.005
well	0.051	0.055	0.004
yeah	0.009	0.009	0.000
alright	0.014	0.014	0.000
okay now	0.009	0.005	-0.005
so yeah	0.019	0.014	-0.005
but	0.019	0.014	-0.005
okay and	0.014	0.005	-0.009
yeah so	0.019	0.009	-0.009
so well	0.009	0	-0.009
okay so now	0.019	0.005	-0.014
and well	0.037	0.023	-0.014
okay so	0.093	0.078	-0.015
the thing is that	0.019	0	-0.019
and so	0.037	0.018	-0.019
and then	0.116	0.096	-0.020
so now	0.056	0.032	-0.024
now	0.060	0.037	-0.024
okay	0.116	0.064	-0.052
and	0.222	0.160	-0.062

Note. 'Diff' = the difference between T1 and T2.

'let's do this exercise') (T1 = 0.10; T2 = 0.02). The most prominent decrease was shown in the IR *okay?* (diff = -0.186), followed by *let's* (diff = -0.074), *you know* (diff = -0.056), *yeah?* (diff = -0.028) and *as you can see* (diff = -0.005). Moreover, some IRs were only used in T1 (*right*, *alright?*, *as you well know*, *you know what I mean?* and *why?*), while others were only used in T2 (*if you remember*, and *look*). Following a similar trend as in the case of DCs, the decrease of amount of IRs uttered illustrated that learners decreased their use of L1-marked PMs, such as *as you well know*, and learned to use new ones.

All in all, the findings related to the research question 1 indicate that the pragmatic instruction in EIL resulted in a reduction of the amount of DCs and IRs used by the instructional group, while the uninstructed group did not experience significant changes in the frequency of PMs uttered. In addition to this, despite the fact that the instructed

Table 5. Frequency of interlocutor relators (IRs) in T1, T2 and difference.

	T1	T2	Diff.
sorry	0.023	0.041	0.018
if you remember	0	0.009	0.009
look	0	0.005	0.005
as you can see	0.014	0.009	-0.005
why?	0.005	0	-0.005
you know what I mean?	0.005	0	-0.005
as you well know	0.005	0	-0.005
alright?	0.009	0	-0.009
right	0.014	0	-0.014
yeah?	0.032	0.005	-0.028
you know	0.088	0.032	-0.056
let's	0.097	0.023	-0.074
okay?	0.213	0.027	-0.186

Note. 'Diff' = the difference between T1 and T2.

learners reduced their amount of DCs and IRs, the results showed that the smaller repertoire, resulting upon instruction, included new PMs that they had not used in T1 (i.e. *moving on, yet, and well*, and *alright so*). Therefore, these trends seem to indicate that EIL pragmatic instruction was beneficial for students to achieve awareness of their use of PMs.

Research question 2: Does instruction affect the use of PMs, in terms of variety of PMs uttered?

Research question 2 asked whether pragmatic instruction in EIL made a difference in the variety of PMs used. Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) of the different types of PMs used in each of the 3 categories by the instructional and the control groups, before (T1) and after (T2) the intervention, as well as the difference from T1 to T2.

As illustrated in Table 6, various trends were observed regarding the different types of PMs used by students in the instructional and the control groups. Examining the 'Difference' data in Table 6, we may observe that the majority of students increased the amount of different types of PMs uttered, except in the case of IRs by the instructional group, and in the case of FIs in the control group. Nevertheless, a series of Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests revealed that changes from T1 to T2 in the overall variety of PMs used were not significant, neither for the instructional nor for the control groups. Further Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests were conducted for each of the subtypes of PMs, showing significant differences only in the instructional group, in terms of DCs ($Z = 2.07$; $p = .039$), and IRs ($Z = -2.05$; $p = .04$). This means that upon pragmatic instruction, students in the experimental group used a wider variety of DCs ($M = 1.09$), while they significantly decreased the variety of IRs ($M = -0.50$).

Table 6. Descriptive statistics of variety of pragmatic markers (PMs) by the instructional and control groups: Mean and standard deviations.

	Instructional group: Mean (SD)				Control group: Mean (SD)			
Discourse continuers	T1	4.18 (1.60)	Diff.	1.09 (2.82)*	T1	4.56 (1.24)	Diff.	0.36 (1.62)
	T2	5.29 (2.45)			T2	4.92 (1.48)		
Fillers	T1	1.82 (1.56)	Diff.	0.09 (1.58)	T1	2.36 (2.04)	Diff.	-0.51 (1.99)
	T2	1.91 (1.58)			T2	1.85 (1.55)		
Interlocutor relators	T1	1.29 (1.22)	Diff.	-0.50 (1.31)*	T1	1.04 (1.46)	Diff.	0.63 (1.71)
	T2	0.79 (1.12)			T2	1.67 (1.73)		
Total PMs	T1	7.29 (3.07)	Diff.	0.68 (3.28)	T1	7.96 (4.02)	Diff.	0.48 (3.61)
	T2	8.00 (4.02)			T2	8.44 (3.55)		

Note. * Difference is significant at .05.

Regarding the significant increase in the variety of DCs uttered, two examples are the cases of Pedro and Lola (pseudonyms). Pedro was the participant who mostly increased the variety of DCs uttered. In the first presentation, he only used one type of DC: *so*; while in the second presentation he expanded his repertoire of PMs to introduce new ideas to 7 different types: *so*, *well*, *and then*, *next*, *alright*, *okay*, and *so now*. In a similar vein, Lola only used two types of DCs to introduce new ideas in her speech: *well* and *and also*; while after instruction, she incorporated 3 more types of DCs, uttering a total of 5 varieties: *well*, *and also*, *moving on*, *now*, and *okay so*.

In relation to significant decrease in the variety of IRs used, the most illustrative cases are those of Pablo and Juan (pseudonyms). In the first presentation, Pablo used 4 different types of IRs: *alright?*, *you know*, *as you can see*, and *as you well know*, while in the post-instruction presentation he only used one of them: *you know*. As for Juan, he completely limited his use of IRs to not uttering any in the post-instruction presentation, while in the first presentation he had used 4 different types of IRs: *okay?*, *right?*, *yeah?* and *let's*.

In summary, results from the research question 2 revealed that pragmatic instruction also made a difference in the variety of PMs used. On the one hand, students increased the variety of one specific type of PMs; that is, DCs, uttered to introduce new ideas. On the other hand, they reduced the variety of IRs; that is the type of strategies to maintain the attention of the interlocutor.

VI Discussion

The findings have revealed that while the uninstructed group did not experience any significant changes in their use of PMs, the instructional one showed different acquisitional trends upon instruction. More particularly, pragmatic instruction in EIL was beneficial for instructed students to be more aware of their use of PMs and to incorporate new ones in their speech during academic oral presentations. Hence, the study illustrates the teachability of pragmatic competence from an EIL perspective.

The first research question asked whether EIL pragmatic instruction affected the frequency of PMs uttered. Findings in this regard showed an effect of instruction on the frequency of PMs, since the instructional group of students reduced the amount of PMs

used in their academic oral presentations upon instruction. More particularly, they used less IRs and DCs, which may be explained by a trend towards a specialization into using only the most relevant PMs and avoiding the not pertinent ones from their discourse. For example, the instructed students limited their use of PMs with L1 transfer, such as the DC *the thing is that* (in Spanish: *el caso es que*) and the IR *as you well know* (in Spanish: *como bien sabéis*). Also, they reduced the frequency of use of the IR *okay?* and stopped using *alright?*, both of which are influenced by the frequent Spanish IR *vale*. Previous ELF scholars have observed that ELF users commonly draw on their L1 or other additional languages as resources to express efficiency over correctness (Jenkins, 2012). In this study, students used PMs with L1 transfer as a strategy to introduce a new idea and to draw the interlocutor's attention.

The second research question asked whether EIL pragmatic instruction affected the variety of PMs uttered. The results also revealed an effect of instruction on the variety of PMs used, as the instructed students incorporated new PM types in their discourse. As explained above, the instructional group learned to use new PMs such as the DCs *moving on* and *yet*, and the IRs *if you remember* and *look*. We hypothesize that the students were exposed to such PMs in the EIL input they received during the instruction or were exposed to them through the corpus analysis activities. Such development illustrates some findings that previous ELF scholars have already pointed out. The use of *yet*, for instance, corroborates House's (2009) findings that revealed that ELF speakers use PMs with different functions than NSs. While *yet* is commonly used as a concessive or adversative connector by NSs, students in this study used it to add new ideas in their discourse. More particularly, they used it at the beginning of a sentence, as in the following example taken from the corpus:

Example 1

Yet, um . . . one curious fact always remain whether we talk about English as a Lingua Franca or English as a Foreign Language.

Moreover, the acquisition of the DC *moving on* and the IR *as we all know* illustrates learners' ability to transfer PMs (Martín-Laguna, 2019, 2020). In particular, our results show what previous scholars have already argued about the fact that ELF users tend to create new PMs, especially out of L1 transfer (Mauranen, 2012; Murray, 2012). While *moving on* would normally be used within a phrase such as 'moving on to the next slide', the participants in this study used it by itself to add a new idea in their discourse, as we can see in Example 2:

Example 2

Moving on, the referential ambiguity, this kind of ambiguity, the humor is caused by confusion between two possible referents in the sentence.

We hypothesize that these acquisitional trends may be due, at least in part, to the learners' exposure to EIL input through audio recordings and dialogic texts, which promoted the expansion of their PMs repertoire. ILP scholars have been arguing that a main challenge

in teaching L2 pragmatics in general (Martínez-Flor & Usó-Juan, 2010) and EIL pragmatics in particular (Sánchez-Hernández & Alcón-Soler, 2021) is the lack of authentic input available for teachers. The present study has shed some light in this regard by illustrating the exposure to authentic EIL input to students by means of audiovisual material and corpora. Such input was analysed in class, and served as the basis for pragmatic production. As a result, as the findings have revealed, instructed learners acquired new PMs which were used in such input.

These findings bring about different pedagogical implications. First, the present study highlights the need to approach EIL instruction from the idea of ‘communities of practice’ (Jenkins, 2012); that is, to design and implement the pedagogical practices taking into account the needs of the students. To do so, a needs analysis was conducted on the first day of class, revealing the wish for students to improve their English in academic oral presentations. Based on this, we focused the EIL pragmatic instruction towards the benefits of such community of practice; that is, a group of Spanish students in their last year of college, some of whom would like to find a job abroad in the near future. More particularly, the instruction focused on PMs, key assets for the need of the students to be able to give an academic presentation in front of an audience with different English backgrounds, as they enhance the speaker’s pragmatic fluency (House, 2009, 2012).

Moreover, as the results have illustrated, pragmatic instruction in EIL made students more aware of their appropriate use of PMs. These findings seem therefore to ascertain the positive role of pragmatic instruction in line with previous studies in ILP that have revealed the importance of adopting a consciousness-raising approach as a first step in learning pragmatic competence (e.g. Martínez-Flor & Usó-Juan, 2010; Taguchi & Roever, 2017). Indeed, a general trend in instructional pragmatics studies in L2/FL contexts has been to start with the presentation of a variety of awareness-raising activities. Adopting an EIL perspective, in this study, the first sessions dealt with the importance of raising learners’ awareness of the legitimacy of EIL, as well as their meta-pragmatic awareness of pragmatic behavior across the world.

With this in mind, the pedagogical approach implemented in this study is particularly innovative in two main aspects. On the one hand, while previous studies on instructional pragmatics have focused on L2 and FL pragmatic competence, the present study addresses EIL. In doing so, it contributes to moving the ILP field towards addressing the current picture of globalization and worldwide communication. On the other hand, rather than focusing on speech acts, as one of the most widely pragmatic aspect examined in previous ILP research, this study has widened the instructional target pragmatic features by dealing with PMs, a less commonly taught pragmatic aspect. Hence, it contributes to the existent small bulk of studies proposing pedagogical approaches to teaching PMs (e.g. Fuentes-Rodríguez, 2018; Hernández, 2008, 2011; Jones & Carter, 2014).

VII Conclusions

The present study attempted to explore the effects of a pragmatic intervention on Spanish students’ EIL pragmatic development, and more particularly on their use of PMs. The first research question was related to whether the instruction affected the frequency of PMs, while the second research question was related to the variety of PMs. The results

showed that the instruction did have an effect on pragmatic ability, since instructed learners decreased their frequency of use of DCs and IRs, while they expanded their variety of DCs and limited their variety of IRs. All in all, these findings point out to the benefits of pragmatic instruction from an EIL perspective on the expansion of students' repertoire of PMs, particularly that of DCs.

Like all research, this investigation involves some limitations, which may be addressed in future studies. First, the development of pragmatic competence was only assessed through PM use in oral presentations. It would also be advisable to include other types of instruments that make use of self-report data, such as retrospective methods, to better understand learners' thoughts and planning when using PMs. In this way, information related to learners' transfer from their L1 or attitude towards the TL could be examined in order to determine if it has an effect on learners' use of a particular type of PM. To this end, we encourage the employment of mixed-method approaches as they allow for the integration of quantitative and qualitative analyses, resulting in an in-depth account of pragmatic development (Alcón-Soler & Safont-Jordà, 2018; Sánchez-Hernández, 2018).

The second limitation is related to the pragmatic target of the study. While it has been shown that it is possible to teach L2 pragmatics with an EIL perspective by focusing on PMs, the pragmatic assessment in this study focused only on three functions of PMs. Thus, a research gap remains as to the effects of pragmatic instruction on development of other PM functions, such as hedging, initiation of closing the discourse or showing the speakers' stance towards the message. Additionally, future research should expand the pragmatic scope by investigating other pragmatic features. In particular, we suggest further exploration on the teachability of speech acts or pragmatic routines from an EIL perspective, one that would guide learners into successfully integrating in speech communities around the globe (McKay, 2012; Taguchi & Ishihara, 2018).

Ultimately, this study has revealed that instruction in L2 pragmatics with an EIL perspective is possible, hence expanding the well-grounded idea of the teachability of pragmatic competence. With such contribution, the findings provide insights into two growing fields within ILP; that is, instructional pragmatics and the pragmatics of EIL, areas which with no doubt deserve further scholarly attention. As Bardovi-Harlig (2020, p. 49) explains, 'knowledge of teaching of pragmatics entails knowledge of pragmatics, but knowledge of pragmatics does not guarantee knowledge of how to teach it, as demonstrated by the fact that pragmatics pedagogy is still developing.' The need to address pedagogical and research practices to such direction seems to be urgent to be able to guide our students into being successful intercultural speakers in the current increasingly multicultural and multilingual society.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the students that participated in the study and the anonymous reviewers who helped improve the article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: Additionally, the second author of the article, as a member of the

LAELA (Lingüística Aplicada a l'Ensenyament de la Llengua Anglesa) research group at Universitat Jaume I (Castellón, Spain), would like to acknowledge that this study is part of the research project PID2020-117959GB-I00 funded by MCIN/ AEI /10.13039/501100011033. Additional funding has been granted by Generalitat Valenciana (AICO/2021/310), the Universitat Jaume I (UJI-B2019-23), and Projectes d'Innovació Educativa de la Unitat de Suport Educatiu 3975/21 and 3976/21.

ORCID iD

Ariadna Sánchez-Hernández  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6231-4927>

Notes

1. We follow the distinction different scholars have pointed out between English as a lingua franca (ELF) and English as an international language (EIL) (House, 2010; Marlina, 2018; McKay, 2018). On the one hand, ELF communication involves NNS–NNS English interactions, and therefore excludes interactions between NSs, or between NSs and NNSs. In House's (1999, p. 74) words, ELF corresponds to 'interactions between members of two or more different linguacultures in English, for none of whom English is the mother tongue'. On the other hand, EIL is an umbrella term that is concerned with all English varieties spoken around the globe and how they are used in different international communicative contexts (Marlina, 2018). Therefore, while ELF focuses on norms of interaction, the EIL paradigm is a wider notion that involves how different types of English are used.
2. Anyone wishing to have copies of all materials used in the study may contact the authors.

References

- Aijmer, K. (2013). *Understanding pragmatic markers: A variational pragmatic approach*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Alcón-Soler, E. (2012). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in an EFL context? *System*, 33, 417–435.
- Alcón-Soler, E., & Safont-Jordà, M.P. (2018). Mixed method approaches in investigating pragmatic learning (Special Issue). *System*, 75.
- Ament, J., Pérez-Vidal, C., & Barón, J. (2018). The effects of English-medium instruction on the use of textual and interpersonal pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics*, 28, 517–545.
- Archer, D., Aijmer, K., & Wichmann, A. (2012). *Pragmatics: An advance resource book for students*. Routledge.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2020). Pedagogical linguistics: A view from L2 pragmatics. *Pedagogical Linguistics*, 1, 44–65.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Vellenga, H. (2015). Developing corpus-based materials to teach pragmatic routines. *TESOL Journal*, 6, 499–526.
- Barón, J., Levkina, M., & Celaya, M.L. (2020). Learning pragmatics through tasks: When interaction plays a role. *Applied Pragmatics*, 2, 1–25.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. John Benjamins.
- Barron, A. (2019). Using corpus-linguistic methods to track longitudinal development: Routine apologies in the study abroad context. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 146, 87–105.
- Baumgarten, N., & House, J. (2010). I think and I don't know in English as a lingua franca and native English discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 1184–1200.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Ablex.

- Brinton, L.J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Mouton De Gruyter.
- Bruti, S. (2016). Audiovisual texts and subtitling in the teaching of pragmatics. *Trans-kom*, 9, 186–207.
- Canagarajah, S. (2014). In search of a new paradigm for teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Journal*, 5, 767–785.
- Chen, Y. (2015). Developing Chinese EFL learners' email literacy through requests to faculty. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 75, 131–149.
- Cogo, A. (2018). Cultural elements in English as a lingua franca. In Liontas, J.I. (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*. Wiley.
- Cohen, A. (2014). Strategies for learning and performing speech acts. In Ishihara, N., & A. Cohen (eds.), *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet* (pp. 227–243). Routledge.
- Cohen, A., & Ishihara, N. (2005). *A web-based approach to strategic learning of speech acts*. Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA), University of Minnesota.
- Crystal, D. (2008). Two thousand million? Updates on the statistics of English. *English Today*, 93, 3–6.
- Cutting, J. (2008). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
- 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, 25–52.
- Edmondson, W.J., & House, J. (1981). *Let's talk and talk about it: A pedagogic interactional grammar of English*. Urban and Schwarzenberg.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Félix-Brasdefer, C., & Cohen, A. (2012). Teaching pragmatics in the foreign language classroom: Grammar as a communicative resource. *Hispania*, 95, 650–669.
- Fischer, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Approaches to discourse particles*. Elsevier.
- Fuentes-Rodríguez, C. (2018). Teaching L2 Spanish discourse markers and pragmatic markers. In Dumitrescu, D., & P.L. Andueza (Eds.), *L2 Spanish pragmatics: From research to teaching* (pp. 108–128). Routledge.
- González-Lloret, M. (2018). Pragmatics in technology-mediated contexts. In Sánchez-Hernández, A., & A. Herraiz-Martínez (Eds.), *Learning second language pragmatics beyond traditional contexts* (pp. 17–48). Peter Lang.
- González-Lloret, M. (2019). Technology and L2 pragmatics learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 39, 113–127.
- Hernández, T. (2008). The effect of explicit instruction and input flood on students' use of Spanish discourse markers on a simulated oral proficiency interview. *Hispania*, 91, 665–675.
- Hernández, T. (2011). The role of explicit instruction and input flood on the acquisition of Spanish discourse markers. *Language Teaching Research*, 15, 159–182.
- Herraiz-Martínez, A., & Sánchez-Hernández, A. (2019). Pragmatic markers by multilingual speakers: Evidence from a CLIL context. *English Language Teaching*, 12, 68–76.
- House, J. (1999). Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In Gnutzmann, C (Ed.), *Teaching and learning English as a global language* (pp. 73–89). Stauffenburg.
- House, J. (2009). Subjectivity in English as lingua franca discourse: The case of *you know*. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6, 171–194.
- House, J. (2010). The pragmatics of English as a lingua franca. In Trosborg, A. (Ed.), *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (pp. 363–387). Mouton de Gruyter.

- House, J. (2012). Teaching oral skills in English as a lingua franca. In Alsagoff, L., McKay, S.L., Hu, G., & W.A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 186–205). Routledge.
- Internet World Stats. (2020). *World internet usage and population statistics*. Available at: <https://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm> (accessed November 2021).
- Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a lingua franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 66, 486–494.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44, 281–315.
- Jones, C., & Carter, R. (2014). Teaching spoken discourse markers explicitly: A comparison of III and PPP. *International Journal of English Studies*, 14, 37–54.
- Kachru, B. (1992). Models for non-native Englishes. In Kachru, B. (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press.
- Kecskes, I. (2019). *English as a lingua franca: The pragmatic perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
- Khazdouzian, Y., Celaya, M.L., & Barón, J. (2020). When watching is not enough: The effects of captions on L2 pragmatics acquisition and awareness. *RAEL – Revista Electrónica de Lingüística Aplicada*, 19, 90–107.
- Magliacane, A. (2020). Erasmus students in an Irish study abroad context: A longitudinal analysis on the use of ‘well’ and ‘like’. *Study Abroad Research in Second Language Acquisition and International Education*, 5, 89–117.
- Martín-Laguna, S. (2019). Exploring case stories in the development of textual discourse–pragmatic markers in formal English language classrooms. In Salazar-Campillo, P., & V. Codina-Espurz (Eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts* (pp. 40–53). Brill/Rodopi.
- Martín-Laguna, S. (2020). *Tasks, pragmatics and multilingualism in the classroom: A portrait of adolescent writing in multiple languages*. Multilingual Matters.
- Martín-Laguna, S., & Alcón-Soler, E. (2018). Development of discourse–pragmatic markers in a multilingual classroom: A mixed method research approach. *System*, 75, 68–80.
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Usó-Juan, E. (2010). The teaching of speech acts in second and foreign language instructional contexts. In Trosborg, A. (Ed.), *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (pp. 423–442). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Marlina, R. (2018). Revisiting the pedagogy of English as an international language. *RELC Journal*, 49, 3–8.
- Matsuda, A. (2012). Teaching materials in EIL. In Alsagoff, L., McKay, S.L., Hu, G., & W.A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 168–185). Routledge.
- Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge University Press.
- McKay, S. (2009). Pragmatics and EIL pedagogy. In Sharifian, F. (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 227–241). Multilingual Matters.
- McKay, S. (2012). Principles of teaching English as an international language. In Alsagoff, L., McKay, S.L., Hu, G., & W.A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 28–46). Routledge.
- McKay, S. (2018). English as an international language: What it is and what it means for pedagogy. *RELC Journal*, 49, 9–23.
- Murray, N. (2012). English as a lingua franca and the development of pragmatic competence. *ELT Journal*, 66, 318–326.
- Nguyen, T.T.M. (2018). Pragmatic development in the instructed context. A longitudinal investigation of L2 email requests. *Pragmatics*, 28, 217–252.

- Nguyen, T.T.M. (2019). Data collection methods in L2 pragmatics research: An overview. In Taguchi, N. (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics* (pp. 195–211). Routledge.
- Nguyen, M., & Basturkmen, H. (2021). Pragmatic teaching materials in EIL. In Tajeddin, Z., & M. Alemi (Eds.), *Pragmatics pedagogy in EIL* (pp. 136–154). Routledge.
- Romero-Trillo, J. (2012). Pragmatic markers. In Carol, C. (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 4522–4528). Blackwell-Wiley.
- Sánchez-Hernández, A. (2018). A mixed-methods study of the impact of sociocultural adaptation on the development of pragmatic production. *System*, 75, 93–105.
- Sánchez-Hernández, A., & Alcón-Soler, E. (2021). Pragmatic instruction in English as an international language. In Tajeddin, Z., & M. Alemi (Eds.), *Pragmatics pedagogy in EIL* (pp. 95–116). Routledge.
- Schnritz, J.R. (2012). To ELF or not to ELF? (English as a lingua franca): That's the question for applied linguistics in a globalized world. *RBLA, Belo Horizonte*, 12, 249–284.
- Sifianou, M., & Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, P. (2018). Introduction: Im/politeness and globalisation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 134, 113–119.
- Sykes, J., & Cohen, A. (2018). Strategies and interlanguage pragmatics: Explicit and comprehensive. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8, 381–402.
- Taguchi, N. (2018). Pragmatic competence in foreign language education: Cultivating learner autonomy and strategic learning of pragmatics. In Walker, I., Chan, D., Nagami, M., & C. Bourguignon (Eds.), *Knowledge, skills and competence in foreign language education* (pp. 53–70). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Taguchi, N., & Ishihara, N. (2018). The pragmatics of English as a lingua franca: Research and pedagogy in the era of globalization. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 38, 80–101.
- Taguchi, N., & Kim, Y. (Eds.). (2018). *Task-based approaches to teaching and assessing pragmatics*. John Benjamins.
- Taguchi, N. & Roever, C. (2017). *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Taguchi, N., & Sykes, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Technology in interlanguage pragmatics research and teaching*. John Benjamins.
- Tajeddin, Z., & M. Alemi (Eds.). (2021). *Pragmatics pedagogy in EIL*. Routledge.
- Tajeddin, Z., Reza, M., & Shayeghi, R. (2019). Native and non-native teachers' changing beliefs about teaching English as an international language. *International Journal of Society, Culture and Language*, 7, 1–14.
- Usó-Juan, E., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2021). Teacher pragmatic awareness in English as an international language. In Tajeddin, Z., & M. Alemi (Eds.), *Pragmatics pedagogy in EIL* (pp. 44–58). Routledge.