Title

Creating a Social Context Through Film: Teaching L2 Pragmatics as a Locally Situated Process

Permalink

Journal

Author

Abrams, Zsuzsanna

Publication Date

2016

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

Creating a Social Context Through Film: Teaching L2 Pragmatics as a Locally Situated Process

ZSUZSANNA ABRAMS

University of California, Santa Cruz
E-mail: zabrams1@ucsc.edu

Pragmatics is an underrepresented area in L2 instruction, in spite of disciplinary emphasis on communicative skills (de Pablos-Ortega, 2011; Eisenchlas, 2011). Films have been shown to be capable of mitigating this lack of pedagogically prepared materials (Abrams, 2014; Kambara, 2011; Fernández-Guerra, 2008; Grant & Starks, 2001; Washburn, 2001), and may provide scaffolding for teaching pragmatics as a dynamic, context-dependent phenomenon. In line with current research in pragmatics, wherein participants' motivations, communicative purpose, and social context play significant roles in communication (Boxer, 2002; Kecskés, 2006, 2012; LoCastro, 2011; Scollon & Wong-Scollon, 2003), the present study compares how authentic filmic materials—in contrast with textbook models—help participants develop pragmatic skills that reflect a locally contextualized, emergent view of interaction. Collaborative dialogues of thirty first-year learners of German at a U.S. university were analyzed using interactional sociolinguistics (Piazza, Bednarek, & Rossi, 2011; Tannen, 2005, 2006). Results indicate that film-based dialogues prompted more pragmatically nuanced interactions than did textbook tasks.

_____

INTRODUCTION

Kecskés (2012) highlights several key aspects of pragmatic skills needed for intercultural communication. First, linguistic features index different attitudes and social relationships between participants; one aspect of learning a second language (L2) consists of figuring out *appropriate* social behavior through language. That is, learners need to become aware of different ways of expressing ideas, as well as the social meaning these pragmatic choices may imply in various interaction with other speakers of the L2 (cf. Culpeper, Marti, Mei, Nevala, & Schauer, 2010; Kecskés, 2012; Mills, 2009). Second, Kecskés points to the dynamic nature of interaction, whereby communication is "achieved jointly through the dynamic emergence of meaning in conversation" (p. 600). In other words, interactions are collaboratively produced in an interpersonal, social context. This view, Kecskés notes, runs counter to much of the cognitively-oriented research on L2 pragmatics, which has focused on how successfully L2 learners have produced and understood L2 speech acts compared to native speaker "norms."

Guided by Kecskés's work, the present study aims to address two gaps in the extant research: First, it responds to the lack of knowledge about beginning L2 learners or learners of *foreign* languages (i.e., an L2 not spoken in the broader social context); much of the existing L2 pragmatic scholarship focuses on advanced learners of English as a second language and, consequently, comparatively little is known about learners of other languages. Second, few studies investigate pragmatics as locally contextualized interaction in L2 instruction. In order to contextualize the present study, I first review research on L2

pragmatics and the use of films to facilitate its development. This research serves as the basis for the subsequent examination of whether and how beginning learners of German can use authentic filmic materials to learn pragmatic features of the L2, which textbook models do not sufficiently foster.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF L2 PRAGMATICS

Previous research on L2 pragmatics in classroom contexts has predominantly focused on teaching L2 learners high-frequency, high-stakes and socially important speech acts (Cohen, 2005), and has examined the extent to which learners can approximate native speakers "norms" in their use (Jeon & Kaya, 2006), yielding several important observations. First, the ability to approximate L2 speech acts seems to depend on variables such as length of residence in the target culture, learners' proficiency, and the learning environment, and not just on instruction (Alcón Soler, 2008). Second, explicit and metapragmatic instruction has been found to be more successful in developing pragmatic knowledge than implicit instruction (Alcón Soler, 2008; Cohen, 2005; Halenko & Jones, 2011). Koike and Pearson (2005), however, noted that the pedagogical focus might have transferred differently in different contexts. That is, the authors found that explicit instruction seemed to improve performance on pragmatic judgment tasks, but implicit instruction was more beneficial for pragmatic production on open-ended dialog tasks. Third, pragmatic development appears to follow observable patterns: in the beginning, learners rely heavily on simple, unanalyzed formulaic units (e.g., "thank you"/"can you, please…"), and then move on to increasingly complex forms of nuanced, multifunctional language use (Bardovi-Harlig, 2009; Kasper & Rose, 2001).

As important as pragmatic knowledge—a central tenet of communicative L2 pedagogy—is for successful communication, it remains neglected in L2 textbooks (de Pablos-Ortega, 2011; Eisenchlas, 2011). To the limited degree that pragmatics is addressed, there tends to be a mismatch between natural language use and textbook examples, which are frequently "essentialist, static, and monolithic" representations of the L2 and its surrounding cultures, where one grammatical form is often equated with one pragmatic function (e.g., politeness is expressed with *bitte* [please] in German) and only standard speech is featured (Eisenchlas, 2011, p. 52). These examples do not reflect the variety (e.g., in register, dialect, humor, or politeness) present in authentic language (Mills, 2011). It is difficult to compensate for this failure in FL contexts (de Pablos-Ortega, 2011; Kallia, 2005), but a process-approach to teaching L2 pragmatics may offer a partial solution (Abrams, 2014; Cohen, 2005; Davies, 2004; Jeon & Kaya, 2006).

A PROCESS-ORIENTED PRAGMATICS PEDAGOGY

A process-oriented approach to teaching L2 pragmatics draws on research that acknowledges the important role of individuals' prior experiences, both in the personal and the cultural domains, which help them determine what is appropriate or how what they say in particular situations may be perceived by interlocutors (Boxer, 2002; Kecskés, 2006, 2012; LoCastro, 2011; Mills, 2009). Words, expressions, speech styles, and language choices are closely linked to individual experiences and significantly contribute to interactions, which are viewed as dynamic, situation-specific, locally contextualized processes, created and filtered

by both linguistic and extralinguistic factors (Kecskés, 2010). This perspective can fundamentally reshape L2 pragmatics instruction, moving from a cognitive to sociocognitive orientation, whereby learning is seen as a socially situated—and not merely an individual—process (Kecskés, 2012).

Several tenets are central to a process-oriented pragmatics pedagogy. Most importantly, learners need to be made aware of the fact that there is no single mapping of linguistic form onto pragmatic meaning and that language use varies both across speakers and even in the speech of an individual speaker. That is, native speakers do not all use the same speech acts (e.g., greetings, leave-taking sequences, requests) to perform a given pragmatic function, nor will the same native speaker necessarily use the same expressions to express an idea at different moments in time (Cohen, 2005). Politeness and impoliteness are also expressed in diverse ways—for example, with the use of downgraders, intensifiers, terms of address, register choice, etc.—and need to be analyzed in context, since what one person may perceive as rude, another may interpret as a joke due to the specific social situation (e.g., the participants, setting, purpose of interaction, etc.) in which it takes place (Mills, 2009). By observing interaction *in situ*, learners can come to avoid stereotyped thinking and understand communication as a collaborative, interpersonal act, greatly dependent upon specific participants situated in a particular, local, dynamic context (Culpeper et al., 2010; Spencer-Oatey, 2002).

In a related vein, it is important to help learners realize that there is no single norm—a perceived standard form that is often based on idealized native speakers (Lippi-Green, 2012)—towards which they should aspire (Mills, 2011). Instead, a broad spectrum of language varieties, speakers, social roles, and communicative purposes should be modeled so that learners can then make *choices* for their own interactions. Authentic materials can model consequences for flouting expected behavior in various social situations (i.e., the same behavior may be acceptable or disruptive, depending on the interlocutors and interactional goals). Additionally, learners' own personal histories and local contexts of communication (e.g., the purpose of an interaction) need to be acknowledged. This is a crucial component of L2 learning, since college-aged learners might not only bring interactional skills from their L1, but also may wish to make informed choices about adopting or rejecting L2 practices in communication (Barron, 2005; Kallia, 2005; Washburn, 2001).

In order to model sufficiently contextualized interactions, varied speech acts (e.g., different forms of greetings or leave-taking, as well as expressions of politeness and impoliteness, such as downgraders, intensifiers, hedges, slang) must be modeled through discourse-length, authentic, naturalistic data, which presents language as situated interaction, as a dynamic, "moment-to-moment … emergent process" (Davies, 2004, pp. 210–211).

Two essential questions for a process-oriented pragmatics pedagogy remain: When and how can L2 learners, especially in a foreign language setting, access sufficient pragmatic input—that is, analyze authentic, discourse-length and naturalistic discourse—so that they can begin to incorporate pragmatic features into their own L2 use. While most research focuses on the pragmatic development of advanced L2 learners (Jeon & Kaya, 2006), Dewaele (2008) and Abrams (2014) advocate for earlier intervention, when pragmatic features of the L2 can serve as important strategies for communication maintenance. Films have been shown to serve as potentially useful sources for pragmatic analysis, especially in instructed foreign language contexts, where spontaneous opportunities for interacting with a wide variety of interlocutors and performing a wide variety of participant roles is limited at best (Abrams, 2014; Washburn, 2001).

USING FILM TO TEACH L2 PRAGMATIC SKILLS

Films, which comprise a regular staple of L2 classrooms, are typically interesting and motivating for L2 learners; they have been used to teach literature, cultural studies, and general language skills (Goldstein, 2010; Kaiser & Shibahara, 2014; Kambara, 2011; Tognozzi, 2010; Washburn, 2001). They can serve as a potential resource for teaching L2 pragmatics as well (Abrams, 2014; Grant & Starks, 2001), offering realistic pragmalinguistic modeling for complimenting behavior (Rose, 2001), closing sequences (Grant & Starks, 2001), requests (Fernández-Guerra, 2008), and multi-speaker interactions with pragmatic feedback (Washburn, 2001). Additionally, films can provide adequate and varied language samples/models/examples, capturing a wider array of authentic interactional settings and roles than any individual may be able to collect by him/herself (Grant & Starks, 2001). However, filmic materials need to be selected with care, since various sources model diverse pragmatic practices; for example, a drama depicting 18th century England would illustrate/depict different social roles and pragmatic functions than a modern sitcom full of colloquial banter among young people.

   It is also important to note that films are layered products, interpreted by the actors, director, editor(s) and screenplay writers. While "good" films allow "native speakers [to] suspend disbelief and accept the language as real" (Kaiser, 2009) and represent at least some linguistically normative behavior, since viewers would otherwise not be able to understand them (Grant & Starks, 2001; Kaiser & Shibahara, 2014; Saville-Troike, 2003), they should be used as analytic springboards and not as fully realistic language models. At the same time, while these scripted texts may not contain certain aspects of natural discourse (e.g., hesitations, pauses, slips of the tongue, or incomplete sentences), they may be more helpful for L2 learners—especially at the beginning stages—than completely authentic input, which can go off on tangents and may be presented with variable audio or video quality (Grant & Starks, 2001). Most importantly, though, scripts can provide extended discourse in a social context, consequently offering insights into the local contextualization of interaction. Several studies have utilized these characteristics of film to teach L2 pragmatics (Abrams, 2014; Fernández-Guerra, 2008; Grant & Starks, 2001; Washburn, 2001). Building on this research, the present study explored the use of two film sources to teach pragmatics in a first-year German language course.

THE PRESENT STUDY

Theoretical Framework

Current research on sociopragmatics and politeness provides both the pedagogical and methodological framework for the present study (Kecskés, 2012; LoCastro, 2011). Accordingly, learners' attention was drawn to pragmalinguistic (concerning the effects of language form on meaning) and sociopragmatic (concerning the adaptation of language form in accordance with situational factors) features of German via discourse-length data, contained in an episode of a German television series and a feature film, sources of realistic interactional input (Grant & Starks, 2001; Saville-Troike, 2003). Learners examined the characters' personalities and motivations, the purpose of interactions, and the social roles

that participants performed in them (cf. Mills, 2009), with a primary focus on how these aspects of communication were expressed linguistically.

Learners' subsequent dialogues were analyzed to examine whether and how they reflected contextually meaningful language (Kecskés, 2012; Piazza, Bednarek, & Rossi, 2011; Tannen, 2005, 2006). An additional theoretical and methodological underpinning to the study came from research on communicative synergy, where communication is understood as a socially situated, interpersonal system that draws on participants' ability to coordinate their interactions (Fusaroli, Rączaszek-Leonardi, & Tylén, 2014; Mills, 2014). Accordingly, learner dialogues were also examined for linguistic features of communicative synergy, including echoing (i.e., the direct repetition of lexical or grammatical structures). This feature is particularly predominant in situations where participants have limited contextual cues to draw on shared schemata (Mills, 2014), a common situation among beginning L2 learners. With these related conceptual and methodological frameworks in mind, the present article sought to answer the following research questions:

1. In what ways can films help beginning L2 learners develop pragmatic skills in the L2 that reflect diverse, locally constructed interactions?
2. What can collaboratively written dialogues reveal about the nature of beginning L2 learners' pragmatic knowledge?

Participants

Thirty first-year learners of German at a U.S. university participated in this study. While the participants had not taken a proficiency exam as part of this course, their proficiency can be described as ranging from novice-high to intermediate-mid on the ACTFL (2012) scale in most skills. Ten participants reported being multilingual (with languages including Spanish, Italian, Russian, Assyrian, Brazilian Portuguese, and Dutch), but most learners were native speakers of American English. Their majors included literature, information technology, engineering, economics, and natural sciences. None of the learners were taking the course as a requirement, and a majority of them intended to visit Germany, Austria, and Switzerland at some point through study abroad, internships, or travel.

Data Collection and Analysis

For the first task, participants completed a textbook activity in pairs, modeled after a dialog in which a traveler complains about his hotel room. Next, over a four-day period, participants watched an episode of the German detective show *Die Rosenheim-Cops: Das mysteriöse Geräusch* (Barthel, 2015; The Rosenheim-Cops: The mystery sound), completing tasks intended to help them understand the plot, as well as analyze the characters, the varied social roles they played in different interactions, the relationships between them, and the spaces in which communication occurred (e.g., at home, in an interrogation room, etc.). Relying on a full transcript of the episode, learners worked in small groups to analyze how characters realized pragmatic functions in various social contexts. For this dialog task, learners developed a scene from the episode in which one character had to resolve an issue at a hotel during her vacation. The structure was similar to all other tasks: two participants attempting to resolve a problem. The third dialog was also based on a textbook exercise: a

conversation between a career counselor and a student, with divergent expectations for the student's future career. Finally, in weeks nine and ten, participants watched a feature film, *Im Juli* (2000; In July), with English subtitles and conducted modified ethnographic analyses of the characters, communicative spaces, and interactional purposes, with an emphasis on pragmatic features. Subsequently, two students taking on the role of characters from the film had to resolve a problem based on a scene in the movie (see Table 1 for an overview of all tasks).

Table 1
Summary of Data Collection Tasks

Week of Instruction	Pedagogical Resource	Situation Specifics	Linguistic Material
week 4	textbook exercise	• Traveling: a problem arises at a hotel between two travelers or a traveler and a manager	• Vocabulary and discourse modeling from the textbook
week 6 (the day after the film screening)	*Die Rosenheim-Cops: Das mysteriöse Geräusch*	• Winning a spa weekend: two characters encounter a problem at the hotel; conversation among the guests or between the guests and the manager	• Findings from modified ethnographic analysis performed in groups; vocabulary and character information from notes and transcripts
week 7	textbook exercise	• Getting advice from a career counselor: participants (e.g., applicant and advisor) discuss a job search, disagree on the job, and negotiate a solution	• Findings from modified ethnographic linguistic analysis of *Rosenheim-Cops*; vocabulary and discourse modeling from the textbook
week 10 (the day after the film screening)	*Im Juli*	• Traveling: a participant's passport was stolen en route to Turkey; he or she has to cross the border, but the customs officer is not accommodating	• Findings from modified ethnographic (linguistic?) analysis of *Im Juli*; vocabulary and content information from notes and worksheets

Students worked in the same pairs throughout the term. Four students' work was excluded from the analysis due to absences. Pairs had 15 minutes to write each dialog, which was then performed in front of the class; the transcripts were submitted to the instructor/researcher. While the capacity to create written dialogues cannot be equated with the ability to participate in spontaneous exchanges, the development of written conversations constitutes an established data-collection methodology (Alcón Soler, 2008).

Input Sources: *Rosenheim-Cops* and *Im Juli*

Rosenheim-Cops, a television show set in Bavaria and with a steady cast of characters in each weekly episode, served as the first filmic input source (the textbook served, in theory, as the first input source). Four characteristics of this series made it ideal for language teaching: 1) It is available at no cost over the Internet, 2) the language is interactive and useful for student-aged populations (including technology-related terms such as 'uploading and downloading files' and 'leaving messages on a cell-phone'), 3) the show has German subtitles, allowing viewers to watch and read interactions simultaneously (The subtitles were truncated, however; for example, characters used the conversational past, but the text was in the simple past, and greetings and terms of address were often omitted. Since these features are crucial for analyzing interpersonal interactions, a full transcript was prepared and shared with participants for instructional purposes.), and 4) several (recurring and novel) social and participant roles are depicted in each episode.

The second authentic resource was a feature film, *Im Juli* (Akin, 2000; In July), selected because its main topic, traveling, coincided with the thematic focus of several chapters in the textbook. In addition, it shared several features with *Rosenheim-Cops*: the language is interactive and places the main characters—who are similar in age to the study's participants—in real-world, albeit not everyday, situations. Each film was broken into shorter segments to facilitate comprehension.

Pedagogical Preparation: Modified Ethnographic Analyses

According to Saville-Troike (2003), ethnography, which has emerged out of the field of anthropology, is a way of examining the relationship between cultural practices and language codes. The researcher notes that discourse patterns represent culturally specific ways of speaking, where patterns can be determined at three levels: 1) society (e.g., speech functions, categories of talk), 2) group (e.g., gender, age, social status, geographic region) or 3) individual (e.g., emotional state, the purpose of interaction). The analysis of communication, in turn, identifies a community's inherent (or explicit) patterns of interaction in a situation, event, or act (Hymes, 1972). Saville-Troike describes a communicative situation as "the context within which communication occurs," the event as "the basic unit for descriptive purposes," and the act as the "interaction function," such as a command, a greeting, or a request (pp. 23–24). Hymes's analytic model (cited in Saville-Troike, 2003, pp. 110–111) recognizes eleven salient components of communicative events:

1. genre: the type of communicative event, such as greetings or narration
2. topic: the content that the communicative event is about
3. purpose: the objectives the participants want to accomplish during or with the interaction
4. setting: the location and context in which the event takes place
5. key: the tone of the event, for example, whether it is humorous or serious
6. participants: the age, gender or profession of the interactants, as well as pertinent relationships between them, such as friendship
7. message form: the type of communication the participants engage in, including verbal and nonverbal channels
8. message content: the referential information exchanged by interactants

9. act sequence: what steps the participants take during the interaction, such as turn-taking, collaborative or competitive overlap
10. rules for interaction: shared interactional expectations
11. norms of interpretation: shared knowledge for understanding the purpose and structure of interaction.

While a first-year language classroom is not conducive to extensive observation and investigation of culturally bound communicative patterns, this model can serve as a useful tool for modified ethnographic analysis of filmic materials. On the one hand, students (and instructors) must understand that films reflect a fictional reality, filtered through screenplay writers, directors, actors, and editors. On the other hand, however, learners should recognize that these individuals rely on culturally patterned communication to encode their message. If this were otherwise, the audience would not be able to decode it (Grant & Starks, 2001; Saville-Troike, 2003).

Within this theoretical context, participants were presented with Hymes's model in English. The entire class came up with examples for each category to clarify what the eleven components meant, and learners shared examples from their own interactions, exploring how interpersonal communication is co-created by participants within specific social situations. Some issues that arose included shared rules for joking (i.e., with whom students can joke, when, and how), politeness, and expressions of authority. Afterwards, while watching the films, students worked in groups of three or four to analyze various pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features identified in the transcripts. To help focus learners' attention, groups were asked to point out/look for greetings and terms of address, intensifiers (i.e., phrases, words, expressions that *intensify* a statement) and downgraders (i.e., phrases, words, expressions that *soften* a statement), backchanneling devices (e.g., sounds, expressions with which speakers signal each other that they are paying attention), and hedges (i.e., how speakers hesitate or "play for time").

Each of these categories was clarified after the first 10-minute segment was shown in class, to ensure that groups were taking notes on the correct linguistic information. Once the groups had completed their analyses by the end of each film, they worked to develop a presentation to share with the entire class using a document camera and their notes. The instructor was available to help the groups with their reports or to answer any questions.

Learners also identified different communicative spaces, such as the crime scene or the detectives' office (White, 2014), observing the various social roles that the characters performed in each. Moreover, they examined how language form and function mapped onto these spaces and social roles (e.g., the use of formal and informal language), how regional expressions contributed to the characters' identities (e.g., northern versus southern forms of greetings), or how characters realized and responded to requesting or teasing behaviors. While they produced expected language mistakes, participants were able to express their shared knowledge in the L2. In order to mitigate the cognitive load of watching a film with attention to both content and language form, each group was responsible for analyzing one or two aspects of language, yielding the following pragmatic information:

Rosenheim-Cops:

1. Greetings, leave-takings, terms of address (Group 1)

- *Frau/Herr* (madam/sir); *Meine Damen/Herren* (ladies/gentlemen); *Herr Kollege* (colleague); *Frau Doktor* (doctor); *Guten Morgen/Tag* (good morning/day); *Grüss dich/Sie/euch* (greetings); very frequent use of people's names to open a turn

2. Downgraders (Group 2)
    - *vielleicht* (maybe); *tja, ja* (well); *möglich* (possibly); *kann sein* (could be)
3. Intensifiers (Group 3)
    - *genau* (exactly); *ja!* (yes!); *sehr* (very); *ziemlich* (quite); *doch* (of course)
4. Backchanneling, hedges, overlap (Group 4)
    - *wissen Sie?/weißt du* (you know); *sag mal* (say); *schaul mal* (look here); *tja, ja, naja* (well) *ich verstehe* (I understand), *klar* (of course), *schon gut* (oh, ok), *du hast recht* (you're right), *richtig* (that's right)
    - *äch, ähm, ach!* (also)

After watching *Im Juli*, the same groups added any new features observed in this movie to their notes, yielding some new findings.

In July:

1. Greetings and terms of address (Group 1)
    - *Jungs* (guys); *hey du!* (hey, you!); *tschüss* (hello/good-bye); *hi* [same as in English]; *meine Kleine* (here: my girlfriend); frequent use of characters' names
2. Downgraders (Group 2)
    - *entschuldige* (excuse me); *wenn du willst* (if you'd like); *oder so* (or something like that,/[also functions as a tag question])
3. Intensifiers (Group 3)
    - interjections: *Scheiße/Shit* (shit); *verflucht nochmal* (dammit); *wirklich gerne* (I'd *really* like to); *bestimmt* (for sure); *doch!* (here: come on!)
4. Backchanneling, echoing, and hedges (Group 4)
    - *phhhh* [~ shrug]; *ja, aber…* (ok, but…); *ja, klar, aber…* (yes, of course, but…); *wieso denn?* (here: how is that possible?); *stimmt* (that's right); *cool* [same as in English]; *Quatsch* (nonsense); *bravo* [same as in English]

These features, accessible to beginning L2 learners, served as focal points for the present study. Additionally, participants were able to observe paralinguistic and non-verbal features, such as intonation, rate of speech, facial expressions, and gestures (e.g., shaking someone's hand). Attending to multiple modes of communication (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001) helped learners better understand the characters' identities and motivations for interaction and make connections between various aspects of the local communicative context. Subsequently, the dialogues that participants created were analyzed with attention to the features that they had adopted from the filmic and textbook materials in order to reveal the potential of film as a tool for fostering learners' pragmatic knowledge in the L2.

FINDINGS

Using interactional sociolinguistics (Fusaroli et al., 2014; Kecskés, 2012; Piazza, Bednarek, & Rossi, 2011; Tannen, 2005, 2006), learners' dialogues were analyzed to examine how and

how well they incorporated the pragmatic features they had gleaned from the filmic materials in both the textbook and film-based dialogues[1]. Dialogue 1, which is based on a textbook exercise pertaining to travel, was written by students D and S prior to the film screenings.

Dialogue 1. Textbook-based Dialogue About Traveling

1	Bob	*Wir fähren nach Deutschland auf unseren zweiwöchigen Urlaub.*
		(We travel* to Germany for our two-week long vacation.)
2	Danny	*Nein! Wir fähren nach San Diego auf Urlaub.*
		(No! We go* to San Diego on vacation.)
3	Bob	*Was?! Deutschland ist besser.*
		(What?! Germany is better.)
4	Danny	*Ja, aber San Diego ist am besten. Das Flugzug fahrkarten*
5		*der Deutschland ist sehr teuer.*
		(Yes, but San Diego is the best. The airplane tickets* of*
		Germany is* very expensive.)
6	Bob	*Ja, es ist sehr teuer… ☹ Ich kann nicht leisten.*
		(Yes, it is very expensive… ☹ I can't afford* [it].)
7	Danny	*Fahren wir nach San Diego.*
		(Let's go to San Diego.)

This dialogue is representative of the language produced by participants prior to the film screenings. There is no greeting to open the exchange, and the participants never address each other by name, even though the characters had been assigned fictional names. There are no downgraders in the dialogue, and the few intensifiers—*Nein!* [line 2], *Was?!* [line 3] or *sehr* [line 6]—are indicated primarily through punctuation (and exaggerated intonation and volume in the spoken dialogue). Backchanneling is limited (*Ja* [lines 4 and 6]), as is echoing (when Bob repeats *teuer* [line 6] following Danny's comment [lines 4 and 5]). To help contextualize this example, Appendix A provides an overview of pragmatic features found in the 13 pre-screening dialogues across all groups.

These baseline dialogues did not reflect any local contextualization (Culpeper et al., 2010; Kecskés, 2012): the characters are vague and lack identity, and the turns are sequential, without any evident conversational synergy (Fusaroli et al., 2014). It seems that while learners had encountered difficulties themselves while traveling, and although they had seen a textbook model, they were unable to draw on their own prior experiences, which at the very least should enable them to attempt some kind of pragmatic modification (Boxer, 2002; Kecskés, 2006), even if unsuccessfully, according to L2 patterns. These characteristics seemed to mirror the arid pragmatic landscape of L2 textbooks described by Eisenchals (2011) and de Pablos Orgeta (2011).

Dialogue 2 was produced by students S and A following the modified ethnographic analysis of *Rosenheim-Cops*, which ends with Ms. Stockl and Ms. Hofer winning a weekend at a health resort. At this time, participants had watched the entire episode of *Rosenheim-Cops*, and the class had discussed the findings of the group analyses. The day after the last segment

---

[1] Due to space limitations, only one dialogue is included for each task. Asterisks mark lexical, grammatical or pragmatic mistakes in the English translations, and participants' names were replaced with initials to meet institutional ethics requirements, but fictional names were retained.

of Rosenheim-Cops was shown, participants were asked to write an imagined interaction between the two women at the spa (the next episode opens with this scenario, as the two women find a dead body and have to leave).

Dialogue 2. Post-viewing Dialogue Based on *Rosenheim-Cops*

1	Hotel personnel	*Guten Morgen. Frau Stockl und Frau Hofer. Wie geht Ihr Aufenthalt?* (Good morning, Ms. Stockl and Ms. Hofer. How is your stay so far?)
2	Ms. Stockl	*Morgen! Es ist fast perfekt, aber wir haben ein kleines Problem.* (Good Morning! It is almost perfect, we just have a small problem.)
3	Hotel personnel	*Ach, es tut mir leid! Was ist los?* (Oh, I'm sorry! What is wrong?)
4	Ms. Stockl	*Das Wasser in dem Unterwassermassagebecken ist zu kalt.* (The water in the underwater massage pool is too cold.)
5	Hotel personnel	*Ach nein! Tut mir leid. Ich will ein reparier Menschen schicken.* (Oh, no! I'm sorry. I will send a repair* technician*.)
6	Ms. Stockl	*Danke schön, wir brauchten heißiger Wasser.* (Thank you, we [would like] hotter* water.)

The two interactants start out with pairwise greetings in lines 1 and 2: Both the first and second speaker wish the other good morning, and the hotel personnel addresses the guests by their last names, using the formal register. S and A also used several downgraders, such as "almost," "a *small* problem" [line 2] and an attempted subjunctive in line 6 "we *need/would like* hot water." The downgraders are in line with the character's preference for addressing problems indirectly. These features reflect context-specific choices, indicating that learners can express the level of politeness required for an interaction between the manager and guests at a fancy hotel linguistically. Thus, the film seemed to provide a context for learners to identify the participants, setting, and purpose of the interaction (Mills, 2009) and modify their language accordingly.

Although this particular dialogue did not include any intensifiers, groups typically used them more frequently than in the previous task. However, the lack of intensifiers in this example raises an interesting consideration. S and A were less likely to use intensifiers in their L1 as well, which should be recognized in L2 pragmatics instruction: The implementation of L2 patterns must be balanced with learners'/speakers' own communicative preferences (Barron, 2005; Kallia, 2005; Washburn, 2001), especially given the fact that pragmatics research increasingly recognizes the role of speakers' prior experiences and personal choices (Boxer, 2002; LoCastro, 2011; Mills, 2009).

The dialogue also included several expressions for backchanneling and echoing. *Ach* and *Ach nein* ("Oh, no") and the apology ("I am sorry") by the hotel personnel [lines 3 and 5] all demonstrate the speaker's orientation to the other interlocutor, which contributes to communicative synergy (Fusaroli et al., 2014), as does the paraphrased echoing in line 3. Here, the guest states that they "have a small problem," a statement that the manager acknowledges by asking, "What is the problem?" The expressions are linguistically correct and further reflect lexical borrowing from the film (e.g., *Aufenthalt*). The dialogue offers a coherent exchange between two people, who have a concrete grounding in *Rosenheim-Cops*,

and learners seem to build explicitly on previous utterances, reflecting a dynamic, emergent, interpersonal process (Davies, 2004; Kecskés, 2006, 2012). The film characters seem to have provided a specific context for the learner-created interactions (see Appendix B for an overview of pragmatic features across all groups on this task).

Dialogue 3 is based on the counseling activity from the textbook, in which participants (students N and M) took on the roles of an advisor or parent and a student looking seeking career advice.

Dialogue 3. Post-viewing Dialogue Based on Textbook Exercise on Careers

1	Applicant	*Hallo, ich möchte einen Job finden.*
		(Hello, I'd like to find a job).
2	Advisor	*Na gut, was für einen Job suchen Sie?*
		(Oh, okay, what kind of a job are you looking for?)
3	Applicant	*Ein Job für dume Leute.*
		(A* job for dumb* people.)
4	Advisor	*Ich denke dass, Sie können einen besser Job machen.*
		(I think you can [get] a better job.)
5	Applicant	*Wirklich? Denken Sie das wirklich so?*
		(Really? Do you really think that?)
6	Advisor	*Jawohl! Ein gut Job passiert Ihnen gut! Hier ist ein Job an dem Computer*
7		*mit kein Studium brauchen.*
		(Of course! A good job would be good for you! Here is a job on the computer that needs no university education.)
8	Applicant	*Wo?*
		(Where?)
9	Advisor	*Als Sekretär im Büro. Haben Sie Computerkenntnisse?*
		(As secretary in an office. Do you have computer skills?)
10	Applicant	*Nein.*
		(No.)
11	Advisor	*Es tut mir leid. Tschuss!*
		(I'm sorry. Bye!)

The dialogue begins with an unreciprocated greeting by the applicant in line 1.[2] The advisor gets to business immediately, asking the applicant what kind of a job he wants. There is one possible downgrader: "would like" [line 1], which might be a chunked expression "I would like," instead. The question "Do you *really* think that?" [line 5] may be viewed as either a downgrader, because it casts doubt on the veracity of the previous utterance, or as an intensifier, if the speaker wanted to add an emotional aspect to the dialogue (e.g., sarcasm). The intonation did not clarify the speaker's intent. The interlocutors also used a few backchanneling devices, including "Oh, okay" [line 2], "Really?" [line 5] and "Of course!" [line 6], but there is no evidence of communicative synergy (Fusaroli et al, 2014). The dialogue does not develop a "story," nor does it resolve the problem, suggesting a lack of contextual awareness of who the participants are or what their communicative purpose

---

[2] It was interesting that although the instructions in the textbook were in German, these students labeled the roles in English. This may be a further reflection of the apparent artificiality and lack of local context in this activity.

might be; thus, this conversation falls short of interaction conceived as a dynamic, interpersonal process (Boxer, 2002; Kecskés, 2006; LoCastro, 2011; Mills, 2009). The utterances are linguistically acceptable but lack context or personality. Participants produced somewhat more pragmatic features in this task (see Appendix C) than in the pre-viewing dialogue, but they included fewer target pragmatic features than in the *Rosenheim-Cops* task.

Apparently, the textbook exercise offered no realistic social setting for the interactions, and participants were not able to fill in the gap (de Pablos Ortega, 2011; Eisenchlas, 2011). While comparing these dialogues to the previous film-based ones reiterates the potential of films to provide requisite social contexts for learning pragmatics (Abrams, 2014; Fernández-Guerra, 2008; Grant & Starks, 2001; Washburn, 2001), it also reveals an important limitation. Specifically, that although learners had at least one preceding movie-based dialogue task, on which they performed with more pragmatic depth, the information they learned there did not transfer to a subsequent, textbook-based activity.

The final dialogue task (see Dialogue 4, produced by students T and L) was completed the day after the class finished watching *Im Juli*. One scene in the movie depicted the main protagonist, Daniel, stuck at the Rumanian border and trying to convince the customs officer to let him through after his passport had been stolen. In another scene, he and the man who was giving him a ride to Turkey were arrested because the driver had his uncle's corpse in the trunk of his car. There is a short concrete conversation between him, the customs officer, and his on-and-off travel companion, Juli, in Rumania, while an interrogation is merely hinted at in the Turkish scene. Participants could expand the short concrete dialogue or imagine an interrogation for the latter scene. As previously, they had access to the pragmatic features collected during the modified ethnographic analyses, all handouts, and notes.

Dialogue 4. Post-viewing Dialogue Based on the Movie *Im Juli*

1	Daniel	*Ich habe kein Geld. Wie kann ich Jetzt über die Grenze gehen?*
		(I don't have any money. How can I get across the border now?)
2	Juli	*Vielleicht können wir etwas klauen. Vielleicht ein Auto oder*
3		*Schmuck mit Diamanten.*
		(Maybe we can steal something. Perhaps a car or jewelry with diamonds.)
4	Daniel	*Oder ein Mercedes! Ich habe immer ein Mercedes gewollt. Ja,*
5		*wir gehen ein Auto klauen!*
		(Or a Mercedes! I have always wanted a* Mercedes. Yes, we'll go steal a car!)
6	Juli	*Toll! Weißt du wie man ein Auto klaut?.*
		(Great! Do you know how one steals a car?)
7	Daniel	*Nein, weißt du wie?*
		(No, do you know [how to do that]?)
8	Juli	*Nein. Ich klau die Schlüssel von dem Mann da.*
		(No. I [will] steal the keys from that man there.)
9	Daniel	*Viel Glück! Hofflich hat er ein Mercedes.*
		(Good luck! Hopefully*, he has a* Mercedes.)
		[5 Minuten später]
		[(5 minutes later)]

10   Juli   *Ich habe die Schlüssel!*
                (I have the keys!)
9   Daniel   *Perfekt! Jetzt können wir in die Turkei reisen!*
                (Perfect! Now we can travel to Turkey!)

Since this conversation referenced the middle of the film, the fact that the interlocutors do not greet each other shows an awareness of the purpose of the interaction (Mills, 2009). However, the absence of terms of address, which is not reflective of the movie's discourse, may reflect learners' own communicative preferences (LoCastro, 2011).

Intensification was expressed mostly through punctuation (i.e., six exclamation points in this dialogue), although the "perfect" in line 10 expresses enthusiasm for a solution to their problems. Two downgraders are used as well: "perhaps" [line 2] and "hopefully" [line 7]. These downgraders and intensifiers, which function as possible politeness strategies, reflect more realistic language and signal the characters' awareness of each others' interpersonal needs (Culpeper et al., 2010; Mills, 2011). Similarly, there is evidence of conversational synergy (Fusaroli et al., 2014). For example, in line 2, Juli suggests that they steal a car "or" some jewelry, and Daniel echoes the "or" and expands the list of options with "or a Mercedes!" [line 4]. Another lexical repetition occurs in lines 6 and 7 in the form of "do you know…" – "no, I don't know…" Further coherence is provided by non-sequential echoing: "to steal" [lines 2, 5, 6, and 8], and "Mercedes" [lines 4 and 9] and "keys" [lines 8 and 10] recur several times throughout the dialogue. These echoes also serve as backchanneling devices, as do the interjections "Great!" [line 6], "Good luck!" [line 9], and "No" [lines 7 and 8]. The content of the dialogue is built directly on events in the film, reiterating that the film provided not only a linguistic but also a contextual anchor (Abrams, 2014). The other 12 dialogues incorporated elements of the movie as well and tended to use similar and similarly diverse pragmatic features (see Appendix D).

As was the case with the *Rosenheim-Cops* dialogue, participants borrowed vocabulary and multiword expressions from the movie (e.g., *klauen*, a slang term for stealing), as well as thematic elements, such as losing a passport or stealing a car. While some of these themes may have limited applicability to learners' own interactional needs in authentic situations in a German-speaking country, the film provided social contexts for participants to incorporate their ideas and L2 use more richly than in textbook-based exercises, reiterating previous findings on the potential of films to offer much needed social contexts for learning L2 pragmatics (Abrams, 2014; de Pablos Ortega, 2011; Eisenchlas, 2011; Fernández-Guerra, 2008; Grant & Starks, 2001; Washburn, 2001).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The first research question concerned the ways in which beginning learners of German can develop pragmatic knowledge by analyzing authentic filmic materials. The data suggest that films acted as an effective springboard for learning pragmatics as a dynamic, interpersonal process (Davies, 2004; Fusaroli et al., 2014; Kecskés, 2006, 2012; LoCastro, 2011; Mills, 2009; Mills, 2014). After conducting modified ethnographic analyses of *Rosenheim-Cops* and *Im Juli*, learners were able to use the social context provided by each film to situate the characters, borrow themes, and employ appropriate linguistic features based on the local context. For example, they selected formal or informal language and greetings depending on the communicative purpose of the interaction. Thus, the films seemed to provide a context

for learners to identify the participants, setting, and purpose of the interaction (Mills, 2009) and to subsequently imagine these characters' language use in line with their filmic preferences. In other words, the language choices participants made in their dialogues appropriately reflected the film characters' personalities and linguistic preferences by including downgraders, intensifiers, and backchanneling devices that were in line with the films' context. Participants' movie-based dialogues, which illustrated effective use of pragmatic features, contrasted with their textbook-based exchanges, which did not include greetings to open the exchange, terms of address (e.g., names), or downgraders. In the textbook-based dialogues, learners only used a few intensifiers—mostly indicated though punctuation (in writing) and intonation and volume (in the spoken dialogue)—and limited backchanneling.

To recap, these findings provide further support that films, with semi-authentic characters (filtered through actors, editors, directors and screen-play writers), are able to model interaction in a way that allows L2 learners to recognize and incorporate communicative patterns into their own dialogues (Abrams, 2014; Alcón Soler, 2008; Grant & Starks, 2001; Rose, 2001; Washburn, 2001). The results also support previous claims that explicit and metapragmatic instruction is more effective than implicit instruction (Alcón Soler, 2008; Cohen, 2005; Halenko & Jones, 2011).

Nevertheless, these benefits may be limited to specific filmic contexts and tasks, since the pragmatic skills gained from modified ethnographic analyses seemed to be specific to a particular context. Although participants had access to the results of their film-based analyses in producing dialogues, these features did not readily transfer to the textbook-based activities. That is, learners used the target pragmatic features considerably more often and in more varied form in the film-based dialogues than in the textbook-based ones; the latter were also less interactive, had flatter characters, and signaled no sociopragmatic variability (e.g., they lacked terms of address, interlocutors' names, greetings, backchanneling, hedges, intensifiers, and downgraders). Thus, the inherent "task constraints" (Fusaroli et al., 2014, p. 147) were different for the textbook and film-based dialogues, helping to shape learners' language in each. The discrepancy between the two situations is most likely due to the lack of a social vacuum characteristic of textbook activities in film (de Pablos Ortega, 2011; Eisenchlas, 2011). It is difficult to enrich interaction with pragmatic devices if the "personalities" in a task have no personalities, no relationships. Often, textbook exercises focus on grammar, which students appear to recognize. Without a social context, there is neither an impetus nor an opportunity to engage in exchanges that reflect socially embedded language use, which would require pragmatic markers to negotiate interpersonal relationships. It is promising that filmic resources seem capable of filling in this important social context.

The second research question, meant to investigate the nature of beginning L2 learners' pragmatic knowledge, also yielded several interesting insights. First, it is noteworthy that, while no single student was able to identify pragmatic features alone, groups were able to generate a substantial framework for the analyzed phenomena. Second, while participants were not able to express all pragmatic intent accurately in terms of lexicon or grammar, in the film-based dialogues they made attempts to vary their language in order to express diverse communicative intentions. In other words, even if learners cannot replicate L2 pragmatic patterns, they appear aware that language should change according to context. This suggests that sociopragmatic knowledge—the need to adapt one's speech to fit the local needs of the interaction—and pragmatic awareness precede pragmalinguistic knowledge (i.e.,

the recognition of appropriate linguistic forms to express one's intended meaning), and consequently, learners can produce—even at an early stage—nuanced, multifunctional language use (Abrams, 2014; Bardovi-Harlig, 2009; Dewaele, 2008; Kasper & Rose, 2001).

Before exploring the pedagogical and research implications of the study, its limitations should be acknowledged. An obvious limitation is the qualitative nature of the study, which limits the transferability of the findings to other contexts. Outcomes could have differed with changes to participants (e.g., a more homogeneous group of students, diverse motivations), filmic materials, or the language-learning context (e.g., a second versus foreign language setting). For example, learners could complete more authentic ethnographic analyses if they were studying German in a German-speaking country; additionally, the analyses may be more complex if participants have a higher proficiency level in the L2. Another limitation of the study, which has already been alluded to earlier, is that films cannot provide the same kind of ethnographic material as real-world interactions. Films, by nature, are constructed through multiple layers; the screenwriters, the director, the actors, the editors all lend their own artistic voices to the final product. A final limitation of the study is also one of its strengths. It is a classroom study, which allows us to see the "messiness" of language learning *in situ*. Yet, this fact also limits the number and type of data collection opportunities, since learners' pedagogical (e.g., curricular) needs must be balanced with the researcher's endless quest for further information as new questions emerge from the ongoing study, questions that suggest future research projects and pedagogical implications.

Several tentative pedagogical insights emerged from the pedagogy surrounding these dialogue tasks. First, in line with Grant and Stark (2001), the television show seemed to provide more "fuel" for dialogues and led to more interactive exchanges, possibly because the characters and their relationships were more varied than even in *Im Juli*. Second, for this study, participants pairs remained consistent to allow for cross-task comparisons, which made some students feel "stuck" if they had a partner with whom they did not work well. In the classroom, varying partnerships (e.g., skill levels, playfulness, and creativity) could prove more beneficial. Third, written dialogues, while not really reflective of real-time conversation (Alcón Soler, 2008), were more preferable than spontaneous oral dialogues. Participants felt that the latter put them on the spot, an experience they found too stressful, especially at the beginning of the term, when a sense of the classroom as a community had not yet emerged. The use of more written dialogues could be a level-specific accommodation for early L2 learners to begin effective study of pragmatics (Abrams, 2014; Dewaele, 2008). Additionally, while films are multilayered, filtered cultural artifacts, they may offer beginning L2 learners a more accessible entry-point for studying pragmatics than completely authentic input, whose pace and shifts in topics could prove too challenging (Grant & Starks, 2001).

Further, this study expanded on previous findings pertaining to the benefits of explicit instruction in pragmatics (Cohen, 2005; Davies, 2004; Washburn, 2001), by suggesting that discourse-length authentic materials can be an effective resource for modified ethnographic analyses, even at early stages of L2 learning. As a final pedagogical benefit, the filmic materials provided a ready-made context for teaching vocabulary and grammar as well, illustrating the *use* of grammar in real, authentic language environments (e.g., how to use the subjunctive to express politeness, how the simple past provides a framework for narrating past events, etc.). Thus, the films not only offered a context for analyzing sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic features of the L2, but also illustrated how language was used in real-world situations.

The findings also carry several implications for research and methodology. Most

importantly, this paper has shown how current research on sociopragmatics (Kecskés, 2012) can provide important theoretical and methodological scaffolding for studying L2 pragmatics, by drawing learners' and researchers' attention to the local nature of interaction. Discourse-length data provided by films can serve as both a source of authentic input and a data source (Abrams, 2014; Fernández-Guerra, 2008; Grant & Starks, 2001; Kaiser, 2009; Kaiser & Shibahara, 2014; Kambara, 2011; Rose, 2001; Saville-Troike, 2003; Tognozzi, 2010; Washburn, 2001). While this study focused on learners' written performance, further research is needed to explore how learners could manage spontaneous, dynamic, or emergent interaction based on filmic materials. Future studies should investigate learners' progress longitudinally in order to examine what pragmatic information they are able to glean from filmic materials and transfer to their own (spontaneous?) performance as their linguistic skills increase. Finally, there is a need to explore the ways in which personal interactional preferences affect a learner's ability or willingness to adopt L2 patterns of interaction. As Kallia (2005) stated, our goal cannot be an expectation of L2 normative performance, since such "norms" do not really exist; rather, individual variation should be accommodated in real-world interactions.

To conclude, this study has demonstrated the relevance of Kecskés's (2012) understanding of pragmatics for film-based L2 pragmatics instruction. The data have also shown that students can depart from context-free textbook language and produce written dialogues that reflect locally contextualized interactions (Kecskés, 2012; LoCastro, 2011; Mills, 2009), with appropriate sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic phenomena, even at an early stage in the L2 learning process (Abrams, 2014; Dewaele, 2008). Thus, in line with previous research (Abrams, 2014; Alcón Soler, 2008; Davies, 2004; Grant & Stark, 2001), discourse-length, authentic filmic resources provided effective scaffolding for learners to produce, albeit far from perfectly, linguistic choices reflecting varying social roles and communicative contexts. With the caveat that these filmic resources are culturally constructed artifacts and do not reflect naturally occurring discourse, they can provide an important entry point for learners into the realm of L2 pragmatics.

REFERENCES

Abrams, Zs. I. (2014). Using film to provide a context for teaching L2 pragmatics. *System, 46*(10)*,* 55-64.

Akin, F. (Director). (2000). *In July* [Motion Picture]. Germany: Wüste Filme (in collaboration with Argos Filmcilik Turizm, Quality Pictures).

Alcón Soler, E. (2008). Investigating pragmatic language learning in foreign language classrooms. *IRAL, 46*, 173–196.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012). *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines.* Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2009). Conventional expressions as a pragmalinguistic resource: recognition and production of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning, 59*(4), 755–795.

Barron, A. (2005). Variational pragmatics in the foreign language classroom. *System, 33*, 519–536.

Barthel, H. (Director). (2015). *Die Rosenheim-Cops: Das mysteriöse Geräusch.* Retrieved from http://www.zdf.de/ZDFmediathek/beitrag/video/2334096/Das-mysterioese-Geraeusch#/beitrag/video/2334096/Das-mysterioese-Geraeusch. [television series]. Germany: Bavaria Fernsehproduktion, Zweites Deutsches Fernsehen (ZDF). Episode currently available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iJ0297C9krU.

Boxer, D. (2002). *Applying sociolinguistics.* Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Cohen, A. D. (2005). Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 2*(3), 275–301.

Culpeper, J., Marti, L., Mei, M., Nevala, M., & Schauer, G. (2010). Cross-cultural variation in the perception of

impoliteness: a study of impoliteness events reported by students in England, China, Finland, Germany, and Turkey. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 7*(4), 597–624.

Davies, C. E. (2004). Developing awareness of crosscultural pragmatics: The case of American/German sociable interaction. *Multilingua, 23*, 207–231.

de Pablos-Ortega, C. (2011). The pragmatics of thanking reflected in the textbooks for teaching Spanish as a foreign language. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*, 2411–2433.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2008). "Appropriateness" in foreign language acquisition and use: Some theoretical, methodological and ethical considerations. *IRAL, 46*, 245–265.

Eisenchlas, S.A. (2011). On-line interactions as a resource to raise pragmatic awareness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(1), 51–61.

Fernández-Guerra, A. B. (2008). Requests in TV series and in naturally occurring discourse: A comparison. In E. Alcón (Ed.), *Learning how to request in an instructed language learning context* (pp. 11–126). Bern, CH: Peter Lang.

Fusaroli, R., Rączaszek-Leonardi, J., & Tylén, K. (2014). Dialog as interpersonal synergy. *New Ideas in Psychology, 32*, 147–157.

Goldstein, D.S. (2010). Page and screen: teaching ethnic literature with film. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture, 10*(3), 562–567.

Grant, L., & Starks, D. (2001). Screening appropriate teaching materials: Closings from textbooks and television soap operas. *IRAL, 39*(1), 39–50.

Halenko, N., & Jones, C. (2011). Teaching pragmatic awareness of spoken requests to Chinese EAP learners in the UK: Is explicit instruction effective? *System, 39*, 240–250.

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of interaction of language and social life. In J.J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: Ethnography of communication* (pp. 35–71). New York, NY: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

Jeon, E. H., & Kaya, T. (2006). Effects of L2 instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development. A meta-analysis. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 165–211). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Kaiser, M. (2009). *Teaching with film clips. Teaching language and culture with film*. [Presentation]. University of California, Berkeley.

Kaiser, M., & Shibahara, C. (2014). Film as source material in advanced foreign language classes. *L2 Journal, 6*(1), 1–13.

Kallia, A. A. (2005). Directness as a source of misunderstanding: The case of requests and suggestions. In R. Lakoff, S. Ide (Eds.), *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness* (pp. 217–234). Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins.

Kambara, W. (2011). Teaching Japanese pragmatic competence using film clips. *L2 Journal, 3*(2), 144–157.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K. R. Rose, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 1–9). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Kecskés, I. (2006). Pragmatics aspects of multilingualism. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Kecskés, I. (2010). The paradox of communication: A sociocognitive approach to pragmatics. *Pragmatics and Society, 1*, 57–82.

Kecskés, I. (2012). The paradox of communication: Socio-cognitive approach to pragmatics. In K. Allan & K. M. Jaszczolt (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 599–616). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Koike, D. A., & Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in the development of pragmatic competence. *System, 33*, 481–501.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001) Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication. London: Arnold.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

LoCastro, V. (2011). Second language pragmatics. In E. Hinkel (Ed.)*, Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2) (pp. 319–344). New York, NY: Routledge.

Mills, G. J. (2014). Dialogue in joint activity: Complementarity, convergence and conventionalization. *New Ideas in Psychology, 32*, 158–173.

Mills, S. (2011). Discursive approaches to politeness and impoliteness. In Linguistic Politeness Research Group (Eds.), *Discursive approaches to politeness* (pp. 19-56). Boston, MA: Walter de Gruyter.

Mills, S. (2009). Impoliteness in a cultural context. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(5), 1047–1060.

Piazza, R., Bednarek, M., & Rossi, F. (2011). Introduction: Analyzing telecinematic discourse. In R. Piazza, M.

Bednarek, & F. Rossi (Eds.), *Telecinematic discourse: Approaches to the language of films and television series* (pp. 1–17). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Rose, K. (2001). Compliments and compliment responses in film: Implications for pragmatics research and language teaching. *IRAL, 39*, 309–326.

Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Malden, MA: Wiley.

Scollon, R., & Wong-Scollon, S. (2003). *Discourses in place: Language in the material world.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2002). Managing rapport in talk: Using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*(5), 529–545.

Tannen, D. (2005). Interactional sociolinguistics as a resource for intercultural pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 2*(2), 205–208.

Tannen, D. (2006). Language and culture. In R. W. Fasold & J. C. Linton (Eds.), *An introduction to language and linguistics* (pp. 343–372). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tognozzi, E. (2010). Teaching and evaluating language and culture through film. *Italica, 8* (1), 69–91.

Washburn, G. N. (2001). Using situation comedies for pragmatic language teaching and learning. *TESOL Journal, 10*(4), 21–26.

White, P. (2014). Multimodality and space exploration: Communicative space in action. In S. Norris, & C. D. Maier (Eds.), *Interaction, images and texts* (pp. 337–346). Boston, MA: de Gruyter.

APPENDIX A

Overview of Pragmatic Features in the Pre-viewing Dialogues

greetings / address forms	• *"Klaus!"*[R & J]; • *"Guten Morgen, Barbara!"* (Good morning, B!) – [K & B] • *"Herr, Entschuldigung!"* (Sir, excuse me) & *"Claudia! Was machen wir jetzt?"* (C! Now what do we do?) – [C & S]
intensifiers	• *"Nein!"* (No) & *"Was?!"* (What?!) – [D&S] • *"Wir sind am Bahnsteig 28!!!"* (We are on platform 28!!!) – [S&A] • *"Ich bin sehr sauer mit dir!"* (I'm very mad at you) – [P&S] • *"Du sprechst kwatch."* (~That's nonsense) – [N&M]
downgraders	• *"Vielleicht können wir in einem Koffer gehen."* (Maybe we can go in someone's suitcase.) – [S&A] • *"Kein Problem."* (No problem.) – [N&M]
backchanneling & hedges	• *"Ja."* [D&S]; *"ooops…"* [S&A]; *"Hm."* [R&J]; *"Ok."* [L&C]; *"Wow!"* [P&S]; *"Ja, klar!"* (Of course), *"Uh"* – [K&B]

Note: each feature is used once, unless otherwise indicated (e.g., 2x = twice); the participants in whose dialogue the feature appeared are noted in square brackets.

APPENDIX B

Pragmatic Features in the Post-viewing Dialogues Based on *Rosenheim-Cops*.

greetings / address forms	• context-appropriate address forms, such as "*Grüss Gott!*" (Bavarian greeting); "*Guten Tag/Guten Abend!*" (good day/evening) • included in most dialogues, both as "warm-up" and as part of the dialogue "*Hallo, Herr Achtziger, wir haben ein Problem…*" (Hello, Mr. Achtziger, we have a problem…) [K&B]
intensifiers	• punctuation: "*Was ist das?!?*" (What is that?) [R&J] • "*Wirklich?!*" (Really?!) [P&S]; "*Oh, mein Gott, das ist unglaublich!*" (Oh, my God, that's unbelievable!) [K&B]
downgraders	• "*fast*" (almost) & "*kleines Problem*" (a small problem) [S&A] • "*Ja, kein Problem.*" (Yes, no problem.) [R&J] • "*Wir möchten… bitte*" (We would like… please)[L&C] • "*hoffentlich*" *&* "*vielleicht*" (hopefully & perhaps) [C&S]
backchanneling & hedges	• some German backchanneling: "*Ach/Ach nein!*" "*Ja*" "*Wunderbar*" (wonderful); "*Aber natürlich!*" (but of course) • very few Americanisms (no wow, few okays)

APPENDIX C

Pragmatic Features in the Textbook-based Post-viewing Dialogues on Career Counseling

greetings / address forms	• 13 Hallo (in 9 dialogues) • "*Guten Morgen!*" (Good morning) [A&B] • "*Wie geht es Ihnen?*" (How are you?) [N&A] • "*Vielen Dank!*" (Thank you!) [N&A, C&S] • "Hallo, Herr H..." (Good morning, Mr. H…) [L&T]
intensifiers	• "*Nein!*" (no) – several dialogues • "Toll!" (great!) [P&S, L&C] • "Super!" [K&L] • "Jawohl!" (~Yes, of course) [N&M]
downgraders	• "*Vielleicht*" (maybe) & "*bitte*" (please)
backchanneling & hedges	• "*Ach ja, natürlich.*" (Oh, yes, of course) [S&A, R&J] • "*Ok*" (3x) • "Hmmm…"

APPENDIX D

Overview of Pragmatic Features in the Post-viewing Dialogue Based on *In July*.

greetings / address forms	• *"Hallo!"* [M, N & A] • *"Du Idiot!"* [2x: B & A; M, N & A] • *"Daniel?"* (1x in 1 dialogue: J & S]
intensifiers	• *"Bist du verrückt?!"* (are you crazy?) [C&S] • *"Super!"* (super) [B & A] • *"Perfekt!"* (perfect) [A & N]
downgraders	• *"bitte"* (please) (2x: A & I, R & C] • *"vielleicht"* (perhaps, maybe) (3x in two dialogues: A & N, B & A]
backchanneling & hedges	• *"Ah!"* (Aha!) (4x: J & S, L & A, ; I & S] • *"nein"* (no) (4x: A & N, J & S, I & S] • *"Ok"* (2x: S & C, A & S] • *"toll!"* (great!) (3x: D & V, A & N] • *"Das ist schade"* (that's too bad) [A & S] • *"Naja"* (well…) [R & L] • *"Keine Sorge!"* (no worries) [Y & L] • *"Alles gut"* (all's well) [Y & L] • *"Kein Problem!"* (no problem) [M, A & N] • *"Was?/ Wie?"* (what/ how) (5x in 2 dialogues: C & S, L & A)