Karen Glaser*

News from the pragmatics classroom: Contrasting the inductive and the deductive approach in the teaching of pragmatic competence

DOI 10.1515/ip-2016-0023

Abstract: While the role of pragmatic skills in a foreign or second language has been receiving increased attention both from a research and a language teaching perspective, there is still a lamentable scarcity of systematic empirical studies into the effectiveness of instructional methods in the teaching of pragmatics. Addressing this research gap, this article reports about a quasi-experimental study into possible differences between an explicit-inductive and an explicit-deductive instructional approach in the teaching of pragmatic skills in English as a Foreign Language (EFL), more specifically the teaching of offer refusals to 49 advanced adult EFL learners in Germany. The instruction consisted of three 90-minute lessons, which were spread out over the duration of a 15-week academic semester and designed according to the deductive principle and the inductive principle, respectively. While the deductive group was provided with metapragmatic rules directly at the beginning of the instruction, the inductive group only encountered such rules after engaging in language use and guided discovery. Production data was elicited by means of DCTs and role play in a pretest-posttest format. Effectiveness of instruction was operationalized by means of two indicators: Indicator 1 measured the increased usage of the strategies taught in class, while indicator 2 measured the approximation to a native speaker target. The results indicate that the gains in the inductive group surpassed those in the deductive group, suggesting that when situated within the explicit framework, inductive instruction is more effective in the teaching of pragmatic skills.

Keywords: interlanguage pragmatics, pragmatic instruction, induction, deduction, offer refusal

*Corresponding author: Karen Glaser, Institute for Primary and Pre-Primary Education, University of Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany, E-mail: karen.glaser@uni-leipzig.de

1 Introduction

The acquisition of pragmatic competence as a vital component of language mastery alongside lexico-grammatical proficiency has gained more and more importance in the foreign language classroom over the past decades (Ishihara and Cohen 2010). This is thanks to as well as accompanied by an increasingly rich body of research into the factors that determine and shape the development of pragmatic competence in an L2, such as the production of speech acts (Economidou-Kogetsidis and Woodfield 2012; Taguchi 2007), of discourse markers (Hellermann and Vergun 2007) and of listener signals (Cutrone 2005); the comprehension of speech acts (Garcia 2004), of implicatures (Taguchi 2013) and phatic utterances (Padilla-Cruz 2009); metapragmatic perceptions across cultures (Abdolrezapour and Eslami-Rasekh 2010; Félix-Brasdefer 2008a), pragmatic awareness in learners (Niezgoda and Roever 2001; Schauer 2006); the role of exposure and immersion (Cohen and Shively 2007; Matsumura 2003), of pragmatic transfer (Su 2010; Wannaruk 2008), and of study abroad experience (Barron 2003; Schauer 2009). A further growing field is devoted to questions of pragmatic testing and assessment (Roever 2011; Ross and Kasper 2013).

In view of this rather rich body of research into various aspects of inter-language pragmatic (ILP) development, it is somewhat surprising that pragmatic intervention studies, that is, systematic empirical analyses of the effects of pragmatic instruction in the language classroom, are comparatively scarce. For her recent review of instructional pragmatics research, Taguchi (2015) found a mere 58 relevant studies published in the three-plus decades since the beginning of ILP research in the early 1980s. Accordingly, she concludes that much more research is needed into the effectiveness of classroom practices, covering “a wider range of target languages, pragmatic features, and assessment measures” (Taguchi 2015: 45). From the analyses that have been carried out so far a number of trends are discernible: On the whole, it has been shown that a wide range of pragmatic phenomena can be taught and hence that pragmatic instruction is feasible (Alcón-Soler 2008; Rose 2005). In addition, pragmatic intervention has proven to be generally effective – both compared to exposure only (Bouton 1992; Félix-Brasdefer 2005) and to classroom contexts without pragmatic instruction (Jeon and Kaya 2006; Taguchi 2011). Accordingly, various recommendations have been made to include pragmatic instruction in language teaching curricula (Eslami-Rasekh 2005; Ishihara and Cohen 2010).

In addition to investigating the general feasibility and effectiveness of pragmatics instruction, a number of studies have analyzed the effectiveness

of concrete instructional methods. Apart from a few research strands such as the Focus on FormS (FonFS) versus Focus on Form (FonF) versus Focus on Meaning (FonM) paradigm (Fukuya and Clark 2001; Nguyen et al. 2012) or the input enhancement tradition (Alcón-Soler 2007; Martínez-Flor and Fukuya 2005), the vast majority of interventional studies have focused on the explicit-implicit contrast. That is, they have examined whether it is more beneficial to provide learners overtly with metapragmatic information on the rules underlying the language use (the explicit approach) or to refrain from such rule provision as the learners deal with the target language material (the implicit approach) (Rose 2005). This strong focus on the explicit-implicit dichotomy has, on the one hand, yielded the rather robust conclusion that explicit approaches are more effective than implicit designs (Alcón-Soler 2005; Cohen 2005), a conclusion which echoes findings for grammar instruction (cf. Spada and Tomita 2010). On the other hand, it has led to a situation where the explicit-versus-implicit debate is dominating the ILP research agenda at the expense of other approaches. Even though other frameworks for teaching pragmatics have been suggested on a theoretical level, “empirical data under these frameworks is still very limited, and there is need for future exploration” (Taguchi 2015: 39). The present study is an attempt to answer this call for systematic research into other approaches to pragmatic instruction. Set *within* the explicit paradigm, i. e., proceeding from the established superiority of explicit instruction, it contrasts a deductive and an inductive teaching design in the teaching of the speech act of offer refusal in English with regard to their effectiveness in ILP development.

2 Literature review

2.1 The deductive-inductive dichotomy in ILP and SLA research

Rather than investigating whether rules should or should not be provided, which is the focus of the explicit-implicit opposition, the inductive-deductive dichotomy is concerned with the sequencing of the instruction and the question of *when* to provide the rules. “Zooming in” on the structuring and planning of pragmatic lessons, this perspective thus deals with more fine-grained aspects of pragmatic intervention and promises more detailed insights into how pragmatic skills should be taught best.

Instruction is deductive if it proceeds “from the general to the specific, from consciously formulated rules to the application in language use” (Decoo 1996:

96). For the teaching of pragmatics, this means that the instruction starts out with the provision of metapragmatic information, followed by examples and exercises to apply and practice these rules. The inductive approach, in contrast, proceeds the other way round, viz., from the specific to the general and thus from language examples to the rules. The learners are first presented with language material that contains the pragmatic phenomena in question and engage in language use, which successively leads to discovering the mechanisms underlying this language use. In short, while the deductive approach *proceeds from* the rule provision, the inductive design *culminates in* it. Figure 1 visualizes this fundamental difference between the two principles.

Figure 1: Deductive and inductive sequencing of explicit pragmatic instruction. Adapted from Ishihara and Cohen (2010: 117).

Research into induction vs. deduction for pragmatic issues is almost non-existent. Out of the seven ILP studies found for this review that have addressed the inductive-deductive contrast, three report about pragmatic intervention in which the two designs were combined in the teaching of one learner group (Martínez-Flor 2008; Trosborg 2003; Trosborg and Shaw 2008). Although the instruction proved effective in each case, the merger of the two approaches does not permit any conclusions about a possible superiority of one over the other. Three other studies (Rose and Ng 2001; Trosborg and Shaw 1998; Takimoto 2008¹) contrasted a deductive-explicit with an inductive-implicit design, which means that the inductively taught group did not proceed all the way to the rule provision phase.² This setup makes it impossible to tell whether any differences were

¹ Even though the inductive group is referred to as explicit in the article, a closer inspection of the treatment reveals that they did, in fact, not receive any metapragmatic information.

² While deductive instruction is, by definition, explicit in nature since it starts with the provision of rules, inductive instruction does not necessarily always include the final rule-provision phase. See Decoo (1996) for an overview of inductive modalities, and Glaser (2014: 58–65) for a refinement and expansion of Decoo's classification.

caused by the explicit-implicit or by the inductive-deductive contrast.³ Thus, only one study (Kubota 1995) contrasted an explicit-deductive and an explicit-inductive design. Both treatment groups improved their knowledge and recognition of implicatures compared to the control group, but any differences between them were negligibly small and varied depending on the test instrument. Given, however, that the instruction consisted of only one single 20-minute unit and was conducted entirely in Japanese (the learners' L1), it is not all too surprising that the study did not yield noticeable differences between the two approaches.

Turning to the wider area of SLA, we find a similar scarcity of studies systematically contrasting the two principles. Thirteen studies were found that compared the effectiveness of induction and deduction in grammar or vocabulary instruction. Of these, seven found induction to be more effective than deduction (Cerezo et al. 2016; Haight et al. 2007; Herron and Tomasello 1992; Shaffer 1989; Smart 2014; Vogel and Engelhard 2011; Vogel et al. 2011), while four identified an advantage of the deductive over the inductive approach (Erlam 2003; 2005; Robinson 1996; Seliger 1975). The remaining two reported inconclusive results (Abraham 1985; Rosa and O'Neill 1999). Similar to the ILP studies, however, five contrasted a deductive-explicit with an inductive-implicit design, thereby potentially confounding the two dichotomies (Abraham 1985; Erlam 2003, 2005; Herron and Tomasello 1992; Seliger 1975). In addition, two studies worked with "rule-search" conditions but did not inform the participants of the (in)correctness of their self-constructed rules, thus not fulfilling the condition of explicit rule-provision either (P. Robinson 1996; Rosa and O'Neill 1999). The remaining six studies, which truly isolated induction and deduction, i. e., which remained *within* the explicit paradigm, unanimously attested greater effectiveness to the inductive approach. It thus appears that induction has an advantage over deduction when it is conceptualized as explicit, i. e., when it culminates in rule provision.

Two conclusions can be drawn from this review. First, the studies indirectly confirm the superiority of explicit over implicit instruction, and any attempts to analyze the inductive-deductive contrast seems only promising if set within the explicit framework for both approaches. Second, if this condition is met, induction seems to have an edge over deduction, suggesting that learners benefit if they are not given the rules right away but instead encounter positive language evidence first. In other words, learners seem to profit from an initial discovery phase in which meaning is given precedence of over form, and during which they can decode, comprehend, and appropriate the language

3 For a detailed discussion of the conflation of the two dichotomies in ILP research, see Glaser (2013).

on their own terms before receiving any rules. Due to this component of active hypothesis-building, the greater gains of inductive instruction have frequently been explained by the active learner involvement and greater processing depths (Cerezo et al. 2016: 267). Cognitive psychology has long established that active involvement in the discovery of “regularities and relationships” is a vital component of any learning (Bruner 1961: 24), and that “‘learning by discovery’ is better retained” (Hammerly 1975: 18). Applied to L2 learning, this means that “language learners need to be actively engaged in their learning” (Herron and Tomasello 1992: 709) for it to be effective and that the language learner “must take a key role in the discovery process” (Bardovi-Harlig 1996: 32). Whether this also holds true for pragmatic aspects in language learning is the focus of the present study.

2.2 The speech act of offer refusal

The refusal of offers in English was chosen as the pragmatic target. Refusals are acts “in which the speaker denies to engage in an action proposed by the interlocutor” (Chen et al. 1995: 121). In most situations refusals qualify as dispreferred speech acts since they jeopardize the rapport between the speakers and potentially risk offense and face threat (Pomerantz 1984). The resulting need for extra face-work makes refusals longer and structurally more complex than preferred speech acts, and they are often performed with much hesitation (Carroll 2011). This structural complexity is reflected on all levels of English native speaker refusal production. On the turn-level, the refusals are characterized by initial mitigation, i. e., the delaying of the refusal by producing some mitigational elements first (Félix-Brasdefer 2008b; Morkus 2009), the most prominent being pausing and hesitation (Al-Kahtani 2005; Carroll 2011). Often, the refusal is also followed by mitigation, so that the dispreferred message is wrapped into layers of face-saving devices (Félix-Brasdefer 2004), resulting in “sandwich refusal.”

On the level of semantic strategies, i. e., the utterance elements that actually perform the refusal, the literature distinguishes between direct and indirect refusals (Beebe et al. 1990). Direct refusals are carried out by means of performatives such as *refuse* or *decline*, by the negating adverb *no/not*, by expressions of negative willingness/ability (*I can't*), and by speaker preference (*I'd rather*) (Barron 2003; Morkus 2009; Sadler and Eröz 2002). However, native speakers prefer indirect strategies such as suggestions/statements of alternatives (*how about...*), dissuasion (*don't worry*), and the giving of reasons/grounders (Barron 2003; Beebe et al. 1990; Morkus 2009), including vague excuses (*I've already*

made plans) and white lies (Chang 2009; Stevens 1993). A further indirect strategy is refusal postponement, which communicates the non-accept by means of stalling, usually in the form of a perfunctory promise to get back to the offerer later (Al-Kahtani 2005; Morkus 2009).

In addition to turn-level and semantic strategies, most offer refusals are accompanied by adjuncts such as positive remarks (*that would be great*), expressions of gratitude/appreciation (*thanks for the offer*), and apology/regret (*I'm sorry*) (Al-Kahtani 2005; Morkus 2009; Wannaruk 2008). Further, the above-mentioned strategies of grounders, suggestions and dissuasion can also function as adjuncts when produced as an addendum to the actual refusal. Both semantic strategies and adjuncts are frequently modified internally by downgraders such as modal verbs (*could, might*), understaters (*kind of*), subjectivizers (*I think*), and cajolers (*you know*) (Barron 2003).

Analyses of learner refusals in L2 English have shown that these are generally marked by a lack of such strategies. Most conspicuously, learners fail to produce initial as well as internal mitigation (Félix-Brasdefer and Bardovi-Harlig 2010; Morrow 1995), and they tend to produce direct rather than indirect semantic strategies (Beebe et al. 1990; Genc and Tekyildiz 2009). Likewise, mitigating adjuncts are used less frequently (Genc and Tekyildiz 2009; Morrow 1995; Wannaruk 2008) with the exception of apology/regret, which is usually overused (Chen 1996; Sadler and Eröz 2002). Overuse has also been reported for upgraders in lieu of hedges and downgraders (Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig 1992). Further learner-typical features include aggravating moves (Morrow 1995), which increase rather than mitigate the refusals' face threat, such as criticism/negative evaluation of the offer and offending remarks (Chen 1996; Stevens 1993). Hence, it can be concluded from the literature that learners of English would profit from refusal instruction on mitigational devices and appropriate (in)directness levels.

3 Method

3.1 Purpose of the study

This study provides a systematic investigation of possible differences between the deductive and inductive approach in the teaching of pragmatic skills. Accordingly, it contrasted a learner group that was taught according to the deductive principle and one that received inductive instruction. To rule out any intervening effects from the explicit-implicit contrast, both treatments

were operationalized within the explicit paradigm. The effectiveness of the instruction was assessed by means of two factors: Indicator 1 focused on the strategies targeted in the instruction (“increased use of taught strategies”), while indicator 2 analyzed the degree of approximation to the target norm, in this case native speakers of American English (AmE) (“approximation to target norm”). The following research questions were addressed:

- 1) Was the intervention effective in both groups?
- 2) Which, if any, instructional design was more effective as shown by indicator 1, and, respectively, indicator 2?

3.2 Participants

3.2.1 Language learners

Forty-nine English as a foreign language (EFL) learners participated in the study. Twenty-four of these were in the deductive group, while the remaining 25 constituted the inductive group. All learners were enrolled in the British and American Studies program at a German university, either as BA, MA or visiting exchange students. Table 1 provides an overview of the learners’ background variables. Proficiency level was measured for all participants by means of the listening, structure, and reading sections of a paper-based TOEFL test (Phillips 2001, used with permission). The results showed that the vast majority of the participants classified as advanced, superior or distinguished in terms of

Table 1: Summary of learner background variables.

	Deductive groups	Inductive group
Number of participants	24	25
Age range (age average)	20–32 years (Ø 23.6)	18–32 years (Ø 23.0)
Gender distribution	female: <i>n</i> = 20 (83 %) male: <i>n</i> = 4 (17 %)	female: <i>n</i> = 21 (88 %) male: <i>n</i> = 4 (12 %)
L1s	German: 16, Turkish: 3, Russian: 2, Indonesian: 1, Albanian: 1, Spanish: 1	German: 19, Russian: 2, Turkish-Bulgarian: 1, Catalan: 1, Czech: 1, Italian: 1
TOEFL-style proficiency test scores	90 % and over: <i>n</i> = 11 80–90 %: <i>n</i> = 13 below 80 %: <i>n</i> = 0 (Ø 89 %)	90 % and over: <i>n</i> = 11 80–90 %: <i>n</i> = 11 below 80 %: <i>n</i> = 3 (Ø 87 %)

the ACTFL proficiency guidelines (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages 2012), with 46 participants scoring 80 % or higher. Only 3 participants missed the 80 % mark, scoring between 66 % and 78 %, which is indicative of upper-intermediate proficiency.⁴ On the whole the learner sample can thus be characterized as advanced. The instruction took place in intact, preexisting language classes, which means that the study was carried out as a quasi-experiment. As Table 1 suggests, despite the lack of random sampling the groups shared a rather similar background so that strong intervening effects from these variables could be largely ruled out.

3.2.2 Native speakers

Two groups of native speakers were involved in the study. The first group provided DCT baseline data while the second group functioned as Confederate Interlocutors (CIs) in the role plays (Morrow 1995). The first group (DCT respondents) consisted of 61 native speakers of AmE. Of these, 43 (71 %) were female, and 18 (30 %) were male, which roughly approximates the gender distribution in the learner groups. The informants were comparable in age and educational background to the learners (18–30 years, current or former university students). Since the DCT was designed as an online tool (see Section 3.3.1), these participants provided their input via the internet.

In addition, five English native speakers assisted with the role plays on site to ensure that each learner interacted with a native speaker. All of these were in their twenties, with two being female and three male. Two were speakers of British English, two of Irish English, and one of American English. From a methodological perspective it would certainly have been ideal to have the learners interact with AmE speakers only, but the constraints of the EFL environment did not permit this. To offset this methodological shortcoming, the CIs were briefed and trained extensively to guarantee standardized openings as well as comparable conversation trajectories and lengths across all CIs.

⁴ While the ACTFL guidelines do not make this direct connection between TOEFL scores and proficiency levels, an analysis of university requirements for graduate admission of international students justifies this interpretation, cf. also Embassy English (2013).

3.3 Data collection instruments

3.3.1 Discourse completion tasks (DCTs)

One portion of the speech act data was collected by means of DCTs, which are “written questionnaires including a number of brief situational descriptions, followed by a short dialog with an empty slot for the speech act under study” (Kasper and Dahl 1991: 9). DCTs have certain advantages: “They allow the researcher to control the context of the scenarios which the participants are asked to fill in, are inexpensive, easy to administer and make it possible to quickly gather a large amount of data” (Schauer 2009: 66). At the same time, DCTs have been criticized for purportedly collecting spoken data while relying on the written mode, producing data that is impoverished with regard to turn-taking mechanisms, pausing/hesitation, false starts/repairs (Golato 2003) as well as length and complexity (Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig 1992). Given that the written medium allows for more planning time than oral interaction, DCTs are thus assumed to tap offline performance such as the speakers’ knowledge and beliefs of what they (or one) *would* say rather than actual online performance (Roever 2011). It is thus advisable to complement DCT data with interactive, oral formats of data collection to achieve greater reliability via triangulation, which was achieved in the present study by adding role plays (see Section 3.3.2).

The present study administered a total of three DCT questionnaires via the internet: DCT 1 was given to the learners before (at T_1), DCT 2 after the intervention (at T_2), and DCT 3 was the native speaker version. Each of these questionnaires contained a total of six refusal scenarios, which were varied according to power and social distance combined⁵ (PD), rank of imposition (R), and obligation (O) since these have been reported to be among the most decisive factors to influence pragmatic choices (Hudson et al. 1995; Taguchi 2007; Thomas 1995). Based on Brown and Levinson (1987: 77), who define power as “the degree to which H can impose his own plans and his own self-evaluation (face) at the expense of S’s plans and self-evaluation”, P was conceptualized as the relative power of the speaker over the hearer (or the other way round, respectively) as perceived by the participant. Social distance D refers to the degree of perceived social closeness and solidarity between the interlocutors (Hudson 2001: 284), and rank of imposition R was defined as the “expenditure of

⁵ Power (P) and Social Distance (D) have been shown to be frequently interrelated (Spencer-Oatey 1993), which is why they were combined here: A high P was coupled with a high D, and a low P with a low D, respectively, to ensure clarity of stimulus.

goods, services, or energy” (Hudson et al. 1995: 5) as well as of time requested of the addressee of the refusal. Obligation O was operationalized as “the obligation to comply with” the offer (Thomas 1995: 131), i. e. to accept it. Great care was taken to provide sufficient information on these perceptions in the scenario descriptions. To ensure realism, the situations and roles related to a university student’s experience and only asked the participants to interact with status equal or status higher interactants.

The six refusal scenarios were administered as part of an omnibus questionnaire which also collected data on other speech acts. Since the native speakers completed the DCTs only once, the six refusal scenarios in their DCT version consisted of three situations taken from DCT 1 and three from DCT 2, selected in such a way that all background variable combinations were covered. Table 2 provides an overview of the refusal scenarios in the three DCT versions in the order in which they were presented. Prior to administration, the scenarios were pilot tested extensively in two stages for realism, robustness of situational variables and cross-cultural comparability by means of Assessment Questionnaires completed by 50 German advanced learners of English and 50 native speakers of American English who were not involved in the main study (for details of this procedure, cf. Glaser 2014).

Table 2: Offers to refuse in the DCT scenarios.

No.	Variables	DCT 1 Learner pretest	DCT 2 Learner posttest	DCT 3 NS baseline
1	PD-low, R-high, O-high	self-made coat by close friend [Coat]	roast beef to vegetarian by new colleague [Vegetarian]	Coat – from DCT 1
2	PD-high, R-low, O-high	coffee sent for by future boss’s personal assistant [Assistant]	new pen by host parents [Pen]	Assistant – from DCT 1
3	PD-low, R-low, O-low	ride by fellow volunteer [Ride]	book return by fellow student [Library]	Ride – from DCT 1
4	PD-low, R-high, O-low	spare concert ticket by roommate [Ticket]	tutoring by classmate [Study Pal]	Study Pal – from DCT 2
5	PD-high, R-low, O-low	ride to hospital by professor after being knocked off bike [Hospital]	fast completion of discharge letter by oral surgeon [Oral Surgeon]	Oral Surgeon – from DCT 2
6	PD-high, R-high, O-high	petsitting by boy/girlfriend’s parents [Petsitting]	new position in remote town [Position]	Position – from DCT 2

Note: PD, Power and social distance; R, Rank of imposition; O, Obligation.

3.3.2 Role plays

Pretest role plays were carried out with all learners, but only the data from 28 learners was included in the final analysis since they also provided posttest data. Incidentally, these were 14 from each treatment condition. These learners performed three refusal role plays each prior to (T₁) and following the instruction (T₂). The posttest scenarios were modeled closely after the pretest to keep the context variables as similar as possible. Table 3 presents an overview of the role play scenarios. Every participant role played with one of the five native English-speaking CIs. All role plays were video recorded and subsequently transcribed for analysis.

Table 3: Offers to refuse in the role play scenarios.

No.	Variables	Role play 1 Learner pretest	Role play 2 Learner posttest
1	PD-high, R-low, O-low	offer to organize help for office move by boss [Move]	prescription for painkillers by doctor [Prescription]
2	PD-low, R-low, O-low	offer to lend laptop by classmate [Laptop]	offer to cover shift by colleague [Shift]
3	PD-high, R-high, O-low	trip to Niagara Falls organized by host family [Trip]	conference presentation slot by BA supervisor [Presentation]

Note: PD = Power and Social Distance; R = Rank of Imposition; O = Obligation.

3.4 Pragmatic intervention

The instruction consisted of four stages, viz. (a) an initial pragmatic consciousness-raising phase (PCR 1), (b) speech act work (SAW), (c) individual video feedback, and (d) a second pragmatic consciousness-raising phase (PCR 2), which were sequenced strictly according to either the inductive or the deductive principle. Examples of instructional materials used at the beginning of the SAW phase are provided in the appendix to illustrate the two approaches. The following description is a very condensed account of the lessons (for a detailed description, the reader is directed to Glaser 2014).

3.4.1 PCR 1

This phase served to present explicit knowledge about speech acts, pragmatics and pragmatic failure, face threat and face loss, face-saving strategies, and the

influence of situational factors such as formality or power on speaking behavior. In the deductive condition, the teacher introduced these terms and their definitions directly to the learners, followed by examples to fulfill the deductive condition. The examples were taken from the native speaker DCTs as well as the learner pretest DCTs to have authentic rather than constructed input (Bardovi-Harlig 2001). In addition, the learners were encouraged to share instances of pragmatic failure they had experienced themselves. In the inductive condition, the lesson started rather than ended with examples and anecdotes, and the teacher used guiding questions to lead the students towards the discovery of the phenomena, so that here the terms and their definitions were provided as the conclusion rather than the starting point in line with the inductive principle.

3.4.2 SAW

This phase was devoted to target-like realizations of offer refusals in (American) English. The following strategies were chosen as teaching foci based on general learner problems identified in the ILP literature (see Section 2.2): initial and sandwich mitigation, pausing/hesitation, positive remarks, gratitude/appreciation, grounders (including vague excuses and white lies), suggestions/alternatives, refusal postponement, and hedging (as a more accessible term for internal modification/downgrading). In the deductive group, these strategies were introduced as a list of rules exemplified by one example each (see Appendix A). More example provision followed via an adapted version of Kondo's (2003) camping refusal dialogs and the watching of two refusal scenes from the TV show *Friends*. In each case, the teacher pointed out to the students how the previously imparted rules were exemplified in the dialogs. In the inductive group, instruction proceeded the other way round, i. e., from the examples to the rules. Here, the learners started out by watching the *Friends* excerpts and by discussing them in terms of the speakers and their relationships, the situation, the offer-refusal sequence and the face-saving devices they observed. More examples were presented via selected native speaker responses to the scenarios the students knew from the pretest, which the learners explored by means of a handout asking them about the speaker relationships, possible face threat, severity of the refusal, and face-saving strategies employed (see Appendix B). Subsequently, Kondo's (2003) camping dialogs were explored in a similar inductive fashion. At the end of this rule-discovery, the list of rules which the deductive learners had received initially was given to the inductive learners as a summary of the rule discovery. In both groups, the SAW phase was followed up with an exercise on

creating white-lie refusals and an exercise on pausing and hesitation modeled after Carroll's (2011) embodiment activity on signaling a dispreferred turn.

3.4.3 Video feedback

In the weeks between SAW and PCR 2, the instructor met with each student for individual video feedback sessions of about 20 min to watch the learner's videotaped role plays from the beginning of the semester. In line with the experimental setup, the deductive learners received this feedback deductively fashion, i. e., the instructor informed the students directly about strengths and weaknesses of their performance and possible areas for improvements. In contrast, the inductive learners were asked to share their own observations first and to reflect about potentially more successful strategies before the teacher provided any input.

3.4.4 PCR 2

The second PCR phase was devoted to raising awareness of the influence of the context variables power and imposition. In the deductive condition, the learners again received the rules first (e. g., "When people refuse an offer by a status-higher person, their statements tend to be longer."), illustrated by examples. In order to apply these rules, the learners completed a few written exercises and then carried out an interactive circle activity suggested by Ishihara (2003) to practice offer-refusals sequences in pairs. The first round consisted of status-equal encounters and the second of refusals to status-higher interlocutors. In the inductive group, this circle activity constituted the starting point of the PCR 2 phase, followed by the elicitation of learner impressions of differences between the status-equal and status-high rounds. The students were then shown the refusal examples the deductive group had received initially as rule illustration and were asked to analyze them and complete the metapragmatic rules on their own. In both groups, the instruction was followed up by role play practice to create opportunities for output and interaction (Long 1996; Swain 2005).

3.5 Procedure and data analysis

The data collection and pragmatic intervention was carried out in the learners' obligatory speaking course over the duration of a 15-week academic semester

and started with the learners' taking the language test as well as the DCT section of the pretest (DCT 1) in the first two weeks. The individually-scheduled pretest role plays were conducted in the third week (role play 1). The pragmatic intervention took place via a total of three 90-minute lessons in weeks four (PCR 1), ten (SAW, practice) and thirteen (PCR 2, practice) as described above. The feedback sessions were scheduled individually outside of lessons between SAW and PCR 2. The posttest was conducted in weeks fourteen (DCT 2) and fifteen (role play 2). Apart from the pragmatic intervention, all course contents were identical in both groups. Pragmatic instruction time was identical in both groups (three 90-minute sessions each).

Results for indicator 1 were established by calculating the frequencies of the features selected as teaching foci for each treatment group for both the pretest (T_1) and the posttest (T_2). For features which can occur once per refusal utterance (initial mitigation, sandwich refusal, postponement), frequency was measured as percentage of utterances displaying the respective feature. For instance, a frequency of 0.78 for initial mitigation means that 78 % of all the refusals in this group displayed this strategy. The remaining features can occur repeatedly within a refusal utterance, which is why their frequency was calculated as the average occurrence of this feature per utterance. For instance, a hedging frequency of 1.70 means that this group used on average 1.7 hedges per refusal. This procedure was adopted from Morrow (1995) and Qadoury-Abed (2011) to be able to account for within-act frequencies of strategy use. The resulting frequencies were analyzed via Student's paired t -tests for statistically significant changes between pretest and posttest for both groups to establish overall effectiveness of instruction (research question 1) as well as for significant developmental differences between the groups (research question 2).

Results for indicator 2 were gained by comparing the learner data to the native speaker data by means of rank correlations rather than by raw frequencies of strategy use. This procedure was chosen since an analysis of utterance length had shown that the learners produced far longer responses at T_2 than both at T_1 and compared to the native speakers (the so-called *waffle phenomenon*, Edmondson and House 1981), so that a direct comparison of frequencies would have merely mirrored the overall increase in strategy use but obscured possible approximations in the internal organization of the refusals. For each subsample, the individual strategies were thus ranked according to their frequencies to depict their relative weight vis-à-vis the other strategies. Subsequently, the rankings for the learner groups were compared to that of the native speakers by means of Kendall's tau-b (τ_B), a rank correlation coefficient which is based on the analysis of concordant and discordant pairs and thus relative robust with regard to outliers. Ranging from -1 to $+1$, this rank

correlation coefficient expresses the directionality and degree of similarity of ranked lists. In the present study, such correlations were established separately for semantic strategies and for adjuncts in both the DCTs and the role plays, resulting in a total of four measures of target language approximation.

To ensure that the observed differences between the groups can indeed be attributed to effects of the different instructional designs rather than pre-existing variation, the data was also analyzed for differences in strategy use prior to the instruction. No systematic differences between the two groups were found at T_1 (for all features, $p>0.05$), which suggests that the groups were comparable in their strategy use prior to treatment administration.

4 Results

4.1 Increased use of taught strategies

This indicator measured effectiveness of instruction as an increased use of the features focused on in the instruction. For this purpose, frequency of use was operationalized as frequency of occurrence in one refusal as described in Section 3.5 above. Table 4 displays the respective frequencies for both treatment groups in the pretest (T_1) and the posttest (T_2) as well as the differences between the two points in time (Δ) in percentage points. A positive value in the Δ -column indicates that this feature was employed more frequently in the posttest and

Table 4: Frequencies of use of the taught features.

Data source	Feature	Deductive			Inductive		
		T_1	T_2	Δ	T_1	T_2	Δ
DCT	Initial mitigation ^S	0.78	0.97	0.19***	0.66	0.99	0.33***
	Sandwich refusal ^S	0.52	0.79	0.27***	0.37	0.83	0.46***
	Refusal postponement	0.02	0.09	0.07***	0.03	0.10	0.07***
	Pausing/hesitation	0.69	2.05	1.36***	0.48	1.78	1.30***
	Positive remarks	0.27	0.78	0.51***	0.31	0.82	0.51***
	Gratitude/appreciation	0.82	1.12	0.30**	0.68	1.16	0.48***
	Grounders	0.65	0.82	0.17**	0.68	0.87	0.19**
	Suggestions/alternatives	0.11	0.30	0.19***	0.17	0.40	0.23**
	Hedging ^S	0.95	1.70	0.75***	0.87	2.19	1.32***

(continued)

Table 4: (continued)

Data source	Feature	Deductive			Inductive		
		T ₁	T ₂	Δ	T ₁	T ₂	Δ
role play	Initial mitigation	0.78	1.00	0.22*	0.86	0.98	0.12*
	Sandwich refusal	0.47	0.55	0.08	0.36	0.61	0.25*
	Refusal postponement	0.25	0.29	0.04	0.17	0.37	0.20*
	Pausing/hesitation ^S	3.00	5.33	2.33***	3.08	7.17	4.09***
	Positive remarks	0.58	0.74	0.16	0.61	0.71	0.10
	Gratitude/appreciation	0.78	1.21	0.43*	0.89	1.10	0.21
	Grounders ^S	1.00	1.31	0.31*	1.44	1.15	-0.29
	Suggestions/alternatives	0.47	0.36	-0.11	0.61	0.41	-0.20
	Hedging	4.17	4.29	0.12	5.58	4.10	-1.48

Notes: The shaded features refer to strategies that can occur only once per refusal, while the other features can occur repeatedly within one refusal.

- * The difference between T₁ and T₂ within the learner group is significant at the 0.050-level.
- ** The difference between T₁ and T₂ within the learner group is significant at the 0.010-level.
- *** The difference between T₁ and T₂ within the learner group is significant at the 0.001-level.
- ^S The differences in the development between the groups show statistical significance on the 0.05-level.

thus increased over time, while a negative value indicates decline. Significant within-group differences (i. e., differences between T₁ and T₂) are marked by asterisks, and significant between-group differences (i. e., differences between the deductive and the inductive condition) by a superscript ^S as specified below the table.

As the many positive Δ-values in Table 4 indicate, the instruction in both groups was effective in the sense of indicator 1. For the majority of strategies focused on in the instruction (15 of the 18 strategy measures in Table 4), both groups increased their frequency of use, in most cases at a statistically significant level as indicated by the asterisks. Hence, in response to research question 1 these data suggest that the instruction was highly effective in both groups, adding to the body of research that attests a high effectiveness of explicit instruction.

Research question 2 asked about possible differences in effectiveness between the instructional designs. Accordingly, the relevant measures are no longer the differences between T₁ and T₂, but rather between the developments in the treatment groups. Table 4 shows that the developmental trajectories that are of interest for research question 2 show significant between-group differences with regard to five features (in the DCT: initial mitigation, sandwich refusal, and hedging; in the role plays: pausing/hesitation and grounders). Four of these five

speak in favor of the inductive design since it was the learners in the inductive group who increased their use of these strategies to a greater extent. Only the use of grounders in the role plays increased to a greater extent in the deductive group. This suggests a slight superiority of the inductive design. In sum, we can thus conclude that while both groups showed a largely parallel development (as evidenced by the same directionality of change for 16 out of the 18 strategy measures in Table 4), the inductive approach yielded a modest advantage (as evidenced by four out of five significant differences between the treatments).

4.2 Approximation to the target norm

This indicator operationalized effectiveness of instruction as the greater approximation to the target norm. Degree of similarity between the native speaker and the learner responses was measured by means of rank correlations, both for semantic strategies and adjuncts.

4.2.1 Use of semantic strategies

The present data contained eight target-like semantic strategies (direct: performative, negating adverb, negative willingness/ability, speaker preference; indirect: grounder, suggestions/ statement of alternative, dissuasion, regret/apology, postponement) as well as the strategy of criticism/negative evaluation, which is associated with non-native performance (see Section 2.2). Table 5 provides the ranked frequencies for these nine strategies for all subsamples and the two data collection methods, including the corresponding correlation coefficients and *p*-values.

As Table 5 shows, we do not find here the largely parallel development between the groups which we saw for indicator 1. Rather, we find an improvement only with the inductive group, both in the DCT data (from $\tau_B = 0.611$ to $\tau_B = 0.788$) and in the role plays (from $\tau_B = 0.648$ to $\tau_B = 0.667$). In the deductive group, however, the results are indicative of a decline (in the DCTs, from $\tau_B = 0.551$ to $\tau_B = 0.500$) and, respectively, a stagnation (in the role plays, at $\tau_B = 0.648$) of the approximation to the target norm. This is especially interesting given that the groups started out rather similar (also indicated by similar numbers and identical directionalities at T_1), suggesting that the observed differences may indeed be attributable to the differences in teaching approach.

What could have caused these differences between the two indicators? One explanation lies in the different perspectives expressed by each indicator.

Table 5: Rank distributions and correlations of semantic strategies.

DCT																	
Rank	NS baseline			Deductive at T ₁			Inductive at T ₁			Deductive at T ₂			Inductive at T ₂				
	data $n_{utterances} = 308$ $n_{strategies} = 347$			$n_{utterances} = 124$ $n_{strategies} = 134$			$n_{utterances} = 124$ $n_{strategies} = 149$			$n_{utterances} = 142$ $n_{strategies} = 149$			$n_{utterances} = 146$ $n_{strategies} = 152$				
Strategy	Frequency		Strategy	Frequency		Strategy	Frequency		Strategy	Frequency		Strategy	Frequency		Strategy	Frequency	
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%
1	neg. adverb	87	25.1	grounder	48	35.8	grounder	49	32.9	grounder	57	38.3	grounder	51	33.6		
2	grounder	80	23.1	dissuasion	36	26.9	dissuasion	44	29.5	dissuasion	45	30.2	dissuasion	50	32.9		
3	dissuasion	75	21.6	neg. adverb	26	19.4	neg. adverb	33	22.1	postponem.	13	8.7	postponem.	14	9.2		
4	postponem.	46	13.3	speaker pref.	7	5.2	neg. willing.	8	5.4	speaker pref. ^o	13	8.7	neg. adverb ^o	10	6.6		
5	neg. willing.	24	6.9	neg. willing.	6	4.5	criticism	5	3.4	neg. willing.	9	6.0	neg. willing. ^o	10	6.6		
6	speaker pref.	14	4.0	criticism	5	3.7	postponem. ^o	4	2.7	suggestion	5	3.4	speaker pref.	9	5.9		
7	suggestion	11	3.2	postponem. ^o	2	1.5	speaker pref. ^o	4	2.7	performative	4	2.7	suggestion	5	3.3		
8	criticism	10	2.9	suggestion ^o	2	1.5	suggestion	2	1.3	neg. adverb	2	1.3	criticism	2	1.3		
9	performative	0	0.0	performative ^o	2	1.5	performative	0	0.0	criticism	1	0.7	performative	1	0.7		
Kendall's τ_B 0.551 ($p = 0.043$) 0.611 ($p = 0.022$) 0.500 ($p = 0.061$) 0.778 ($p = 0.004$)																	
(continued)																	

(continued)

Table 5: (continued)

Role Play									
Rank	NS baseline data $n_{utterances} = 308n_{strategies} = 347$			Deductive at $T_1n_{utterances} = 124n_{strategies} = 134$			Inductive at $T_1n_{utterances} = 124n_{strategies} = 149$		
	Strategy	Frequency	%	Strategy	Frequency	%	Strategy	Frequency	%
1	neg. adverb	87	25.1	dissuasion	15	24.2	dissuasion	16	22.9
2	grounder	80	23.1	neg. adverb	11	17.7	neg. adverb	13	18.6
3	dissuasion	75	21.6	speaker pref.	10	16.1	speaker pref.	11	15.7
4	postponem.	46	13.3	postponem.	9	14.5	grounder	9	12.9
5	neg. willing.	24	6.9	grounder	6	9.7	neg. willing.	7	10.0
6	speaker pref.	14	4.0	neg. willing.	5	8.1	postponem. ^o	6	8.6
7	suggestion	11	3.2	suggestion ^o	3	4.8	suggestion ^o	6	8.6
8	criticism	10	2.9	criticism ^o	3	4.8	criticism ^o	1	1.4
9	performative	0	0.0	performative	0	0.0	performative ^o	1	1.4
Kendall's τ_B				0.648 ($p = 0.016$)			0.648 ($p = 0.016$)		
							0.667 ($p = 0.012$)		

Note: = The item shares a rank with an adjacent strategy.

Indicator 1 is based on the assumption that “more is better,” i. e., that a teaching design is more effective if the learners increase their use of the targeted strategies. This is, however, a strictly classroom-emic perspective which does not take into consideration that an increased strategy use may just as well overshoot the mark and thus not necessarily result in a more target-like performance. This is why indicator 2 was also used to see whether the instruction would not only result in an increase of strategy use but in a convergence with the real-world target (the classroom-etic perspective). A second explanation suggests that the inductive design with its emphasis on language use and guided discovery may be better suited to impart target-like language *patterns* compared to the deductive approach, which presents the *rules* right from the outset in a rather absolute fashion and thus leaves hardly any room for the language learners to exploit the foreign language on their own and to engage in meaningful pattern search activities themselves. As Table 5 suggests, this was especially visible with strategies that were not targeted explicitly in the instruction, namely the role of the negating adverb and speaker preference in the DCT data as well as negative willingness/ability in the role plays. Hence, it is conceivable that the deductive instruction’s initial focus on rules causes the learners to focus rather narrowly on the features covered by these rules, whereas the inductive design permits a more holistic intake of other characteristics of the target language as well. In any case, the comparison of the learners’ and native speakers’ use of semantic strategies suggests with regard to research question 1 that the instruction was not effective in both groups but only in the inductive group. Accordingly, this means with regard to research question 2 that the inductive approach proved superior to the deductive design.

4.2.2 Use of adjuncts

The approximation to the native speaker norm for adjuncts was also assessed by means of a rank correlation analysis. Table 6 presents the respective numbers.⁶ In addition to the six adjuncts of positive remarks, expressions of gratitude/appreciation, apology/regret, grounders, suggestions, dissuasion, and aggravating remarks previously identified in the literature, the data revealed many instances of what was termed *cooperation signals*. These were expressions of a

⁶ The strategies of grounder, suggestion, and dissuasion are appended by _A to indicate that they functioned as adjuncts. These strategies had been coded separately for semantic strategies and adjuncts to account for sequential aspects of speech act production (Huth and Taleghani-Nikazm 2006; Kasper 2004).

general willingness to collaborate (e. g., *whatever works best for you*) and to bond (e. g., *Saves us both a hassle right?*), terms of endearment (e. g., *honey*), or pleas for understanding (e. g., *I hope you understand*). This category was added to the list of adjuncts due to its frequent occurrence.

The results for adjuncts displayed in Table 6 are rather similar to the findings for semantic strategies reported in Table 5 in that they attest a greater effectiveness of the inductive treatment. This becomes especially evident in the role play data, where the deductive group again showed a stagnation of the correlation size ($\tau_B = 0.714$ at both T_1 and T_2), i. e., these learners did not increase their similarity to the baseline data over the course of the instruction. In contrast, the inductive learners increased their correlation from $\tau_B = 0.714$ at T_1 to $\tau_B = 0.786$ at T_2 . As far as the DCTs are concerned, we find that the learners started out from slightly different degrees of approximation (deductive: $\tau_B = 0.500$; inductive: $\tau_B = 0.643$). In the course of the instruction, both groups were able to approximate the target norm, with the deductive learners reaching $\tau_B = 0.714$ and the inductive learners $\tau_B = 0.857$ at T_2 . This is an identical percentage point increase of 0.214; hence for this measure the instruction in both groups was equally effective. On the whole, the results for indicator 2 thus allow the conclusion that the pragmatic intervention was more effective in the inductive condition, which produced the same degree of effectiveness in one out of four measures (DCT for adjuncts) and a greater increase than the deductive treatment in the remaining three (DCT and role plays for semantic strategies, role play for adjuncts).

5 Discussion and conclusion

This study contrasted an explicit-deductive and an explicit-inductive design in the teaching of pragmatic competence in refusing offers in EFL. Two indicators were used to assess effectiveness of instruction, to establish whether the intervention was generally effective (research question 1) and to analyze whether one approach proved superior to the other (research question 2). The first indicator – use of taught strategies – revealed first and foremost a largely parallel development in the two learner groups, suggesting that both designs were effective. This adds to the numerous studies attesting a high effectiveness to explicit approaches in the teaching of pragmatics (Cohen 2005; Jeon and Kaya 2006; Rose 2005). In addition, indicator 1 yielded a moderate superiority of the inductive treatment in the form of greater gains in that treatment group. This superiority was even more pronounced in indicator 2, which measured the

Table 6: Rank distributions and correlations of adjuncts.

DCT																
Rank	NS baseline data			Deductive at T ₁			Inductive at T ₁			Deductive at T ₂			Inductive at T ₂			
	<i>n</i> _{utterances} = 308 <i>n</i> _{adjuncts} = 644			<i>n</i> _{utterances} = 124 <i>n</i> _{adjuncts} = 279			<i>n</i> _{utterances} = 124 <i>n</i> _{adjuncts} = 278			<i>n</i> _{utterances} = 142 <i>n</i> _{adjuncts} = 473			<i>n</i> _{utterances} = 146 <i>n</i> _{adjuncts} = 579			
	Strategy	Frequency	%	Strategy	Frequency	%	Strategy	Frequency	%	Strategy	Frequency	%	Strategy	Frequency	%	
1	gratitude	239	37.1	gratitude	102	36.6	gratitude	84	30.2	gratitude	159	33.6	gratitude	169	29.2	
2	grounder_A	123	19.1	dissuasion_A	53	19.0	dissuasion_A	48	17.3	pos. remark	111	23.5	pos. remark	119	20.6	
3	pos. remark	85	13.2	pos. remark	34	12.2	pos. remark	38	13.7	grounder_A	59	12.5	grounder_A	76	13.1	
4	dissuasion_A	61	9.5	grounder_A	32	11.5	grounder_A	35	12.6	coop.signal	38	8.0	dissuasion_A	58	10.0	
5	suggestion_A	59	9.2	apology	18	6.5	coop. signal	22	7.9	suggestion_A	37	7.8	coop. signal	56	9.7	
6	coop. signal	52	8.1	coop. signal	16	5.7	suggestion_A ^o	19	6.8	dissuasion_A	36	7.6	suggestion_A	53	9.2	
7	apology	19	3.0	suggestion_A ^o	12	4.3	apology ^o	19	6.8	apology	25	5.3	apology	27	4.7	
8	aggr. move	6	0.9	aggr. move ^o	12	4.3	aggr. move	13	4.7	aggr. move	8	1.7	aggr. move	21	3.6	
Kendall's τ_B		0.500 (<i>p</i> = 0.083)			0.643 (<i>p</i> = 0.026)			0.714 (<i>p</i> = 0.013)			0.857 (<i>p</i> = 0.003)					

(continued)

(continued)

Table 6: (continued)

Role Play															
Rank	NS baseline data			Deductive at T ₁			Inductive at T ₁			Deductive at T ₂			Inductive at T ₂		
	<i>n</i> _{utterances} = 308 <i>n</i> _{adjuncts} = 644			<i>n</i> _{utterances} = 124 <i>n</i> _{adjuncts} = 279			<i>n</i> _{utterances} = 124 <i>n</i> _{adjuncts} = 278			<i>n</i> _{utterances} = 142 <i>n</i> _{adjuncts} = 473			<i>n</i> _{utterances} = 146 <i>n</i> _{adjuncts} = 579		
	Strategy	Frequency	%	Strategy	Frequency	%	Strategy	Frequency	%	Strategy	Frequency	%	Strategy	Frequency	%
1	gratitude	239	37.1	gratitude°	30	21.9	grunder_A	43	26.5	gratitude	51	31.5	gratitude	45	28.5
2	grunder_A	123	19.1	grunder_A°	30	21.9	gratitude	32	19.8	grunder_A	36	22.2	grunder_A	31	19.6
3	pos. remark	85	13.2	pos. remark	21	15.3	dissuasion_A	28	17.3	pos. remark	31	19.1	pos. remark	30	19.0
4	dissuasion_A	61	9.5	coop. signal	16	11.7	pos. remark	22	13.6	coop. signal	19	11.7	coop. signal	28	17.7
5	suggestion_A	59	9.2	suggestion_A	14	10.2	suggestion_A	16	9.9	suggestion_A	12	7.4	suggestion_A	15	9.5
6	coop. signal	52	8.1	dissuasion_A	12	8.8	aggr. move	10	6.2	dissuasion_A	6	3.7	dissuasion_A	5	3.2
7	apology	19	3.0	aggr. move	11	8.0	coop. signal	9	5.6	aggr. move	4	2.5	apology	3	1.9
8	aggr. move	6	0.9	apology	3	2.2	apology	2	1.2	apology	3	1.9	aggr. move	1	0.6
Kendall's τ_B				0.714 (<i>p</i> = 0.013)			0.714 (<i>p</i> = 0.013)			0.786 (<i>p</i> = 0.006)					

Note: = The item shares a rank with an adjacent strategy.

approximation to the native speaker target norm. While the results for the deductive condition varied between decrease, stagnation and increase of the degree of similarity, the learners in the inductive group showed a clear increase in all four measures. This suggests that learners profit most from being taught in an inductive fashion which provides them with opportunities to engage in meaningful language use and individual rule discovery and helps them see patterns in the target language that may go well beyond the features and rules the teacher may have selected as explicit teaching foci.

This conclusion is in line with the studies from the wider area of SLA that have examined the inductive-deductive opposition within the explicit paradigm (cf. Section 2.1). It transpired during the literature review that when culminating in explicit rule-provision, induction is more favorable to L2 development than deduction, owing to its initial rule-discovery phase that offers opportunities for meaning-focused stimulus interpretation, active engagement with the language material, and greater depth of processing. Even though ILP research has not addressed the inductive-deductive contrast as systematically yet, Taguchi (2015) identified in her meta-analysis of pragmatic intervention studies a general superiority of those designs that featured cognitively engaging tasks and concluded: “Effective treatment can be summed up under the quality of processing depth. Learners who [...]are guided to [in]duce pragmatic rules may have an opportunity to process the input at a deeper level than those who just receive input without working further on it.” (36) Hence, it seems that an explicit-inductive framework is most promising compared to explicit-deductive and implicit-inductive approaches across all aspects of language teaching ranging from grammar and vocabulary teaching to the furthering of pragmatic skills.

In addition to this cognitive perspective, the superiority of induction found in the present study might also be explained, at least partially, on the basis of sociocultural theories of learning. Sociocultural approaches view learning as a social activity and emphasize the role of interaction and collaboration with peers and experts in tapping a learner’s potential for progress and development (Brooks and Donato 1994; Ohta 2005; Vygotsky 1978). From this perspective, a vital prerequisite for effective learning is the provision of opportunities for such interactions. This condition is met in the initial rule discovery phase, which encourages the learners to share their observations, experiences and findings and assist each other in the identification of rules, which is what the inductive learners did with increasing intensity in the present study as the semester progressed. Deduction, on the other hand, is largely devoid of such opportunities due to the direct “shortcut” to the rules. Hence, induction seems to trigger active learner involvement in both cognitive as well as sociocultural terms, both of which are conducive to L2 development.

Overall, the results of the present study are thus in line with theories of language learning and previous SLA research. At the same time, they provide new insights into the hitherto neglected dichotomy of inductive and deductive instruction in ILP. By going beyond the prevailing explicit vs. implicit debate, the study has shown systematically that foreign language learners profit most from an inductive presentation of pragmatic issues. That is, learners benefit most from engaging in bottom-up language use and in a guided discovery of the mechanisms underlying the language compared to the deductive, top-down processes of rule provision and rule application. Needless to say, however, more research is needed to corroborate and fine-tune these findings with other learner populations, other L1s and L2s, and different pragmatic foci.

References

- Abdolrezapour, Parisa & Abbass Eslami-Rasekh. 2010. A cross-cultural study of perceptions of politeness by Iranians and Americans in request forms. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences* 7(2). 164–169.
- Abraham, Roberta G. 1985. Field independence-dependence and the teaching of grammar. *TESOL Quarterly* 19(4). 689–702.
- Alcón-Soler, Eva. 2005. Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System* 33(3). 417–435.
- Alcón-Soler, Eva. 2007. Fostering EFL learners' awareness of requesting through explicit and implicit consciousness-raising tasks. In María del Pilar García Mayo (ed.), *Investigating tasks in formal language learning*, 69–90. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Alcón-Soler, Eva. 2008. Pragmatics in instructed language learning contexts. In Eva Alcón-Soler (ed.), *Learning how to request in an instructed language learning context*, 17–39. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Al-Kahtani, Saad Ali W. 2005. Refusals realizations in three different cultures: A speech act theoretically-based cross-cultural study. *Journal of King Saud University* 18. 35–57.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. 2012. *ACTFL proficiency guidelines 2012*. http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012_FINAL.pdf (accessed 14 October 2015).
- Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen. 1996. Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. In Lawrence F. Bouton (ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning monograph series* 7, 21–39. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen. 2001. Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In Kenneth R. Rose & Gabriele Kasper (eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*, 13–32. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Barron, Anne. 2003. *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Beebe, Leslie M., Tomoko Takahashi & Robin Uliss-Weltz. 1990. Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In Robin C. Scarcella, Elaine S. Andersen & Stephen D. Krashen (eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language*, 55–73. New York: Newbury House.
- Bouton, Lawrence F. 1992. The interpretation of implicature in English by NNS: Does it come automatically – without being explicitly taught? In Lawrence F. Bouton & Yamuna Kachru (eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning monograph series 3*, 353–365. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, NFLRC.
- Brooks, Frank B. & Richard Donato. 1994. Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania* 77(2). 262–274.
- Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruner, Jerome S. 1961. The act of discovery. *Harvard Educational Review* 31(1). 21–32.
- Carroll, Donald. 2011. Teaching preference organization: Learning how not to say “no”. In Noël R. Houck & Donna H. Tatsuki (eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation*, 105–118. Alexandria: TESOL.
- Cerezo, Luis, Allison Caras & Ronald P. Leow. 2016. The effectiveness of guided induction versus deductive instruction on the development of complex Spanish *gustar* structures. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 38(2). 265–291.
- Chang, Yuh-Fang. 2009. How to say no: An analysis of cross-cultural difference and pragmatic transfer. *Language Sciences* 31(4). 477–493.
- Chen, Hongyin Julie. 1996. *Cross-cultural comparison of English and Chinese metapragmatics in refusal*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University dissertation.
- Chen, Xing, Lei Yea & Yanyin Zhang. 1995. Refusing in Chinese. In Gabriele Kasper (ed.), *Pragmatics of Chinese as native and target language*, 119–163. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, NFLRC.
- Cohen, Andrew D. 2005. Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 2(3). 275–301.
- Cohen, Andrew D. & Rachel L. Shively. 2007. Acquisition of requests and apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of study abroad and strategy-building intervention. *Modern Language Journal* 91(2). 189–212.
- Cutrone, Pino. 2005. A case study examining backchannels between Japanese-British dyads. *Multilingua* 24(3). 237–274.
- Decoo, Wilfried. 1996. The induction-deduction opposition: Ambiguities and complexities of the didactic reality. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 34(2). 95–118.
- Economidou-Kogetsidis, Maria & Helen Woodfield (eds.). 2012. *Interlanguage request modification*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Edmondson, Willis & Juliane House. 1981. *Let's talk and talk about it. A pedagogic interactional grammar of English*. Munich: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Embassy English. 2013. English Levels. *Embassy English – English courses in England, the USA, Canada, Australia & New Zealand*. <http://www.embassyenglish.com/student-life/your-level-of-english#3> (last accessed 4 September 2016).
- Erlam, Rosemary. 2003. The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the acquisition of direct object pronouns in French as a second language. *Modern Language Journal* 87(2). 242–260.
- Erlam, Rosemary. 2005. Language aptitude and its relationship to instructional effectiveness in second language acquisition. *Language Teaching Research* 9(2). 147–171.

- Eslami-Rasekh, Zohreh. 2005. Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal* 59(3). 199–208.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. 2004. Interlanguage refusals: Linguistic politeness and length of residence in the target community. *Language Learning* 54(4). 587–653.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. 2005. The effects of explicit instruction on developing pragmatic competence: A longitudinal study of L2 Spanish learners. Paper presented at the 16th International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, Indiana University, April.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. 2008a. *Politeness in Mexico and the United States. A contrastive study of the realization and perception of refusals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. 2008b. Perceptions of refusals to invitations: Exploring the minds of foreign language learners. *Language Awareness* 17(3). 195–211.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. César & Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig. 2010. “I’m sorry – can I think about it?” The negotiation of refusals in academic and non-academic contexts. In Donna H. Tatsuki & Noël Houck (eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching speech acts*, 163–180. Alexandria: TESOL.
- Fukuya, Yoshinori J. & Martyn K. Clark. 2001. A comparison of input enhancement and explicit instruction of mitigators. In Lawrence F. Bouton (ed.) *Pragmatics and language learning monograph series 10*, 111–130. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- García, Paula. 2004. Pragmatic comprehension of high and low level language learners. *TESL-EJ* 8(2). A–1.
- Genc, Zubeyde Sinem & Ozlem Tekyildiz. 2009. Use of refusal strategies by Turkish EFL learners and native speakers of English in urban and rural areas. *Asian EFL Journal* 11(3). 299–328.
- Glaser, Karen. 2013. The neglected combination: A case for explicit-inductive instruction in teaching pragmatics in ESL. *TESL Canada Journal* 30(7). 150–163.
- Glaser, Karen. 2014. *Inductive or deductive? The impact of method of instruction on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in EFL*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Golato, Andrea. 2003. Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics* 24(1). 90–121.
- Haight, Carrie E., Carol Herron & Steven P. Cole. 2007. The effects of deductive and guided inductive instructional approaches on the learning of grammar in the elementary foreign language college classroom. *Foreign Language Annals* 40(2). 288–310.
- Hammerly, Hector. 1975. The deduction/induction controversy. *The Modern Language Journal* 59(1–2). 15–18.
- Hartford, Beverly S. & Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig. 1992. Experimental and observational data in the study of interlanguage pragmatics. In Lawrence F. Bouton & Yamuna Kachru (eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning monograph series 3*, 333–352. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i, NFLRC.
- Hellermann, John & Andrea Vergun. 2007. Language which is not taught: The discourse marker use of beginning adult learners of English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39(1). 157–179.
- Herron, Carol & Michael Tomasello. 1992. Acquiring grammatical structures by guided induction. *French Review* 65(5). 708–718.
- Hudson, Thom. 2001. Indicators for pragmatic instruction: Some quantitative tools. In Kenneth R. Rose & Gabriele Kasper (eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*, 283–300. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, Thom, Emily Detmer & James D. Brown. 1995. *Developing prototypic measures of cross-cultural pragmatics*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

- Huth, Thorsten & Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm. 2006. How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research* 10(1). 53–79.
- Ishihara, Noriko. 2003. Giving and responding to compliments. In Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig & Rebecca Mahan-Taylor (eds.), *Teaching pragmatics*. Washington, DC: United States Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. <http://americanenglish.state.gov/resources/teaching-pragmatics#child-531> (accessed 14 October 2015).
- Ishihara, Noriko & Andrew D. Cohen. 2010. *Teaching and learning pragmatics. Where language and culture meet*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Jeon, Eun Hee & TadayoshiKaya. 2006. Effects of L2 instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development: A meta-analysis. In John M. Norris & Lourdes Ortega (eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*, 165–211. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kasper, Gabriele. 2004. Speech acts in (inter) action: Repeated questions. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 1(1). 125–133.
- Kasper, Gabriele & Merete Dahl. 1991. *Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, NFLRC.
- Kondo, Sachiko. 2003. Teaching refusals in an EFL setting. In Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig & Rebecca Mahan-Taylor (eds.), *Teaching pragmatics*. Washington, DC: United States Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. <http://americanenglish.state.gov/resources/teaching-pragmatics#child-531> (accessed 14 October 2015)
- Kubota, Miko. 1995. Teachability of conversational implicature to Japanese EFL learners. *Institute for Research in Language Teaching Bulletin* 9. 35–67.
- Long, Michael H. 1996. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In William C. Ritchie & Tej K. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*, 413–468. New York: Academic Press.
- Martínez-Flor, Alicia. 2008. The effect of an inductive-deductive teaching approach to develop learners' use of request modifiers in the EFL classroom. In Eva Alcón-Soler (ed.), *Learning how to request in an instructed language learning context*, 191–225. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Martínez-Flor, Alicia & Yoshinori J. Fukuya. 2005. The effects of instruction on learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *System* 33(3). 463–480.
- Matsumura, S. 2003. Modelling the relationships among interlanguage pragmatic development, L2 proficiency, and exposure to L2. *Applied Linguistics* 24(4). 465–491.
- Morkus, Nader. 2009. *The realization of the speech act of refusal in Egyptian Arabic by American learners of Arabic as a Foreign Language*. Tampa, FL: University of Florida dissertation.
- Morrow, Christopher K. 1995. *The pragmatic effects of instruction on ESL learner's production of complaint and refusal speech acts*. Buffalo, NY: State University of New York at Buffalo dissertation.
- Nguyen, Thi Thuy Minh, Thi Hanh Pham & Minh Tam Pham. 2012. The relative effects of explicit and implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(4). 416–434.
- Niezgoda, Kimberly & Carsten Roever. 2001. Pragmatic and grammatical awareness: A function of the learning environment? In Kenneth R. Rose & Gabriele Kasper (eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*, 63–79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ohta, Amy Snyder. 2005. Interlanguage pragmatics in the zone of proximal development. *System* 33(3). 503–517.
- Padilla-Cruz, Manuel. 2009. Understanding and overcoming pragmatic failure when interpreting phatic utterances. In Reyes Gómez-Morón, Manuel Padilla-Cruz, Lucía Fernández-Amaya &

- María Hernández-López (eds.), *Pragmatics applied to language teaching and learning*, 87–108. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Phillips, Deborah. 2001. *Longman introductory course for the TOEFL test. Student book with answer key and CD-ROM*. White Plains: Longman.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*, 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Qadoury-Abed, Ahmed. 2011. Pragmatic transfer in Iraqi EFL learners' refusals. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 1(2). 166–185.
- Robinson, Mary Ann. 1991. Introspective methodology in interlanguage pragmatics research. In Gabriele Kasper (ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as a native and target language*, 27–82. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, NFLRC.
- Robinson, Peter. 1996. Learning simple and complex second language rules under implicit, incidental, rule-search, and instructed conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18(1). 27–67.
- Roever, Carsten. 2011. Testing of second language pragmatics: Past and future. *Language Testing* 28(4). 463–481.
- Rosa, Elena & Michael D. O'Neill. 1999. Explicitness, intake, and the issue of awareness: Another piece to the puzzle. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 21(4). 511–556.
- Rose, Kenneth R. 2005. On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System* 33(3). 385–399.
- Rose, Kenneth R. & Connie Kwai-fun Ng. 2001. Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses. In Kenneth R. Rose & Gabriele Kasper (eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*, 145–170. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, Steven J. & Gabriele Kasper (eds.). 2013. *Assessing second language pragmatics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sadler, Randall W. & Betil Eröz. 2002. "I refuse you!" An examination of English refusals by native speakers of English, Lao, and Turkish. *Arizona Working Papers in Second Language Acquisition and Teaching* 9. 53–80.
- Schauer, Gila A. 2006. Pragmatic awareness in ESL and EFL contexts: Contrast and development. *Language Learning* 56(2). 269–318.
- Schauer, Gila A. 2009. *Interlanguage pragmatic development: The study abroad context*. London: Continuum.
- Seliger, Herbert W. 1975. Inductive method and deductive method in language teaching: A re-examination. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 13(1). 1–18.
- Shaffer, Constance. 1989. A comparison of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching foreign languages. *Modern Language Journal* 73(4). 395–403.
- Smart, Jonathan. 2014. The role of guided induction in paper-based data-driven learning. *ReCALL* 26(2). 184–201.
- Spada, Nina & Yasuyo Tomita. 2010. Interactions between type of instruction and type of language feature: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 60(2). 263–308.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 1993. Conceptions of social relations and pragmatics research. *Journal of Pragmatics* 20(1). 27–47.
- Stevens, Paul B. 1993. The pragmatics of "No!": Some strategies in English and Arabic. *Issues and developments in English and applied linguistics* 4(6). 87–112.

- Su, I-Ru. 2010. Transfer of pragmatic competences: A bi-directional perspective. *Modern Language Journal* 94(1). 87–102.
- Swain, Merrill. 2005. The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* 1, 471–483. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Taguchi, Naoko. 2007. Task difficulty in oral speech act production. *Applied Linguistics* 28(1). 113–135.
- Taguchi, Naoko. 2011. Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31. 289–310.
- Taguchi, Naoko. 2013. Comprehension of conversational implicature. In Naoko Taguchi & Julie M. Sykes (eds.), *Technology in interlanguage pragmatics research and teaching*, 19–41. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Taguchi, Naoko. 2015. Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching* 48(1). 1–50.
- Takimoto, Masahiro. 2008. The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the development of language learners' pragmatic competence. *Modern Language Journal* 92(3). 369–386.
- Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in interaction. An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Trosborg, Anna. 2003. The teaching of business pragmatics. In Alicia Martínez Flor, Esther Usó-Juan & Ana Fernández-Guerra (eds.), *Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching*, 247–281. Castelló de la Plana: Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.
- Trosborg, Anna & Philip Shaw. 1998. “Sorry does not pay my bills”: The handling of complaints in everyday interaction/cross-cultural business interaction. *Hermes Journal of Linguistics* 21. 67–94.
- Trosborg, Anna & Philip Shaw. 2008. Deductive and inductive methods in the teaching of business pragmatics: Not an ‘either/or’! In Ronald Geluykens & Bettina Kraft (eds.), *Institutional discourse in cross-cultural contexts*, 193–220. Munich: Lincom.
- Vogel, Séverine P. & George Engelhard, Jr. 2011. Using Rasch measurement theory to examine two instructional approaches for teaching and learning of French grammar. *Journal of Educational Research* 104(4). 267–282.
- Vogel, Séverine P., Carol Herron, Steven P. Cole & Holly York. 2011. Effectiveness of a guided inductive versus a deductive approach on the learning of grammar in the intermediate-level college French classroom. *Foreign Language Annals* 44(2). 353–380.
- Vygotsky, Lev S. 1978. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wannaruk, Anchalee. 2008. Pragmatic transfer in Thai EFL refusals. *RELJ Journal* 39(3). 318–337.

Appendix A. Handout for the deductive group at the beginning of the SAW phase

You work as a volunteer at a charity organization. In one of your meetings, you and one other volunteer are teamed up to go to a local conference the following week. You don't like her very much, and you have heard some talk about her unsafe driving. After the meeting, she comes up to you and

says: “We’re both going to that convention next week, right? Why don’t you ride with me? I wouldn’t mind the detour to pick you up.” You don’t want to ride with her.

When native speakers want to politely decline an offer, they...

- hesitate and pause
Oh... I mean, you don't have to. I was planning on driving myself anyway.
- use hedging
Actually, I think your house is between mine and the conference. Why don't I pick you up instead?
- express thanks for the offer
Thanks so much for the offer! Actually, I think my schedule might not work out – I have some errands to run afterwards, so it would be better if I have my car. I appreciate it, though.
- use positive remarks to show appreciation
That's very thoughtful of you; however, I prefer to drive my own vehicle. You're welcome to ride with me...
- provide excuses, reasons and explanations to justify why they can't accept the offer
Actually I am going to be coming from work, and I need to head to a friend's immediately after the convention, so it's much easier for me to have my car there as well. Thank you so much for the offer though. I'll see you there!
- provide alternative suggestions
Carpooling is a great idea, but why don't I drive? I get super antsy in the passenger seat.
- use stalling and postponing strategies to avoid the refusal at that moment
Oh thank you so much for the offer! I really appreciate it. I think I might have to be downtown right beforehand, so I'm not totally sure yet what my transportation situation is like. Let me email you, though, once I know for sure.
- often put FSS at the beginning and at the end of the refusal (delayed/sandwich refusal)

Appendix B. Handout for the inductive group at the beginning of the SAW phase

Page 1: Three situations from DCT 1 plus select NS responses

Situation 1 (Ride, adapted from Robinson 1991):

You work as a volunteer at a charity organization. In one of your meetings, you and one other volunteer are teamed up to go to a local conference the following week. You don't like her very much, and you have heard some talk about her unsafe driving. After the meeting, she comes up to you and says: "We're both going to that convention next week, right? Why don't you ride with me? I wouldn't mind the detour to pick you up." You don't want to ride with her.

- a) That's very thoughtful of you; however, I prefer to drive my own vehicle. You're welcome to ride with me...
- b) Oh... I mean, you don't have to. I was planning on driving myself anyway.
- c) Oh thank you so much for the offer! I really appreciate it. I think I might have to be downtown right beforehand, so I'm not totally sure yet what my transportation situation is like. Let me email you, though, once I know for sure.

Page 2: Guiding questions for pragmatic observations and rule discovery

	Situation 1	Situation 2	Situation 3
Who are the speakers?			
What is their power relationship? How well do they know each other?			
What is the potential face threat in the situation, i. e., how might one or both of the speakers lose face?			
What face-saving strategies do the refusers use? Be as detailed as possible.	a) b) c)	a) b) c)	a) b) c)
How severe (how 'big of a deal') is the refusal?			
How is this severity of the refusal and the power relationship reflected in the language used for the refusal?			

Bionote

Karen Glaser

Karen Glaser is Junior Professor for TEFL/TEYL at University of Leipzig, Germany. She holds a PhD in English Linguistics from Leuphana University Lüneburg, an MA in TESL from Kent State University, Ohio/USA, and an MA in English and Applied Linguistics from TU Dresden. She has taught ESL/EFL, linguistics and teacher training courses in Germany and the USA. Her research interests include interlanguage pragmatics, classroom interaction, and Teaching Languages to Young Learners.