

Exploring Television as an Exponent of Pragmatic and Sociocultural Information in Foreign Language Learning

Anne M. O’Keeffe, Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick

Introduction

It is increasingly recognised that being both fluent and accurate in a foreign language will not always guarantee successful communication between speakers. According to Hyde (1998: 10), in his discussion on intercultural competence in English language education, even if someone has perfected standard grammar and pronunciation, “there is no guarantee that they will be effective intercultural communicators... Successful communication is not simply about acquiring a linguistic code: it is about dealing with different cultural values reflected in language use”. Communication is coded differently across languages and cultures, and unfortunately this dimension is not often explored in language learning. This paper will focus on the potential of using television material in language learning within the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), for the purpose of raising students’ awareness of how certain aspects of communicating in their first language might differ in their target language. Crystal (2000: 3) tells us that over the past one hundred years, English has become spoken by more people in more places than ever before and that current estimates suggest that 1.5 billion use it as a first, or second foreign language – one in four of the world’s population. This statistic is indicative of socio-economic change amid vast development in the way we communicate on a global scale. Communicating across cultures brings new challenges for foreign language teaching and learning; language course designers and textbook writers increasingly have to grapple with the cultural diversity of their ‘customers’. In appealing to a global audience, course materials published internationally can easily become culturally diluted.

Burns, Gollin and Joyce (1997: 72-3) point out that “if we believe that language learners need to be able to deal with the unpredictability of spoken language outside the classroom, then we need to introduce them to authentic texts in the security of the classroom”. Television and video have enormous potential for classroom use in this respect. Vanderplank (1996: 32) asserts that no teacher, no textbook, no classroom can provide the richness and variety of language, content, accent and culture that television can. Apart from providing a rich source of material for language development, the audio-visual medium also carries pragmatic richness, as to how a language is used as well as sociocultural information. This paper will examine the potential of television and video material as an exponent of pragmatics and sociocultural information in language learning. It is the contention of this paper that some of the pragmatic, social and situational norms of a language can be highlighted in the language classroom by using authentic television extracts from the target language as supplementary material. In so doing, learners can ultimately develop their awareness of *difference* across cultures.

Pragmatic information

Pragmatics is about distinguishing between what a speaker's words literally mean and what the speaker might mean by his words (Grundy 1995: 5) in that it deals with intended meaning. Within the framework of pragmatics, we can look beyond language at the level of grammar (syntax, semantics and phonology) and deal with how language users make sense of each other linguistically. By looking at language in this way, one can talk about speakers' intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes and the kinds of actions they are performing when they speak (Yule 1996: 4). It is worth noting that the study of language in use and its users is normally carried out in the context of native speakers (for an interesting discussion of this, see Thomas 1983:104). These speakers have, from an early age, become accustomed to the norms of using a language within a particular society. Take as an example the function of *thanking*, in Western English-speaking societies, children are normally taught to say *thank you* when they have been given something (see Aijmer 1996: 33-79). Yet this example would not be valid in the context of every language environment. In many societies, politeness can be expressed in ways other than saying *thank you*. For instance, the norm of politeness in English tells us that the utterance: *Could I have a cup of coffee, please* is more appropriate in a café than the utterance *I want a cup of coffee*, which would be interpreted, as rude. However, in many languages, the latter, more direct, form of request would be much more common and indeed, the polite English equivalent, when transferred into some languages, could even sound obsequious.

Thomas (1983: 106) asserts that cross-culturally two things may occur which appear to involve a fundamental conflict of values, but in fact stem from socio-pragmatic mismatches: (1) in different cultures, different pragmatic 'ground rules' may be invoked and (2) relative values such as 'politeness', perspicuousness, and so on may be ranked in different order by different cultures. Along the same lines, Aijmer (1996: 33) notes that even advanced learners of English have problems with *thanking* due in part to the idiomatic nature of the phrases used and "the socio-pragmatic constraints on their use...when one compares English with other languages, there are differences in whom one says *thank you* to, when one says *thank you*, the setting in which thanking is expected, etc." Communication can break down between a speaker and a hearer from two different discourse cultures just as it can sometimes break down between native speakers. Thomas (1983: 93) provides the following example where a native speaker misinterprets the pragmatic information:

A: *Is this coffee sugared?* [intended as a complaint]

B: *I don't think so. Does it taste as if it is?* [misinterpreted as a genuine request for information]

In face-to-face interaction, native speakers can normally *read* the signals as to what is required pragmatically. Take as an example the utterance: *Is that right?*, as native speakers of English, we can usually infer from a given context whether the utterance is being used to query the validity of new information or if it is simply facilitating the flow of a conversation (as a backchannel, an utterance used to show speakers' interest or surprise etc. and which does not seek to take over the speaking turn - see Yngve 1970). Knowing which act is being performed by an utterance normally comes naturally to native speakers because they have acquired pragmatic competence as they

acquired the language itself. In other words, they intuitively know the ground rules. Pragmatic failure on the part of a non-native speaker can lead to more than communication failure according to Thomas (1983: 97): “while grammatical errors may reveal a [non-native] speaker to be a less than proficient language user, pragmatic failure reflects badly on him/her as a person”.

Moving into a new language ‘territory’ turns up a pragmatic minefield for learners and dialogues that are found in foreign language course books cannot plausibly cover the vastness of pragmatic meaning which utterances can carry. For instance, most language courses begin with the function of introducing oneself to someone new, using, among other exponents: *Hello. How are you?*. However, in everyday usage, the same utterance often functions as a greeting rather than as a genuine request for health information. Indeed, in the absence of such pragmatic knowledge, a non-native speaker of English might reasonably infer that the speaker is being grossly insincere in asking the question *how are you?* without entertaining a reply. For language learners who wish to engage in face-to-face interaction with native speakers, it is essential that they have attained pragmatic competence in the target language. Gunn (1999: 17) refers to pragmatic competence as “the art of consistently using both an appropriate meaning and form in given social situations”. It will be argued that television clips can be used as a means of sensitising language learners to pragmatic information.

Sociocultural information

Within any discourse culture, speakers follow a large number of social rules. As in the case of pragmatic information, these conventions are nurtured from an early age in children, for instance, knowing when to use *tu* and *vous* in French, knowing not to blow your nose in public in Japan and so on. The factors governing our choice of language and our behaviour in social interaction are culture bound and problems arise when these norms are transferred to a new language environment. It is not difficult to see how cultural misunderstandings occur. Cohen (1996: 254) talks about sociocultural choices which he defines as the speaker’s ability to determine whether it is acceptable to perform a speech act in a given situation and, if so, to select a semantic formula that would be appropriate in the realisation of a given speech act. He provides the example of when a professor is given a small gift in a university setting: an American person would choose to thank the giver whereas a Japanese person would normally apologise for being unworthy. On a broader level, when this idea is extended to social behaviour, an error can cause great offence and compound negative stereotyping. In some cultures, for example, it is possible, in certain situations of ‘service encounter’ (see Aston 1988) such as a bar or café, to attract the attention of the person serving by whistling or hissing, while in other cultures, eye contact is the sole means of engagement. Obviously, to suggest that sociocultural components of a language can or should be taught is to enter the territory of linguistic imperialism. It is important, however, that foreign language learners gain an awareness of the sociocultural aspects of the language they are learning.

Audio visual material in language teaching

Tatsuki (1997: 13) describes video as an endless source of models of grammar structures, vocabulary, authentic discourse sequences and variety in pronunciation,

conversational register and dialects. Pearson (1988: 143) states that television offers an open window on the landscape and culture of the foreign country bringing the land alive and enabling the learner to see as well as hear the speaker. Further to this, one can add the “total situational matrix” (Rivers, 1964: 44): the external non-verbal context comprising facial expressions, gestures and associated objects and activities. Effective and systematic exploitation of selected video sequences could focus students’ awareness of these aspects of the target language beyond the literal verbal message. On this point, Willis (1983: 36) warns that if this is to be achieved, teachers need to have a clear understanding of the visual medium and how it interrelates with the aural medium of communication. The most comprehensive attempt to analyse this area systematically in terms of how it relates to language teaching can be found in Riley (1981). Riley sets out to examine how video can be used in the teaching of comprehension. In order to use video effectively, Riley believes the role of the audio-visual channel of communication in interaction must first be explored. Riley (1981) identifies six communicative functions of visually perceived aspects of interaction. These features are extremely useful categorisations when applied to television material. In terms of adapting television material for the language classroom, Riley’s work offers great insights into the non-verbal aspects of meaning.

Riley’s model

At this point, Riley’s communicative functions of the visually perceived aspects of interaction will be outlined and a suggestion will be made with each one as to how the function might be explored within a lesson so as to highlight the particular function for language learners. These suggestions do not constitute full lessons, in many cases they are basic strategies that can be incorporated into any lesson where video material is being used:

The deictic function

This refers to the way we point to people, physical places and objects in our conversational environment, e.g. Could you ask *him* to pass *that* book *there*... Language learners need to be exposed to language in an audio-visual context so as to prepare for the reality of face-to-face encounter. Language in interaction is not always explicit and it is often very allusive, especially when compared with the language used on language learning cassettes.

Classroom focus on deixis

One way of bringing overt focus to this area in the language classroom is to create a ‘deictic void’. This can be achieved by viewing a television clip without its visual component, simply by covering the screen. A clip involving speakers whose relationship is close, where the shared knowledge is high and where some goal, for example, cooking, putting up shelves and so on is involved, will yield a high level of deictic items (see McCarthy 1998: 32-47). As a follow up to explaining the concept of deixis to the class, a transcribed extract of the audio visual text could be explored. Students could be asked to identify deictic references and to consider the differences, if any, between deixis in their target language and their first language.

The interactional function

One of the main features of face-to-face interaction is the process by which speaking turns are negotiated. Riley reminds us that this is “almost exclusively regulated by visually perceived non-verbal communication” (Riley 1981: 148). Gaze, posture, orientation and gesture are used in this negotiation of who speaks when and to whom. Duncan and Niedereche (1974: 234) refer to *turn yielding signals* (TYS) which are displayed at points where the person who is listening might want to begin to speak. In their analysis of two-person face-to-face conversations, they found that in 92 per cent of cases where the TYS existed, the turn passed smoothly. The subtle differences in the way turns are negotiated across languages can be explored through television material.

Classroom focus on the interactional function

The exponents of the interactional function, the non-verbal process of negotiating speaker turns, may be examined in terms of how gaze, posture, orientation and gesture operate in a scene containing a business meeting, a political debate or a group discussion etc. This could be compared with less formal settings where friends are chatting or where a family is gathered. Speakers could be numbered on a grid and students could be asked to note how speakers signal that they want to speak next. Looking at the speaker-relationships of the participants could be fruitful here since it may have a bearing not only on who speaks when and to whom, but also on how turns are negotiated in terms of level of formality. In comparative terms, it may be discussed how in some languages the non-verbal processes of turn-taking can be more aggressive than in other languages. Hierarchical aspects of turn-taking may be relevant to some language learners, where power and status strongly influence the process (some of the verbal aspects of turn-taking will be addressed in a subsequent section).

The modal function

This involves the non-verbal means by which we show commitment to the literal meaning of an utterance: a cynical smirk, a sympathetic smile or a dismissive shrug. This area can be highly problematic as one crosses from one discourse culture to another. In some societies, for example, a smile is used to accompany profuse apology while, in other cultures, smiling while apologising negates the sincerity of the verbal message. It is also interesting to consider the area of ‘deadpan’ humour where facial expression, or lack of it, is an essential part of the genre. In this case, when the subtle facial expression is missed and the sentence is taken literally, it can be highly confusing for the non-native participant in a conversation.

Classroom focus on the modal function

Examining the non-verbal means by which speakers show their commitment to the literal meaning of what they say involves looking at a video clip in micro-detail and so it is wise to select one or two utterances within a longer stretch of discourse. Subtle facial expressions and gestures serve as exponents in what Riley terms the Modal Function. The nuance carried by such facial expressions is closely tied to intended meaning and so students can focus on what particular facial expressions might mean, based on the non-verbal information as an extra dimension to the literal meaning of an utterance. Choose a suitable utterance and show it initially without the sound.

Encourage students to guess what the facial expression might mean based on the non-verbal information, then introduce what the speaker actually says and explore the intended meaning. Obviously, this strategy is best suited to material which highlights the ambiguity between the literal meaning of the utterance and the visual message signalled by non-verbal exponents such as facial expression, shoulder shrugging and smiling etc. Instances of sarcasm and humour could be chosen, especially with advanced levels. It is often only possible to gauge sarcasm, humour and irony from facial expression. Checking predictions encourages language learners to develop very subtle awareness of the nuances of non-verbal communication which can often be missed, even at very advanced levels.

The indexical function

This refers to the information communicated about a speaker's emotional state, age, social class, ethnic group, nationality and so on. The function communicates clues about the identity and frame of mind of the speaker in an interaction. These signals are very often misinterpreted from one culture to another, for example, the significance in some cultures of having a particular hairstyle or wearing certain clothing.

Classroom focus on the indexical function

The Indexical Function can be explored with most video material simply by asking students to make predictions about speakers' ages, emotional states, occupations, social classes, nationalities, ethnic groups and so on. In doing this, students will quite naturally draw on their own cultural framework when they try to create a character profile. Through focused discussion in the classroom, their 'judgements' about characters may reveal some interesting cultural differences since the indices on which we form our opinions may be coded quite differently across cultures.

The linguistic function

Here Riley classifies systematic gestures into four categories:

- Emblems (verbal substitutes, e.g., *OK* sign, *V* sign, thumbs up etc.);
- Illustrators (used to show the propositional content of the message, e.g., *It was at least this wide*);
- Enactions (gestures which add to the illocutionary force of the message, e.g., beckoning gesture which could accompany the utterance *Come here at once*) and
- Batons (usually head and hand movements in time with the stress, rhythm and tempo of the utterance).

Classroom focus on gestures

When using video in the language classroom, opportunities to focus on the meaning of different gestures should not be missed. Take, for example, the simple act of shrugging one's shoulders: in English, this functions either on its own as an *emblem* or verbal surrogate for *I don't know* or as an *enaction* adding to the illocutionary force of the verbal message *I don't know*. However, its use may differ in other languages, and as a classroom task, it is very interesting to explore gestures in this comparative way.

The situational function

The Situational Function refers to a macro-category encompassing everything from signs and buildings to behaviour in a given setting, for example, the setting and behaviour in a bank, an examination hall, at a bus stop or a supermarket - all of which are culturally coded. A sign saying *No Standing Anytime* on a New York sidewalk to mark an area where a driver cannot stop even temporarily in a car can be as confusing as an *L* plate on a car to signify a learner driver. Our expectation of what happens in public or institutional settings in our own society is not universally transferable. Riley (1981: 153) remarks:

Banks, churches and examination halls are all places where an Englishman's behaviour becomes formal, reverential and hushed: but when one looks at, say, banks in the Middle East, churches in Italy or examination halls in France, it soon becomes obvious that this is not an immutable law of nature, merely a cultural choice.

Classroom focus on situational functions

The situational function of most television material can be highlighted by overt comparison to the first language equivalent. The signs, symbols and behaviours associated with a situation can be compared and discussed with a view to sensitising language learners to the notion of difference.

Face-to-face interaction

Within the framework thus elaborated, the question remains as to how television and video can be exploited in language teaching and learning so as to raise awareness of the pragmatic and sociocultural pitfalls of verbal face-to-face interaction that might await a language learner. In this section, two areas will be examined. The procedures outlined do not necessarily correspond to complete language lessons; they are offered as prototypes, which can either be built upon, or which can be integrated into existing lessons. In reality, any class will be guided by the actual video or television clip chosen by the learner or the teacher, based on 'local' needs and learning conditions. It is hoped, however, that these suggestions are flexible enough to be adaptable to different languages, learning situations and different television material.

In each case, the teacher needs to focus the task by providing explanations or background as appropriate. This raises issues in terms of native versus non-native teachers of a foreign language which I will return to in the discussion that follows this section. The two areas that will be explored are (1) the verbal aspects of turn negotiation and (2) speech acts and sociocultural choices. These areas are seen as fundamental to successful face-to-face interaction in that they are the most likely sources of sociopragmatic failure as defined by Thomas (1983: 103)

Verbal aspects of turn negotiation

Duncan and Niederehe (1974: 234) cite Goffman's (1955) insight that in any society whenever the physical possibility of spoken interaction arises, it seems that a system

of practices, conventions and procedural rules come into play which guides and organises the flow of messages. So while turn taking might be universal, the system within which it is manifested may be culturally-specific. In its broadest sense, turn-taking could also include turn-avoiding, that is, when a speaker wishes to maintain the flow of the conversation without taking over the turn. This is often achieved verbally through backchannels. Tottie (1991: 255) explains backchannels as “the sounds (and gestures) made in conversation by the current non-speaker, which grease the wheels of the conversation but constitute no claim to take over the turn”. Backchannels can include such items as *yeah, oh, right, mm hm* and so on. Gardner (1998: 204-24) argues strongly for the importance of addressing backchannels (also referred to as minimal response or receipt tokens) in the teaching of conversational skills. He says that “if language teaching is to prepare learners to talk in the real world, then part of that preparation would need to take into account participation in interactive talk that involves these very common vocalisations” (Gardner, 1998: 204). Research has shown that each response has at least one distinct function; they provide important feedback to the speaker about how their message is received and so influence the path of the conversation (see Schegloff 1981). By using video clips, backchannels can be examined in both verbal and non-verbal forms. Potential for pragmatic errors at this level is high, especially when substituting a token from one’s first language could have the wrong effect on the course of the conversation. Take, for example, news marking items such as *Really* and *You’re not serious*, if translated, they run the risk of being interpreted as challenges to the validity of the message rather than as backchannels.

To focus on backchannelling in the classroom, isolate a suitable clip involving informal conversation, for example two friends chatting. Transcribe the dialogue leaving out the backchannels. The items that have been omitted from the transcript are placed on the whiteboard. Having introduced and developed the notion of backchannelling and having supplied different examples to the class, divide the class into groups and ask students to categorise these backchannels in terms of how they function (as agreeers, continuers, news markers, evaluators, clarification seekers etc.). Monitor the progress of the groups and gather whole class feedback. Eventually, distribute the transcript and ask students to predict where each of the tokens will be used in the dialogue. Play the clip at least twice so that students can check and alter their predictions if necessary.

It is important to examine backchannels in the context of equivalent forms in the learner’s first language. Through this reflective and comparative process, pragmatic problems can be unearthed. Thomas (1983: 101) offers an interesting discussion of the “pragmatically inappropriate transfer of semantically/syntactically equivalent structures”. She gives the example of *of course*, which in Russian is often used to mean *yes* to convey an enthusiastic affirmative similar to *yes indeed*. In English *of course* is often used when something is self-evident, so the following inappropriate transfer might result between Russian and English:

A: *It’s so cold today, isn’t it?*
B: *Of course.*

Without pragmatic competence in this area, non-native speakers of a language may be compromised in face-to-face interaction with a native speaker. The potential for

misunderstanding or misrepresentation in a real time conversation is enormous as Thomas' example from Russian clearly illustrates.

Focusing on speech acts and sociocultural choices

As mentioned earlier, Cohen (1996: 254) defines sociocultural choices as the speaker's ability to figure out whether it is acceptable to perform a speech act in a given situation and, if so, to choose an utterance that is appropriate in the realisation of a given speech act. Television and video can help greatly in preparing students in this respect. By isolating clips containing speech acts, transcribing them and then taking out certain lines of the segment that contain the speech act or part of it, one can set as a task: predicting what is said next. Take, for example, a scene where someone answers the phone; the generic sequence of what happens when the telephone is answered varies from culture to culture. In some cultures, rigorous self-identification is the normal response to a ringing telephone, for example, in Dutch, *This is Tom* is typical of an answerer's immediate response on picking up the phone (see Houtkoop-Steenstra (1991) for a comparison between American and Dutch opening sequences in telephone conversations).

Other areas that can be explored here are complimenting and apologising. Find a sequence where, for example, complimenting takes place, transcribe it and leave out the utterance that comes immediately after the compliment. Ask students, in pairs or in groups, to write some possible utterances which might follow the compliment. This activity should reveal what the students expect will happen next based on their native language pragmatic norms. For some, an apology should follow a compliment while for others, an utterance giving thanks will sound more appropriate (this idea is based on Cohen 1996).

Mey (1993: 153) points to intercultural difference that can arise in relation to the force of a speech act verb. He gives the example of when Americans want to draw their interlocutor's attention to the fact that they has been misunderstood, they may try to clear up the misunderstanding using a speech act of 'self-correcting': *I'm afraid I didn't express myself too clearly*. Mey compares this with what French speakers might say in a similar situation: *Mais vous ne comprenez pas!* (literally, 'But you don't understand'). Though both utterances represent the same underlying intention of setting a misunderstanding straight, they differ in how they approach it. In (American) English, speakers pre-empt causing face threat by blaming themselves whereas the Frenchman "goes 'bald on record' as stating the fact of misunderstanding" (Mey 1993: 154). Cohen's strategy of exploring speech acts could be adapted and extended here also. Not only could television excerpts be used to focus on sequencing aspects of speech acts, but also to unearth how similar intended meanings manifest differently across languages and cultures.

Problems and issues

Having explored some of the applications of television material for awareness raising in the area of pragmatic and sociocultural difference, we cannot ignore the validity of the criticism that not all language students will need to use a foreign language in face-to-face interaction with a native speaker. This is especially relevant in the case of English as a foreign language as the potential for 'linguistic' and, by extension,

'cultural imperialism' is a plausible one. Even though English is so widely spoken globally, it does not give it a *de jure* position among languages and we cannot assume that all learners, or indeed any learner, would wish to reject their first language pragmatic and sociocultural norms when they speak a foreign language. This paper is not advocating this notion. Nor is it attempting to undermine non-native teachers of foreign languages. Television material is relatively easy for language teachers to attain and offers native and non-native teachers access to language in use outside of a native speaking environment. Such pragmatically and socioculturally rich and diverse material cannot be conjured up from textbooks.

Albeit a vicarious experience, 'seeing' language in use on television, gives language students a view of what native speakers *do* when they speak. They get an opportunity to see face-to-face interaction *in situ*, and they are thus in a position to see how their first language and their target language differ pragmatically and socioculturally. Television is pervasive in our lives and it is my contention that for teachers and learners it has vast potential for bringing issues of language and culture into the classroom. Pragmatic and sociocultural aspects of a language as discussed in this paper are not discrete items, which can be packaged, taught and evaluated. A teacher cannot readily measure what has been 'learnt' as in the case of grammatical items and we must accept that learners have every right to reject certain norms which they observe in the foreign language. But what is important is that we acknowledge that different norms exist in the pursuit of intercultural understanding. Byram (1999: 18) describes the "intercultural speaker" as someone who needs "multilingual competence; sensitivity to the identities present in intercultural and cross-frontier interaction; an ability to mediate/relate own and other cultures with 'intercultural competence' i.e. a communicative competence... complemented by 'intercultural competence' ". As pre-conditions to intercultural competence, Byram lists the following: *Attitude*: the ability to relativise self and value other; *Knowledge*: of one's own and other behaviours, beliefs and values, of how intercultural interaction works.

Conclusion

Television is by no means the panacea for modern language teaching, but it has great potential. It is hoped that this paper has provided some insights into how this type of material can be used beyond the level of listening comprehension. Television and video material originally designed for native speakers can offer foreign language students an authentic language experience on many levels. It will put the learner into a situation that demands native-speaker-like comprehension. Dealing with the pragmatic and sociocultural content of the material brings many challenges for both language teachers and language students. Overall, the material can provide an instructive bridge between viewing interaction in a foreign language environment and actual interaction in a foreign language environment. At a minimum, television is extremely motivating and not only provides visual information and stimuli to make learning more memorable, it brings foreign language interaction in context into the classroom allowing it to be examined at levels which go beyond language into conversational, pragmatic and sociocultural norms.

References

Aijmer, K. (1996) *Conversational Routines in English – Convention and Creativity*, London: Longman

Aston, G. (1988). *Negotiating Service: Studies in the Discourse of Bookshop Encounters*, Bologna: Editrice CLUEB.

Burns, A, Gollin, S and H. Joyce (1997). “Authentic Spoken Texts in the Language Classroom”, *Prospect* 12/2: 72-86.

Byram, M. (1999). “Developing the Intercultural Speaker for International Communication” in: *Intercultural Communication and Language Learning*, Chambers A. and D. P. Ó Baoill (eds.), 17-36, Dublin: Irish Association of Applied Linguistics.

Cohen, A. (1996). “Developing the Ability to Perform Speech Acts”, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18: 253-67.

Crystal, D. (2000) “Emerging Englishes” *English Teaching Professional*, 14: 3-6.

Duncan, S. and G. Niederehe, (1974) “On Signalling That It’s Your Turn to Speak” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10: 234-47

Gardner, R. (1998). “Between Speaking and Listening: the Vocalisation of Understandings”, *Applied Linguistics*, 19/2: 204-24.

Grundy, P. (1995). *Doing Pragmatics*, London: Edward Arnold.

Gunn, C. (1999). “An attempt to Test Sociolinguistic Competence in a Grade 6 ESL Classroom”, *IATEFL Issues*, 146: 17-8.

Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1991). “Opening Sequences in Dutch Telephone Conversations”, in: *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*, D. Boden and D. Zimmerman (eds.), 232-50, Oxford: Polity Press.

Hyde, M. (1998). “Intercultural Competence in English Language Education”, *Modern English Teacher*, 7/2: 7-11.

McCarthy, M.J. (1998). *Spoken Language and Applied Linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mey, J.L. (1993). *Pragmatics - An introduction* , Oxford: Blackwell.

Pearson, J.A., (1988). “Satellite Dish Well Worth the Cost”, *The British Journal of Language Teaching*, 26/3: 143-4.

Riley, P. (1981). “Viewing Comprehension ‘L’oeil écoute’ ”, in: *The Teaching of Listening Comprehension*, 143-55, London: The British Council.

- Rivers, W. (1964). *The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1981). "Discourse as an Interactional Achievement: Some Uses of 'Uh Huh' and Other Things that Come between Sentences", in *Analysing Discourse: Text and Talk*, D.Tannen (ed.), 71-93, Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Tatsuki, D. (1997). "Video in Curriculum Design", *IATEFL Newsletter*, 138: 13.
- Thomas, J. (1983). "Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure", *Applied Linguistics*, 4/2: 91-112
- Tottie, G. (1991). "Conversational Style in British and American English: the Case of Backchannels", in: *English Corpus Linguistics*, K. Aijmer and B. Altenberg (eds.), 254-71, London: Longman.
- Vanderplank (1996). "Really Active Viewing with Teletext Subtitles and Closed Captions", *Modern English Teacher*, 5/2: 32-7.
- Willis, J. (1983). "The Role of the Visual Element in Spoken Discourse: Implications for the Exploitation Of Video In The EFL Classroom", in: *Video Applications in Language Teaching*, J. McGovern, (ed.), 29-42, Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Yngve, V. H. (1970). "On Getting a Word in Edgeways", in: *Papers in the 6th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, April 16-18, 567-77, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.