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Pragmatic competence comprises an essential component of proficiency: it enables speakers to use and interpret language appropriately in varied contexts. The use of technological applications for teaching pragmatics is on the rise (Taguchi & Sykes, 2013), in part because those applications are well-suited to the types of awareness-raising tasks that support Schmidt's (1993; 2001) noticing hypothesis. However, the potential for technology in the instruction of routine formulas has yet to be examined. Furthermore, there has thus far been no research on the intersection of pragmatics and technology in the instruction of Russian. Russian pedagogical materials rarely present routine formulas, which communicate pragmatic meaning in social interaction, in a thorough manner. This dissertation reports on the impact of an awareness-raising, corpus-referred instructional website on L2 Russian learners' acquisition of nine routine formulas, selected with reference to analyses of corpus data and popular textbooks of Russian. Intermediate and advanced L1 English learners of Russian were assigned to either an experimental (n = 18) or control (n = 16) group. An oral proficiency assessment and background questionnaire were used to collect information on participants. Pre-/post-/delayed post-tests assessed knowledge and aural recognition of the targeted routine formulas. Experimental group participants completed online instructional modules that provided information on the form, function, and typical contexts of these formulas, along with authentic examples of usage (Russian National Corpus excerpts and film clips) and opportunities for practice. Data on the experimental group participants' experience with the routine formulas and reactions to the instructional website were collected via an online feedback form and retrospective interviews. Results indicate that the intervention had a durable effect on learners' knowledge of the targeted routine formulas. However, aural comprehension was not affected. Participants who used the
website reported that it increased their awareness of the routine formulas and their functions in conversation. Use of the formulas was found to be contingent on many factors, particularly context and relationships with interlocutors. This study demonstrates the potential for pedagogical interventions that explicitly instruct pragmatics and for the use of corpus methodologies in pragmatics-focused technological applications, especially for languages other than English.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Background

One of my primary motivations for becoming a Russian language educator and applied linguist was the desire to apply research findings on language use and acquisition to instruction—specifically, to the materials used for teaching. Presumably because Russian is not a commonly taught language in the U.S., there are few research-based materials that can address the specific needs of learners. When I began to communicate with speakers of Russian, I found that, although I had control over grammar, I was ill-equipped for conversing fluently. I lacked the words and phrases that are so commonly encountered in interaction, but are virtually ignored in textbooks. My host father, Misha, during a semester abroad in Krasnodar, Russia, would react to each step of my stories with a da ty chto that perplexed me because of its incomprehensible literal translation—yes you what. Two years later, while living in St. Petersburg, I photographed a cell phone company advertisement that contained a similarly baffling phrase:

![Image of an advertisement with Russian text]

Figure 1. Advertisement in St. Petersburg (2007)
The text reads *Nichego sebe / Vse liudiam!* This is a clever play on words that translates as both the literal *Nothing for us / Everything for the people!* and the figurative *Wow / Everything for the people!* I understand the double meaning now, but at the time I sensed I was missing something. In order to decode these mysterious but ubiquitous conversational phrases, I had no reference materials to turn to, and no source for explanation of the intricacies of these expressions beyond the vague and sometimes contradictory descriptions provided by native speakers when queried. I felt reluctant to make mistakes by risking the use of language whose meaning and impact I was unsure of. Bit by bit, I picked up these phrases after many encounters. While this slow process—of repeated exposures, guesses based on context, consultations with Russian speakers, and experimentation—can result in acquisition, there is surely a place for pedagogical materials that explicitly address the functions of this language with reference to real usage. In an attempt to begin to meet this demand, I have drawn inspiration from my own experience as a learner of Russian and have targeted for instruction the aforementioned expressions, among others, in this project.

1.2 Rationale

This dissertation addresses an aspect of language teaching and learning that, while essential to successful communication, has been understudied within the field of second language acquisition (SLA): pragmatics. Crystal (1997) defined pragmatics as:

> the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication. (p. 301)
Language instruction has traditionally focused on grammar and lexicon, while the intricacies of usage in interaction are left untaught. Folk wisdom dictates that the pragmatic dimension of language is best acquired in settings where the target language is spoken. For this reason, instructors may approach pragmatics as a non-essential add-on that does not warrant focus in the classroom. However, in order to communicate effectively, speakers must possess pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence entails the knowledge necessary for using language in contextually appropriate ways. It includes "the knowledge of language functions, of sociolinguistic rules of appropriateness, and of cultural references and figurative language" (Bachman, 1990, p. 98). As Kasper (1997) stated, "pragmatic competence is not extra or ornamental, like the icing on the cake" (Need L2 Pragmatics Be Taught? section, para. 1). In fact, it makes language a dynamic resource for interacting in the world. Forming relationships, expressing oneself, making things happen, all across an endless range of contexts and with endless configurations of interlocutors—these are the reasons we use language in the first place.

Pragmatic competence is necessary for functioning appropriately across the four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. It enables language users to comprehend the tone and communicative goals of oral and written texts, and to produce speech and writing that is socially and rhetorically appropriate and reflective of one's intent (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). These are difficult tasks for native and non-native speakers alike, as acquisition of pragmatics requires attention to "multipart mappings of form, meaning, function, force, and context" (Taguchi, 2015b, p. 1).

Pragmatics has typically been poorly integrated in foreign language curricula. However, this state of affairs has been slowly changing as researchers and educators have started investigating issues of pragmatics as they relate to language acquisition. Over the past few
decades, there has been a dramatic increase in research on pragmatic use and acquisition in language learners with the rise to prominence of interlanguage pragmatics (ILP), a field at the intersection of pragmatics and SLA (Alcón Soler & Martínez-Flor, 2005). ILP research addresses two central questions: what is the nature of pragmatic competence in second language learners, and how do learners develop this competence? While this dissertation necessarily touches upon these primary issues, it focuses on a corollary of the second question: how can we effectively instruct pragmatics? This question assumes that instruction facilitates acquisition, a claim that has been thoroughly substantiated in the literature (Taguchi, 2015b). Having established the value of instruction, Roever (2009) articulated the more pressing challenge for the field: "to achieve curricular integration of pragmatic instruction in syllabi and textbooks at every level, and across teaching settings" (p. 573). This dissertation is one small step in that direction.

In addition to the issue of integrating pragmatics instruction into the curriculum, three research gaps have motivated the current study. First of all, the vast majority of studies within ILP examine learners of English. Learners of Russian are severely underrepresented, with a few notable exceptions (Dykstra, 2012; Frank, 2010; Mills, 1993; Shardakova, 2005). The second research gap concerns an area of pragmatics that has been largely neglected—routine formulas. These are formulaic expressions (i.e. words and phrases that recur frequently in certain contexts) used for communicating pragmatic meaning (e.g., You're welcome as the expected response to an expression of gratitude). They perform functions in discourse, like expressing surprise (e.g., No way!), or supporting the flow of conversation (e.g., So what?). Recently, a small body of scholarship on routine formulas has emerged in ILP, but there has thus far been no work on routine formulas in Russian. Finally, there is a need for further research on the use of technology in promoting pragmatic competence among L2 learners, both in and out of the classroom.
Taguchi (2015a), in a recent review of the studies carried out on context in ILP, called for additional empirical evidence of the effectiveness of technological interventions, concluding that "research in this area is still at the stage of showing only what is possible" (p. 16). Technology has significantly changed the way that people learn languages in general, as it "dramatically extends and changes the breadth and depth of exposure that learners can have with the target language and interactive events in which they have the opportunity for language focus" (Chapelle, 2009, p. 750). Technological applications can be flexibly designed to accommodate a range of learners through the provision of diverse exercise types and engaging content. They can be based on the latest findings in pragmatics research, serving as a theoretically grounded resource for instructors who may lack knowledge of this area, and who may not have the time to address pragmatic issues in the classroom. These challenges are particularly acute for Russian language teaching. As a "less commonly taught language" (LCTL), instructional resources and teacher training initiatives for Russian are limited as it is.

The use of technological applications for teaching pragmatics is on the rise (Taguchi & Sykes, 2013), in part because they are well-suited to the types of awareness-raising tasks which support Schmidt's (1990; 1993; 2001) noticing hypothesis, the primary theoretical framework being used in this study. While there is a growing body of research on the use of computer-assisted language learning (CALL) programs in ILP, particularly on speech acts (Ishihara, 2007; Li, 2013; Russell & Vasquez, 2011; Sykes & Cohen, 2008; Waugh, 2013), there are no studies on the effectiveness of CALL applications on the acquisition of routine formulas in particular.

Another burgeoning area of research on technology in ILP addresses the applications of corpus data and methodologies to pragmatics instruction. A corpus is "a collection of authentic language, either written or spoken, which has been compiled for a particular purpose"
(Flowerdew, 2012, p. 3). By analyzing large amounts of naturally occurring language, it is possible to gain insights into the pragmatic dimension of language that are more robust and reflective of actual usage than traditional introspective methods. Corpus data can indicate which words and phrases are used frequently, and the ways in which contextual variables interact with their use. These discoveries can inform materials design, and in effect can provide learners with research-based instructional content. Although corpus linguistics has long been a presence in the field of applied linguistics, its impact has been felt predominantly within English language teaching and materials development. By harnessing data from the freely available Russian National Corpus (http://www.ruscorpora.ru/) in the design of instructional materials, this study demonstrates the potential of corpus research for Russian language materials design.

1.3 Research Questions

The current project adopts a mixed-methods, longitudinal (six-week) research design in order to document the process of pragmatic development in L1 English learners of Russian. Experimental group participants underwent an intervention: the use of an innovative instructional website that integrates corpus data and other authentic language sources, including film clips, to illustrate the functions of the targeted routine formulas in conversation in order to facilitate noticing among users, and, it was hypothesized, to promote acquisition of these formulas. Experimental group performance on pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests assessing the knowledge and aural recognition of the routine formulas has been compared with a control group's in order to address the first research question:

1) Does the instructional website increase users' understanding and use of routine formulas, as measured by the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests? Are gains (if any) significantly greater in the experimental group than in the control group?
While quantitative data are valuable for empirically validating the effectiveness of a particular intervention, the individual and social dimensions of language acquisition and use cannot be ignored. Pragmatics is fundamentally concerned with individuals' interaction in the social world. When researchers do not take the voices of participants into account, they only tell part of the story. Therefore, qualitative data were collected via questionnaires and interviews in order to address the second research question and to contextualize the test results:

2) What is the relationship between individual factors, related to identity and context, and participants' development of routine formulas in Russian?

The triangulation of data sources and analysis methods was chosen with the intention of providing for a more accurate interpretation of the learners' developmental process.

1.4 Organization

This dissertation begins with a review of the literature relevant to the topic at hand, providing a synopsis of research within ILP, specifically those studies that address formulaic language and its pragmatic functions. Then, a discussion of the construct of pragmatic competence follows, with a survey of the literature related to learners' use of language and the variables that affect pragmatic competence. Next, the phenomena under investigation—routine formulas—are defined and described in detail, with an emphasis on their functions in interaction and the role of corpus research in their analysis. This is followed by a summary of issues in instructional pragmatics: theories of learning (the aforementioned noticing hypothesis and the role of frequency effects) that have informed this study, and the principles of the development of materials and assessments for the instruction and evaluation of pragmatic and related competencies. Finally, the applications of corpus methodologies and technological tools and resources are examined in detail.
The literature review is followed by a description of the methodology implemented in the current study: overall research design, participants, study procedure, the design of the instructional website, data collection instruments, and rating and transcription procedures. The instructional website design process is explained in depth, from the initial corpus and textbook analyses to the selection and creation of content and exercises. Transparency and pedagogical theory are given prominence in order to present a clear and replicable model for fellow materials developers.

The next chapter presents the results of the study. First, information about the participants, elicited from a background questionnaire and an oral proficiency assessment, is provided. Next, the test results of the control and experimental groups are given, followed by statistical analyses performed to locate significant differences. Test responses on open-ended discourse completion and aural recognition tasks are analyzed in further detail. This is followed by a qualitative analysis of website feedback form, retrospective interview, and control questionnaire data. Findings are then discussed with reference to the literature.

The final chapter is the conclusion, in which the results of this study are summarized. Pedagogical implications are presented, followed by a discussion of the current project's limitations and, lastly, future research directions.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter contains a review of the literature relevant to the study at hand, including a discussion of research within the field of ILP, a description of routine formulas, and an overview of instructional pragmatics with particular focus on the theory and practice of materials design (especially technological applications).

2.2 Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP)

Kasper and Schmidt (1996) defined ILP as "the study of the development and use of strategies for linguistic action by nonnative speakers" (p. 150). Pragmatic competence is the term used to characterize these strategies. According to Bachman (1990), pragmatic competence is: the knowledge necessary, in addition to organizational competence, for appropriately producing or comprehending discourse. Specifically, it includes illocutionary competence, or the knowledge of how to perform speech acts, and sociolinguistic competence, or the knowledge of the sociolinguistic conventions which govern language use. (p. 42)

Pragmatic competence entails selecting and interpreting "the form/function composites required for particular circumstances" (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992, p. 11). This is an important skill for the language learner to develop, since lacking such competence can have social repercussions. As Thomas (1983) pointed out, "while grammatical error may reveal a speaker to be a less than proficient language-user, pragmatic failure reflects badly on him/her as a person" (p. 97).
The field of ILP has been in existence since the late 1970s, and has seen a dramatic expansion of research in the past two decades (for overviews, see Alcón Soler & Martínez-Flor, 2008, and Barron, 2012). However, as Barron and Warga (2007) noted, there has long been a need for more longitudinal research—particularly that which includes pedagogical interventions (Takahashi, 2010)—into the nature of the acquisition of pragmatic competence, as ILP has primarily focused on use rather than development (Kasper & Rose, 2002; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996). According to Kasper and Schmidt (1996), this could be due to the historical origins of ILP in cross-cultural pragmatics, where contrastive studies are highly valued.

Barron and Warga (2007) emphasized the continued acute need for ILP research on L2s other than English. This holds true for studies addressing the pragmatic competence of learners of Russian (but see Dykstra, 2012, on address forms; Frank, 2010, on learner perspectives on acquiring pragmatics in study abroad; Mills, 1993, on requests; Shardakova, 2005, on apologies). A lack of scholarly and instructional emphasis on the pragmatic dimension of Russian language may be reflected in views of L2 Russian learners, who may not consider pragmatics to be a legitimate object of study. Miller and Ginsberg (1995) found that learners of Russian studying abroad believed that grammatical rules are the most important feature of language, while the linguistic structures that convey pragmatic meaning are nonessential cultural tidbits that one picks up in immersion settings. In fact, there is an indication that learners—particularly those with low proficiency—do not attend to their pragmatic performance, since they primarily focus on grammatical accuracy and appropriate lexical selection (Frank, 2010). This may be a phenomenon particular to Russian, as its notoriously complex grammatical system is at the forefront of instructional materials, at the expense of acknowledgment of its pragmatic intricacies.
One of the fundamental research areas within ILP addresses the role of formulaic language in pragmatic competence. Formulaic language is tightly intertwined with contexts of use and is necessary for speaking appropriately in many situations. Over two decades ago, Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) asserted that there was a deficit of studies in this area. Encouragingly, explorations into the role of formulaic language in ILP have increased steadily since that time.

2.2.1 Formulaic Language

The current study focuses on a specific type of formulaic language that conveys pragmatic meaning, routine formulas (discussed in Section 2.2.3). However, an overview of this language in general is necessary. While there has been increasing research into the nature, use, and development of formulaic language recently (Wray, 2012), the concept is not a new one (for an excellent overview of the history of formulaic language across a variety of disciplines, and discussion of the major research foci in the field generally, see Pawley, 2007). In an oft-cited article, Pawley and Syder (1983) stated that the critical issue in linguistic theory is understanding two "puzzles": nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. That is, how do we make sense of the fact that, firstly, native speakers of a language are able to choose, amongst a range of possible expressions, those that are idiomatic and best express their intended meaning and that, secondly, native speakers are able to produce coherent, fluent discourse even though human planning and processing capabilities appear to be insufficiently suited to this task? The use of formulaic language is essential to nativelike selection and fluency. It is the "key to idiomaticity" (Wray, 1999, p. 213). By choosing the appropriate formulaic language, and being able to interpret it in interaction, language users can communicate in pragmatically appropriate (or inappropriate, if they choose) ways.
Language is largely composed of more and less fixed patterns of word combinations. Thus, knowledge of a lexical item entails knowledge of the ways in which it combines with other items in systematic ways to create various semantic and pragmatic meanings. As Firth (1957/1968) famously stated, "you shall know a word by the company it keeps" (p. 11).

Language consists of some proportion of formulaic language, but there is debate over what that proportion is. Estimates range from 4% to 80% (Bardovi-Harlig, 2006; Wray, 1999), depending on what one counts as formulaic language and what data sources the researcher consults. Historically, research on the formulaicity of language has its roots in phraseology (the study of word combinations) and lexicography (Altenberg, 1998; Cowie, 1998; Howarth, 1998; Pawley, 2007; Schmitt & Carter, 2004). Unfortunately, scholarship in phraseology has been largely ignored in applied linguistics. This is likely due to the fact that, within linguistics, formulaic language has long not been perceived as a legitimate area of study as a result of the influence of generative grammar (Howarth, 1998; Pawley, 2007), which devalues the analysis of language in use. As Widdowson (1989) pointed out, linguists have "become so enthralled with the admitted power of generative systems, that memory as an important process, and the possibly vast store of memorised units we each call upon every day, have somehow fallen into disrepute" (p. 135).

There has been skepticism about the significance of formulaic language from teaching methodologists as well: although they agreed on the existence of formulaicity in language, Krashen and Scarcella (1978) privileged the creative construction of language and minimized the importance of formulaic language, stating that "the use of routines and patterns is certainly a part of language, but it is probably not a large part" (p. 297).

Formulaicity is, in fact, a key characteristic of language, as communicating with language is not simply a matter of ordering lexical units according to grammatical rules. Rather, speakers
follow the *idiom principle*: "a language user has available to him or her a large number of semi-preconstructed phrases that constitute single choices, even though they might appear to be analysable into segments" (Sinclair, 1991, p. 110). This is in opposition to the *open-choice principle*, which corroborates the view of language in generative grammar as "a series of slots which have to be filled from a lexicon which satisfies local restraints" (Sinclair, 1991, p. 109). Language obeys both principles, falling on a creative–formulaic continuum, as Weinert (1995) asserted, drawing upon her survey of research in the area of formulaic language. However, linguists have traditionally privileged the creative end of the continuum over the formulaic.

Pawley and Syder (1983) noted the tendency to focus on the rules of grammar to the near complete exclusion of usage in works in linguistics, the assumption being that the language that does not "fit" into the grammatical system is inconsequential and peripheral. But a renewed interest in the formulaicity of language was ushered in by the highly influential work of Wong Fillmore (1976), Coulmas (1981), and Pawley and Syder (1983), among others. Two major research areas that have emerged concern the role of formulaic language in language development (see, for example, Wong Fillmore, 1976, and Myles, Hooper, & Mitchell, 1998) and in cognitive processing and production (for an overview, see Conklin & Schmitt, 2012).

The term formulaic language encompasses an expansive range of phenomena. As such, defining the concept of formulaic language has proven to be one of the key challenges in the field. As Schmitt and Carter (2004) noted, "lack of a clear definition remains one of the foremost problems" (p. 2). In current research on formulaic language, one of the most commonly cited definitions is Wray's (1999), who adopted the term *formulaic sequence*:

a sequence, continuous or discontinuous, of words or other meaning elements, which is, or appears to be, prefabricated: that is, stored and retrieved whole from memory at the
time of use, rather than being subject to generation or analysis by the language grammar.

(p. 214)

Because this definition is quite inclusive, providing for the widest range of formulaic language, it is a good place to begin. Formulaic sequences function as lexical units but have their own internal grammar. Pawley (2007) argued that they "straddle the grammar–lexicon boundary awkwardly" and that, in any case, it is disingenuous to divide language into two parts (p. 23). For this reason, the term lexicogrammar in sometimes used in order to account for the fact that formulaic language does not belong exclusively to the lexicon or the grammar of a language. Rather, these components of language work together as an "integrated system" (Halliday, Teubert, Yallop, & Čermáková, 2004, p. 169).

N. Ellis (2012), working from a usage-based perspective, used the following three criteria to determine whether or not a string is formulaic: frequency (how often does the combination occur in the language?), association (how often do the component lexemes in a combination occur together?), and native norms (do native speakers perceive the unit as formulaic?). Moon (1997) suggested that three criteria distinguish formulaic units from other strings: institutionalization (is the unit perceived as such by a language community?), fixedness (are there restrictions on the item's order, component lexemes, and inflection?), and non-compositionality (is the meaning of the item different from its literal interpretation?). While most research on formulaic language identifies this type of language using some combination of these characteristics, criteria vary. As Weinert (1995) noted, this is a function of the aims and research questions of any given study.

As concerns pragmatic competence, not all types of formulaic language are relevant. In fact, there are many varieties of frequently occurring multi-word units found in language that
may or may not convey pragmatic information. Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992), arguing for the study of formulaic language for pedagogical purposes, distinguished between chunks with pragmatic function \((\text{lexical phrases})\) and without \((\text{prefabricated phrases})\). Because the current review addresses a specific type of formulaic language, routine formulas, in ILP research, a discussion of the pragmatic functions of formulaic language follows.

### 2.2.2 Pragmatic Functions of Formulaic Language

Speakers frequently use formulaic language to perform pragmatic functions in real-world communication (Weinert, 1995). Knowledge of formulaic language aids users in quickly and reliably behaving appropriately in a given communicative situation through the use of sequences of language that are conventionalized and therefore expected (Roever, 2012; Schmitt & Carter, 2004; Yorio, 1980). Furthermore, as Yorio (1980) noted, formulaic language can help users deal with awkward or stressful social interactions. Because proficient language users readily recognize it, formulaic language helps both the speaker and the hearer in efficiently solving, in real-time, the problems that arise during communication (Wray, 2002). Since formulaic language can facilitate the pragmatically appropriate use of language in interaction, it can act as a means to fit in with other speakers of the language (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). It also plays a role in the organization of discourse, both spoken and written, and thus assists in both language comprehension and production (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009).

However, formulaic language acts as a tool in easing communication primarily for native speakers, given their extensive experience with the pragmatic functions of such language. As N. Ellis and Larsen-Freeman (2006) noted, "the very things that make a known language easy make a new language hard" (p. 568). Kecskes (2007) argued that, in fact, formulaic language is the defining feature of native usage, since "speaking a language idiomatically is a matter of
conforming to established ways of saying things” (Pawley, 2007, p. 22). Research on the intersection of formulaic language and ILP investigates these issues through the examination of how learners acquire, use, and process language with pragmatic functions.

Bardovi-Harlig (2006) described the functions of formulaic language identified in research on language acquisition and use as belonging to two categories: communicative strategies and production strategies. Communicative strategies consist of: "allowing learners early entry into communication when there is general lack of competence in target language rules"; "eliciting further input for acquisition"; "increasing a speaker's confidence that speech acts performed will be understood by the interlocutor in the intended way"; and "making a learner appear nativelike" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2006, p. 2). In its function as a production strategy, formulaic language "allows for fluency in production and faster processing" and "saves the speaker planning time that can be used where it is needed more" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2006, p. 2). Pawley and Syder (1983) explained that, since these chunks are "ready-made" and therefore do not require decoding, the speaker can devote her energy to other tasks that arise when producing speech, thereby easing the processing load. One of the main areas of early inquiry in formulaic language was its role in second language development. Hakuta (1974) and Wong Fillmore (1976), in two influential longitudinal studies on the acquisition of English by young learners, found that the use of language chunks by study participants aided in the acquisition process and argued that these chunks served as input to be analyzed, leading to the development of creative language. According to both researchers, the child learners used language chunks to facilitate communication and forge social relationships with peers.

Formulaic language can also aid adult learners in navigating basic communicative situations in the initial stages of development, particularly in immersion settings (Boers &
Novice language users may rely on formulaic sequences, which can serve as "islands of reliability" (Dechert, 1983) or "zones of safety" (Boers, Eyckmans, Kappel, Stengers, & Demecheleer, 2006) that learners can depend on to fulfill necessary pragmatic functions when producing language. However, it has been hypothesized that children use formulaic language more readily because the need to communicate is more urgent for children than for adults. Wray (2002) proposed that "the experience of the very young second language learner will be virtually identical to that of the first language learner, because the interactional conditions which promote the use of formulaic sequences and curb their unnecessary analysis are so similar" (p. 204). Adult learners have very different social needs and thus are not as driven to acquire the formulaic language that will facilitate their inclusion in target language communities.

Nonetheless, adult L2 learners who want to communicate effectively must master the formulaic language associated with a range of interactional contexts and situations. This competence may enable them to be perceived as fluent speakers even if their speech exhibits grammatical errors (Swan, 2014). For example, Schmidt (1983), in his famous case study of Wes, a Japanese learner of English residing in the U.S., noted that Wes' extensive use of formulaic language encouraged perception of Wes as a fluent user of English. Being able to express meaning in conventionalized ways can facilitate effective communication, while creativity in language use can potentially lead to communication breakdown. Creative deviation from expected formulas may not only be potentially misunderstood, it may also be pragmatically inappropriate. Levin (2014) performed a corpus analysis of how speakers of American and British English realize the "bathroom formula" (e.g., how speakers announce their intention to use the bathroom), proposing that the formulaicity of the most common variants not only allows for quick comprehension and production, but also serves the social purpose of being
unobtrusive—a critical function for a somewhat taboo activity. Such knowledge of cultural norms and appropriacy is necessary for pragmatic competence.

Two common terms for this type of cultural information are *schemata* (House, 1996; Wildner-Bassett, 1994) and *situational frames* (N. Ellis, 1998; van Dijk, 1977). Knowledge of schemata/situational frames and associated language arises through participation in *usage events*. In usage-based linguistics, usage events are the key to mastering, in both L1 and L2 acquisition, the range of meanings and pragmatic functions of utterances, be they single lexical items or formulaic sequences (Eskildsen, 2009; Kemmer & Barlow, 2000). Through exposure to and participation in usage events, speakers of a language build up extensive networks of usage and internalize the formulaic language appropriate to a given situation.

**2.2.3 Routine Formulas and Related Linguistic Phenomena**

Much of the work on formulaic language mentions the importance of context and the role of such language in social support. Hymes (1962) referred to the *linguistic routines* necessary for communicative competence, which speakers acquire over the course of a lifetime through participation in various communicative events. These routines are not limited to strings of lexical units, but also refer to the larger discursive patterns found in interaction (in the performance of a traditional ceremony, for example). Coulmas (1979) used the term *routine formulae*, which he defined as "expressions whose occurrence is closely tied to types of recurrent social situations" (p. 239). They function to maintain the "orderliness" of communication by providing social support. Additionally, they "represent petrified forms of typical behavior for handling certain types of situations" (Coulmas, 1979, p. 251). Bardovi-Harlig and Vellenga (2012) called them *conventional expressions*, noting that they are also known as *pragmatic routines* and *formulaic sequences*. Researchers have used other terms for similar and related phraseological concepts:
gambits (Keller, 1979) are semi-fixed expressions with functions in discourse; situation-bound utterances (Kecskes, 2000) are "highly conventionalized, prefabiricated units whose occurrence is tied to more or less standardized communicative situations" (p. 146); a multi-word expression (Eskildsen, 2009) is a "recurring sequence of words used together for a relatively coherent communicative purpose" (p. 338); conversational routines (Aijmer, 1996) are formulaic expressions "closely bound to a special function or communication situation" (p. 1); lexical phrases (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992) are frequent and idiomatic multi-word "conventionalized lexical form/function composites" (p.1).

Since there exists within ILP research a variety of terms that vary subtly, this review uses routine formula as a general term for any recurring word or phrase that conveys pragmatic meaning in interaction (for a comprehensive review of all the various terms used to describe formulaic language generally, see Wray, 2002). Such language has three key characteristics: "the form as a recurrent sequence, its occurrence in specific social contexts, and the idea of the social contract which extends to members of a particular speech community" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2012, p. 207). These criteria are sufficiently flexible to account for the range of formulaic language in interaction that is context-dependent, frequent, and pragmatically productive. Although most discussion of formulaic language in the literature addresses strings of at least two words, some scholars have argued for the inclusion of single-word items, especially when discussing pragmatic function (Schmitt & Carter, 2004; Weinert, 1995). Raupach (1984) included one-word fillers, discourse markers, and pragmatic markers in a study examining the role of formulas in planning speech. Pawley (2007) opted to use the terms conventional expressions and formulaic language over phraseology in order to include single-word expressions that have pragmatic
function (e.g., *Thanks!*). Because the use of such words is highly conventionalized and context-specific, they too can be classified as formulaic.

While routine formulas are an established object of research within ILP—although far less studied than speech acts (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Roever, 2009)—studies have focused predominantly on their acquisition by learners of English and learners of Japanese (e.g., Tateyama, 2001). Studies on L2 Russian learners are scarce, and, as mentioned previously, underrepresented in the field of ILP generally. Research on speech acts often, albeit in passing, mentions the role of formulas (Cohen, 1997; Eisenstein & Bodman, 1993; Ogiermann, 2008). Because the literature on speech acts is so extensive, those studies have been omitted from the current review unless they explicitly discuss routine formulas.

Routine formulas share many commonalities with four related linguistic categories that are necessary for conveying pragmatic meaning: *pragmatic markers, discourse markers, interjections, and particles*. Aijmer and Fetzer (2014) and Fraser (1996) used pragmatic marker as an umbrella term that refers "to linguistic devices with a discourse-connecting or interpersonal function" (Aijmer & Fetzer, 2014, p. 1). Discourse markers, which are subsumed under this category, signal "how the speaker intends the basic message that follows to relate to the prior discourse" (Fraser, 1990, p. 387). Aijmer (2013) demonstrated that *well* has both discourse marking (e.g., it can signal a change in topic) and pragmatic marking (e.g., it can be used to hedge) functions. This review uses the term pragmatic marker to encompass a range of words and phrases with either or both of these functions, as the categorization of pragmatic and discourse markers is blurry and long-disputed (Aijmer & Fetzer, 2014; but see Fraser, 1996 for an influential paper on their classification).
Interjections fall under the umbrella of pragmatic markers, as they exhibit discourse-connecting and interpersonal functions. They have "different degrees of affinity with other items such as particles and routines, and they have sometimes been subsumed under these items" (Ameka, 1992, p. 102). In a discussion article, Norrick (2007) explored the role of interjections in participation and information frameworks in more depth, arguing that they be analyzed as a class of their own, separate from pragmatic markers. However, their importance in conveying pragmatic information cannot be ignored. Ameka (1992) contended that interjections "may be defined as a subset of items that encode speaker attitudes and communicative intentions and are context-bound" (p. 107). Fraser (1996) classified interjections as a specific type of pragmatic marker which he termed *pragmatic idioms*. While they have traditionally been singled out on account of their emotive functions, Fischer and Drescher (1996) asserted that interjections "have clear pragmatic functions and are not just expressions of emotions as suggested by grammarians" (p. 860). Interjections have been viewed as peripheral to language, as paralinguistic. Norrick (2015) suggested that this is a function of the historical focus on written language. In spoken grammar, interjections (as well as other linguistic elements infrequently found in writing) are essential. The linguistic class of interjections can include backchannels, discourse markers, particles, vocatives, onomatopoeic words, and other words and phrases. It is a "wastepaper basket" category, overflowing with sometimes disparate members (Cuenca, 2000; Drescher, 1997). Interjections can fulfill emotive, cognitive, evaluative, phatic, and discourse-marking functions. Moreover, like the broader category of pragmatic markers, they can be multifunctional (Ameka, 1992).

This multifunctionality makes it difficult to assign definitions to interjections, and to differentiate between interjections that share similar functions. Historically, interjections have
been broken into two categories: primary and secondary interjections. Primary interjections belong only to the word class of interjections (e.g., *oh* in English; *akh* in Russian), while secondary interjections belong to other word classes but function as interjections. Formulaic expressions that express an attitude or state would be classified as secondary interjections (e.g., *Thank God!* in English; *Nichego sebe!* in Russian). Norrick (2015) proposed the term *phrasal interjections* to refer to these phrases, which he defined as "recurrent multi-word chunks which act like unitary interjections with characteristic pragmatic functions and distributions" (p. 265).

In Russian, as in other languages, the classification and definition of interjections, despite their surface simplicity, is complex. Most dictionaries simply resort to a description of the emotions expressed by the interjection in question, accompanied by examples from literary works (Sharonov, 2002). Didactic materials are even less descriptive: in Russian language textbooks, *nu* and *oi* are staples of model dialogues but textbook authors rarely, if ever, address their functions in conversation. Similarly, Reber (2011) found that while English as a Foreign Language (EFL) textbook dialogues include interjections, they are rarely translated or explained. The related category of particles—that is, pragmatic markers that typically combine with other words in order to convey stance and other meanings—in Russian (e.g., *zhe*, *ved’*, *-to*, among others) has been studied for pedagogical purposes to some extent (Townsend, 1972; Vasilyeva, 1973). According to Minchenkov (2001), particles are characterized by their ability to convey hidden meaning that native speakers understand intuitively, but foreigners find difficult to access. Particles may constitute an essential element of a routine formula (*Da ty chto!*?) but their potential uses are extensive. Some work on Russian particles and discourse markers (e.g., *nu* and *vot* in conversation, Kuosmanen & Multisilta, 1999) has been done in the field of discourse analysis (see Grenoble, 2006, for an overview). Generally, though, pragmatic markers and
related phenomena in Russian receive inadequate attention in research, as well as in reference and pedagogical materials. However, understanding the functions of pragmatic markers, including routine formulas, is crucial to the development of pragmatic competence in language learners.

2.2.4 Functions of Routine Formulas

Routine formulas have both discourse-connecting and interpersonal functions, and, like pragmatic markers, are multifunctional, depending on context (Aijmer & Fetzer, 2014). This multifunctionality makes them difficult to define and categorize. As such, it is necessary to examine routine formulas in use in order to catalog their various functions/meanings. Pragmatic markers, and by extension routine formulas, are indexical in that they point to various elements of discourse, such as affective and epistemic stance, speaker-hearer relationship, turn-taking protocol, identity, and social acts. Furthermore, "they comment on the utterance and thus assist in the interpretation of that utterance" (Aijmer & Fetzer, 2014, p. 3). Part of what makes acquiring pragmatic competence so challenging is the fact that "the indexical meaning of speech acts and strategies varies inter- and intraculturally" (Kasper & Rose, 2001, p. 8).

Routine formulas are crucial to the flow of conversation. Norrick (2015) argued that approaches to describing interjections should include a focus on "their nuts-and-bolts functionality in filling pauses, introducing turns, connecting utterances, signaling attention, and so on" (p. 253). This applies to routine formulas as well. They, and other pragmatic markers, can also indicate the speaker's participation in a dialogue. McCarthy (2003) analyzed the role of backchannels (he termed them nonminimal response tokens) in conversation with a focus on their interactional and responsive functions, highlighting their importance in displaying "good listenership." The use of these words is necessary for achieving good listenership because it
"shows a concern on the part of listeners toward attending to the relational aspects of the conversation as well as performing the necessary feedback functions with which listeners cocreate the discourse with speakers" (McCarthy, 2003, p. 59). In reference to interjections, Norrick (2009) found that they "function in the participation and information frameworks of discourse, rather than marking emotional involvement" (p. 888). These words and phrases that are subsumed under the category of pragmatic markers do much more than express a speaker's emotions. However, their emotive functions still deserve investigation.

Caffi and Janney (1994) prioritized the importance of studying emotive communication within the field of pragmatics. In their view, emotive communication is "less a personal psychological phenomenon than an interpersonal social one" (Caffi & Janney, 1994, p. 329). Thus, it is crucial to examine the expression of emotion as a resource in interaction. Wilkinson and Kitzinger (2006) adopted this view in their analysis of reaction tokens that express surprise: "instead of treating reaction tokens as eruptions or leakages of internal, individual, physiological, or psychological states, we explore them as interactional strategies in social contexts" (p. 152). When a speaker reacts with an expression of surprise, s/he is asserting that the content of the utterance in question violates expected norms of the present context. Surprise is a performance rather than a visceral reaction, enacted in order to claim (or reject) membership in a particular community (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006).

Finally, an important but understudied feature of pragmatic markers, routine formulas included, is prosody (Aijmer & Fetzer, 2014). Prosodic features can change depending on a marker's function and its context of use (Norrick, 2009). Reber (2011) stressed the importance of discussing prosodic features of interjections in the classroom, noting that "the vocal, i.e. prosodic-phonetic, shape, and context-specific use of interjections contribute to their affective
and discourse-organizational meanings" (p. 373). One future avenue for research in this area is through the analysis of spoken corpus data. However, corpus methodologies can be used to illuminate other features of routine formulas and pragmatic markers in general.

2.2.5 Applications of Corpus Linguistics to Pragmatics Research

Adolphs (2008), in her study of patterns of speech act expressions in English through the analysis of spoken corpora, made a case for harnessing the explanatory power of corpus analysis in pragmatics research. Norrick (2015) proposed the use of corpus methodologies in the study of interjections in order to "reveal their distribution and range of functions" (p. 249). These methodologies could be fruitfully used to analyze routine formulas as well. Corpora can be searched for all instances of a particular formula, and the results of these queries can then be analyzed with reference to context and interlocutors to illuminate the relationship between form, function, and context. Norrick (2015) called for research that triangulates the results of large quantitative and small qualitative studies, arguing that quantitative studies are needed "to discover the multifarious contexts and functions of interjections" (as well as other pragmatic markers) while qualitative research is necessary "to determine particular functions" (Norrick, 2015, p. 271).

Cross-linguistic research can also be enhanced through the use of corpus data. The ability to express emotion is one aspect of pragmatic competence, and corpus methodologies can be used to explore the differences in "emotional etiquette" across languages. Apresjan (2013) investigated this issue by comparing the distribution of various emotion words in American English and Russian in order to shed light on an area that "can neither be found in dictionaries nor in grammar books; instead, it has to be intuited and accumulated from one's communication with native speakers" (p. 534). Learning how to express emotions and react appropriately in
conversation is challenging but necessary. Not only do speakers express emotions differently across languages, but a particular emotion may be more commonly expressed in one language than another, or may carry a different weight. Corpus analyses like Apresjan's (2013), in which lexical items associated with emotion categories were queried in a corpus, can uncover this element of conversational language in context, and can provide researchers and learners with explicit information on usage that would otherwise require extensive spoken interaction to glean.

Corpus linguistics also provides tools for determining whether or not a phrase is formulaic. Nation (2001) asserted that frequency should be the foremost determinant of which sequences are most important to learn. However, frequency counts are not reliable measures of formulaicity. Strings of extremely common words will be very frequent, but may not constitute a coherent formula (e.g., *and the*). Association measures, such as t-score and mutual information (MI) score, are better suited for the identification of potential formulaic sequences (Durrant & Schmitt, 2009; Siyanova & Schmitt, 2008). MI scores, for example, single out word combinations that are rarely found apart, thereby controlling for frequency effects.

In addition to providing insight on usage and formulaicity, corpora are also useful for both identifying and tracking pragmatic and formulaic language development in first and second language learners (for an overview of learner corpus studies on formulaic language, see Paquot & Granger, 2012). Acquisitional studies using corpus data are particularly valuable in usage-based approaches (Kemmer & Barlow, 2000).

Researchers may query particular formulaic sequences in order to discover how speakers use them in communication, but analyzing how functions are realized in corpus data may lead to more telling evidence of the nature of pragmatic use. Rühlemann and Aijmer (2015) pointed out that the field of *corpus pragmatics* utilizes both form-to-function and function-to-form
approaches in analyzing pragmatics in corpus data. Since "pragmatics involves a systematic many-to-many mapping between form and meaning," it is especially difficult for both humans (especially learners of a language) and computers to interpret pragmatic meaning (Cummins & Ruiter, 2014, p. 133). Manual pragmatic tagging of corpus data is extremely time-consuming, and efficient automated pragmatic tagging has not yet been developed. Thus, most researchers use a form-to-function approach in which they query particular words and phrases that realize, for example, certain speech acts (see Dipper, Zinsmeister, & Webber, 2013, for more on the challenges of annotating pragmatic phenomena). However, this method neglects to return data on speech acts that do not contain such conventionalized language. Durrant and Mathews-Aydinli (2011) performed an analysis of formulaic language used by native and nonnative writers of English using a function-to-form approach "in which a corpus is first annotated for communicative functions and formulas are then identified as the recurrent patterns associated with each function" (p. 58). This approach yields extensive data on how particular discourse and pragmatic functions are realized in usage, but it is quite laborious. Still, it is valuable as it provides a method of calculating "the occurrences of a particular message form as a proportion of the total number of attempts to express that message" (Wray, 2002, p. 30).

Finally, corpus data have been used to examine the validity of instruments for assessing pragmatic competence, such as the discourse completion task (DCT). Schauer and Adolphs (2006) compared data elicited with a DCT to corpus data, and found that the two data sources complement each other well. DCT data contained formulas specific to the communicative environment described therein while corpus data provided greater detail on routines across multiple turns and information on other contexts in which those routines occurred. Regrettably, corpus research into routine formulas in ILP is still quite rare in the field (Bardovi-Harlig, 2012).
Corpus methodologies can aid in cataloguing the abundant and complex pragmatic functions of routine formulas—as indexical markers, as resources for the expression of emotion, and as interactional tools that contribute to conversational flow. However, routine formulas nonetheless present a challenge for language learners. The nature of pragmatic use and development in general by learners has been documented extensively in the ILP literature; a review of this research with particular emphasis on routine formulas follows.

2.2.6 L2 Pragmatic Use and Development

L2 pragmatic use is characterized by two types of error that are crucial to understanding research in the field of ILP: pragmalinguistic failure and sociopragmatic failure. Thomas (1983) established the use of these terms in order to distinguish the two main kinds of pragmatic error. Pragmalinguistic failure happens when the linguistic means used to perform a pragmatic function in a given communicative context are not what a native speaker of the language would choose. This may be the result of lack of knowledge of appropriate forms or of negative transfer from the speaker's L1. Sociopragmatic failure, on the other hand, occurs when a speaker acts in a way that is not ordained in a given culture. As this review will illustrate, learners often err both pragmalinguistically and sociopragmatically in the target language as a result of misuse of the formulaic language needed to perform various pragmatic functions.

Pragmalinguistic failure frequently results from the lack of knowledge of the appropriate language form for a given context. A learner may correctly interpret that a particular illocutionary force needs to be conveyed, but cannot produce the means necessary to exert that force (Taguchi, 2013). Or, a learner may misunderstand the illocutionary force of a word or phrase s/he uses (Churchill & DuFon, 2006). For example, De Cock (2004), in a corpus analysis of the formulaic language preferred by French learners of English as compared to native
speakers, found that learners employed inappropriate pragmalinguistic means in informal interviews with a native speaker interlocutor, using yes and yeah of course in response to requests for information or to opinions, which "may well make learners sound rather over-emphatic and even impolite" (p. 242). Similarly, Aijmer (2009) found that Swedish learners of English used the sequence I don't know as a speech management signal, while native speakers preferred the phrase as a means to avoid directness in asking questions. Learners may also err by recognizing only the literal meaning of a phrase (Kasper & Rose, 2001). Jaworski (1994) discovered that native speakers of Polish, when asked How are you?, responded as if it were a genuine question rather than a formulaic greeting. In a study on native and nonnative speaker use and comprehension of situation-bound utterances (similar to routine formulas), Kecskes (2000) found that the nonnative speakers relied on literal translations of the utterances in a dialogue comprehension task, which led to errors in comprehension of illocutionary force.

Alternatively, learners may use a pragmalinguistically appropriate utterance in the wrong context, resulting in sociopragmatic failure. Bardovi-Harlig (2009), in her study of the recognition and production of conventional expressions by learners of English, found that learners sometimes misinterpreted the context and supplied a sociopragmatically inappropriate response. For example, in an oral DCT, participants responded to the following situation: a friend is standing on a chair with a broken leg, reaching for a book. Nonnative speakers tended to offer help, where the vast majority of native speakers issued a warning. Sociopragmatic failure can be a result of misunderstandings of formality and register as well. Iino (2006) reported on an American learner of Japanese who used a pragmalinguistically appropriate formulaic sequence when giving a gift to her hosts, who responded with laughter. The utterance was sociopragmatically inappropriate, as it was one that is used only in very formal contexts in Japan.
Another potential source of pragmatic failure is L1 transfer in the use of formulaic language (N. Ellis, Simpson-Vlach, & Maynard, 2008; Granger, 1998). Kasper and Rose (2001) posited the existence of "universal" pragmatic knowledge—for instance, the understanding that speakers of a language use routines, rather than original utterances, to navigate frequently occurring situations. These universals may lead to both positive and negative transfer, depending on the extent to which L1 forms and their usage correspond to their L2 counterparts. As such, learners must acquire L2 pragmalinguistic forms alongside knowledge of sociopragmatic rules of use which may or may not line up with contextually equivalent mappings in their L1. Barron (2003), in her longitudinal study of the acquisition of pragmatic routines by Irish learners of German studying abroad, found that learners initially transferred routines from the L1, but over time their pragmalinguistic competence developed and they were able to use more target-like forms. In another study by Barron (2007), she discovered that learners transferred extended refusal routines from their L1, which are sociopragmatically necessary in Irish English but not in German. In an analysis of conversations between American learners of German and a native speaking interlocutor, Wildner-Bassett (1994) found that the learners sometimes exhibited negative L1 transfer, thus failing pragmalinguistically although their intentions were sociopragmatically correct. Yoshimi (1999) examined the use of the discourse particle ne in interactions between learners and native speakers of Japanese. She found that while learners used the particle, their uses reflected L1 pragmatic norms, and were therefore not target-like.

Occasionally, however, knowledge of pragmatic meaning in one's L1 may result in positive transfer in the L2. Indeed, a pragmatic routine in one language may communicate the same illocutionary force when translated literally into another language. Still, researchers in the
field of ILP have shown that literal translation generally results in a transformation of illocutionary force and loss of idiomaticity (Coulmas, 1981; Wierzbicka, 1991).

Overuse and underuse are also key topics in studies on learners’ use of formulaic language (De Cock, 2004; Raupach, 1984; Schmidt & Frota, 1986). In overuse, the function of the formulaic utterance is often lost, and in underuse, "learners do not use formulas where they are expected" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2006, p. 15). Learners may overuse the one formulaic expression at their disposal for a given communicative function, whereas native speakers have a wide repertoire of expressions for every function (e.g., thanking can be expressed by *thanks, thank you very much, I'm very grateful*, etc.), the use of which varies depending on the context (Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012; Foster, 2001). This may be an effect of instruction: a teacher may emphasize one routine formula to the exclusion of all others for a particular function (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001). In a survey of literature on the topic, Wray (2012) found that post-childhood L2 learners "tend to have a small inventory of formulaic sequences that they overuse and often have limited sensitivity to register differences" (p. 235). Churchill and DuFon (2006) discovered that even though learners increased their use of routines in pragmatically appropriate ways during sojourns abroad, they also overgeneralized, using expressions in inappropriate contexts. Barron (2003) found similar results in her study of Irish learners studying German abroad.

Underuse has been attributed to lack of knowledge of formulas (Shardakova, 2005; Wildner-Bassett, 1994) and lack of rich input (Irujo, 1986), but could also be related to learner identity, which will be discussed in Section 2.2.8. Learners may avoid the use of formulaic language altogether in order to circumvent pragmatic failure (Moon, 1997). This is a sound strategy, since being able to use formulaic language in pragmatically appropriate ways is a gargantuan task that can overwhelm nonnative speakers. Because they may have, in contrast,
fluent grasp of the grammatical system and an extensive inventory of individual vocabulary words, learners may opt to rely on that knowledge to produce fluent (albeit not always idiomatic) language (Wray, 2012). If this is the case, it is possible that proficiency is not a significant variable in formulaic language production, as both novice and expert learners may avoid its use. Other factors, most notably context of acquisition, may be more influential.

2.2.7 The Role of Proficiency and Context in Pragmatic Development

Assessments of learner language, including the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Proficiency Guidelines, recognize the importance of the production of formulaic language (particularly sequences used in daily communicative routines) in overall proficiency, even at levels where learners have little to no control over grammatical forms (Myles, Mitchell, & Hooper, 1999). However, in a survey of the literature on the role of proficiency and study abroad experience on formulaic language production, Taguchi (2013) found that higher proficiency on its own did not predict accurate and appropriate control of formulaic language. She suggested that it "may be advantageous for the basic control of linguistic sequences and efficient processing of them" but that time spent in the target country may play a more critical role (Taguchi, 2013, p. 117). Evidence from a study by Roever (2006) supports this idea, as learners who had spent time immersed in a target language culture showed greater knowledge of routines on a test of English as a Second Language (ESL) pragmalinguistics than test-takers who had not. Knowledge of speech acts and implicature, however, was positively correlated with English proficiency.

The relationship between study abroad participation and the development of pragmatic competence and formulaic language has been investigated in the literature, with the general consensus being that time spent abroad correlates positively with gains in the comprehension and
production of pragmatic routines (Bardovi-Harlig, 2012; Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011; Barron, 2003; Taguchi, 2013). Two explanations for such findings have emerged: rich pragmatic input is readily available in the target culture, given its importance in daily communication; and, since learners have more opportunities to interact with native speakers, the use of formulaic language can be a tool for claiming membership in target language communities (Dörnyei, Durow, & Zahran, 2004; Ortaçtepe, 2013; Roever, 2012; Schmidt & Frota, 1986). By using formulas, the learner signals to native speaking interlocutors that she is equipped to both produce and comprehend idiomatic language (Wray, 2002).

House (1996) found that learners with experience abroad outperformed those without such experience in tests of pragmatic fluency. Similarly, in a DCT asking participants to provide a particular cliché used frequently on television (Stay tuned), Kecskes (2000) found that only the nonnative speakers who had spent at least two years abroad responded correctly. Roever (2005), in his analysis of results from a web-based test of pragmatic competence of ESL learners living in the U.S. and in EFL learners in Germany, reported that the ESL learners outperformed the EFL learners on both comprehension and production tasks.

Still, although many language learners and teachers view study abroad experience as a panacea, it is not a guaranteed method for the acquisition of pragmatic competence (Kasper & Rose, 2002). Even learners immersed in a target language context for long periods may not achieve native-like levels of competence (Cohen & Shively, 2007; Rose, 2005). Pragmatic development may be uneven or impartial. In a longitudinal study of refusals produced by Chinese learners of English, Ren (2012) demonstrated that time abroad was correlated only with improved sociopragmatic knowledge. Shardakova (2005), in a comparison of how American learners of Russian and Russian native speakers perform the speech act of apologizing, found
that learners used routines very infrequently in their apologies, regardless of whether or not they
had been exposed to the target culture. Factors other than context may be more relevant in the
acquisition of pragmatic competence. Kecskes (2000) suggested that the ability of ESL learners
from a wide variety of L1 backgrounds to accurately produce and interpret formulaic expressions
was determined by the distance between L1 and L2 cultures rather than length of stay.

Additionally, participation in the socialization process may play a role in pragmatic
acquisition. Turkish learners of English in a study by Ortaçtepe (2013) were perceived as more
nativelike as a result, the researcher argued, of becoming socialized to L2 practices while abroad.
Dörnyei et al. (2004) also noted the importance of socialization, finding that integration into the
host community was a strong determinant of formulaic language production. Simply residing
abroad was not sufficient. Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011) accounted for the effect of social
integration by collecting data on the participants' (ESL learners at an American university)
intensity of interaction, and found that increased intensity of interaction led to higher scores on a
test of comprehension and production of conventional expressions. According to Wray (2002),
learners who interact at length with native speaker interlocutors will be motivated to use the
language known by their interlocutors in order to better control their environment. Desire to
participate in these interactions, however, is contingent upon individual factors.

2.2.8 The Role of Individual Differences and Identity in Pragmatic Development

Language learners differ in their development of pragmatic competence. Variation in
levels of motivation and strength of desire to sound like a native speaker play an important role
in the acquisition process (Bardovi-Harlig, 2006; Wray, 2002). Kasper and Schmidt (1996)
suggested that learners who are driven to reach nativelike proficiency in a language would be
likely to "seek out interactions with different interlocutors, to obtain pragmalinguistic and
sociopragmatic input, to test hypotheses, and to practice their communicative skills whenever possible" (p. 162). In a pre-test/post-test study on productive and receptive knowledge of formulaic sequences among learners of English studying in the UK, Dörnyei et al. (2004) found that motivation and extent of involvement in the target language community influenced how successfully learners produced and recognized the sequences. Schmidt (1983) demonstrated that Wes' high motivation appeared to facilitate his development of pragmatic competence, including routines, although his grammatical ability fossilized. In formulaic utterances like *Do you have time?*, Wes exhibited grammatical accuracy, but in non-formulaic strings this was not the case (e.g., "ah, you has keys?"). His motivation to communicate with native speakers may also have increased his awareness of the sociopragmatic norms of the target culture, given that he displayed a considerable understanding of these features. Kinginger (2008) found that while sociopragmatic awareness increased among Americans studying abroad in France (specifically awareness of colloquial language and address forms), production of the language under examination was dependent on learners' identities and on the nature of their participation in French-language interactions. As the results of these studies indicate, pragmatic development is not linear, but context- and participant-dependent.

Pragmatic competence is necessarily intertwined with issues of identity. The use of formulaic language with pragmatic functions gives speakers the means to assert their identity by claiming membership in a group and upholding group norms (Coulmas, 1979). In fact, the shared knowledge of the formulaicity of any given word or phrase "can be the badge of belonging to a speech community, and not possessing that knowledge can be a mark of social exclusion" (Wray, 2002, p. 24). Thus, formulaic language can be a significant part of effective communication and expression of identity in the L2, but the lack of formulaic language in learner speech is not
necessarily a sign of pragmatic incompetence. Identity and choice may explain deviation from native speaker norms. According to Wray (2002), a major function of formulaic language is to assert individual and group identity. Expert language users, given their idiomatic command of a language, can assert their identity as a particular type of speaker through creative manipulations of formulaic language for humorous or rhetorical effect. Unfortunately, when nonnative speakers do this in situations where a formulaic expression is expected, "their deliberate creativity might result in them being perceived as non-nativelike" (Ortaçtepe, 2013, p. 862). Or, language users may have access to pragmatically appropriate resources for a given situation, but choose not to use them as a way to assert their identity—as a nonnative speaker (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996; Wray, 1999), or perhaps as an incompetent user of the language (Rampton, 1987). Thornbury and Slade (2006) emphasized the importance of allowing for choice of speech style in their approach to teaching conversation: "Encouraging learners to adopt the conversational style of a group which they do not wish, or are not allowed, to become members of, may be futile and demotivating" (p. 285). House (1996) described a pedagogical intervention used with German learners of English that investigated the effects of metapragmatic instruction on pragmatic competence. Learners were uncomfortable using routines typical of phatic communication, considering that kind of talk "'exaggerated', 'superficial', and 'typically American'" (House, 1996, p. 239). They thus avoided such language as a way to assert their non-American identity. Thomas (1983) proposed that teachers equip students with the ability to express themselves as they wish in their L2, rather than being "condemned to the 'reduced personality'… allowed only banal and conventional opinions" (p. 96). Yorio (1980) also emphasized the teaching of conventionalized forms with the aim of adding routines to learners' existing set, rather than replacing them.
Because issues related to identity and individual differences are closely linked to the pragmatic choice(s) of language learners, Kasper and Schmidt (1996) and Taguchi (2011) have stressed the importance in ILP of using introspective data collection methods that can tap into these factors. In order to better address the role of individual differences in the language development process, Kinginger (2008) solicited interviews and written reflections from American learners studying in France and interacted with them throughout the course of their semester abroad, in addition to documenting their proficiency and language awareness. Thus, the perspectives of the participants on their identities and experiences abroad were built in as an integral component of the study, enabling a more nuanced analysis of the relationship between learners' identity, their participation in French-speaking contexts, and their use of colloquial French and address pronouns. Letting participants speak for themselves can shed light on the agency of the learner in the process of pragmatic acquisition.

Researching learner identity through narratives and other introspective data can deepen understanding of the process of pragmatic acquisition, but analyses of instructional materials can provide valuable information as well. Often, textbooks do not provide learners with a range of identity options that reflect their personalities, backgrounds, goals, and language behavior. V. Cook (2013) criticized the "blandness" of beginning textbooks of English, French, and Italian, summarizing that those materials depicted "a sanitized world of clean-living teenagers untouched by 'sex and drugs and rock "n" roll'" (p. 293). In the textbooks he surveyed he found characters in a limited range of communicative situations, the erasure of references to learners' L1, and a privileging of the native speaker as the only acceptable user of the language. In an analysis of beginning Russian textbooks, Shardakova and Pavlenko (2004) found that the language learners depicted in those materials are homogenous (male, white, middle-class, able-bodied, and
educated) and are linguistically adept at tackling banal communication problems. Azimova and Johnston (2012) examined the native speaking characters in popular Russian as a foreign language textbooks and found that they, too, are homogenous and fail to represent the diversity of speakers of the Russian language. This state of affairs has implications for the development of pragmatic competence, as the deficit of models for language use that reflect learners' identities, interests, and motivations may leave students ill-equipped to express themselves authentically in L2 interaction. Thus, teaching materials play an important role in pragmatic development, as they not only present the language to be learned, but also provide students with the models and forms necessary to construct a personally meaningful identity in their L2. A speaker’s linguistic choices communicate information about how she orients to her interlocutors, in addition to potentially granting recognition of a speaker as a fluent L2 user.

2.3 Instructional Pragmatics

Instructional pragmatics refers to the pedagogically-oriented subfield of ILP (Ishihara, 2010). Regarding language pedagogy more generally, Ortega (2009), after reviewing the literature on the teaching of grammar, concluded that instruction leads to more accurate and quicker acquisition: "instructed learners progress at a faster rate, they are likely to develop more elaborate language repertoires and they typically become more accurate than uninstructed learners" (p. 139). According to Roever (2009), the acquisition of pragmatics is a process similar to language acquisition generally, but it "is complicated by the need to learn non-linguistic rules of social conduct and social relationships" (p. 561). Research has demonstrated that pragmatics is amenable to instruction (Rose, 2005). Unfortunately, most of this research has focused on the instruction of pragmatics in English and, to a lesser extent, Japanese (Alcón Soler & Martínez-Flor, 2008; Rose, 2005; Taguchi, 2015b).
Kasper (1997) delineated two kinds of activities useful for the teaching of pragmatics: those "aiming at raising students' pragmatic awareness, and activities offering opportunities for communicative practice" (L2 Classrooms as Impoverished Learning Environments section, para. 5). Judd (1999) categorized the activity types implemented in the literature on instructional pragmatics slightly differently: cognitive awareness, receptive skill development, and productive use. The employment of these activities is predicated on the necessity of noticing, understanding, and using pragmalinguistic devices with awareness of their sociopragmatic dimension, often first in the learner's L1, and then in her L2 (Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; Judd, 1999; Usó-Juan, 2008). Furthermore, it has been shown that learners who engage in cognitively demanding tasks, such as comparing their own performance to that of native speakers, or investigating pragmatically appropriate forms and their contexts in inductive exercises, exhibit more durable acquisition of pragmatic features (Taguchi, 2011; Takahashi, 2010).

One prominent strand of research in instructional pragmatics addresses the importance of learning strategies in achieving pragmatic competence. Proponents advocate for strategy instruction as a means to facilitate pragmatic acquisition (Cohen, 2008a; Cohen & Shively, 2007). While there is thus far little evidence to support this approach, strategy training is nonetheless a promising direction for the field, as it may promote autonomy and opportunities for target language interaction among learners.

A point that should be mentioned is the tendency in the field to use the native speaker as the model of pragmatic competence in instructional interventions. As Ishihara and Cohen (2010) pointed out, expert speakers (both native and nonnative) uphold pragmatic norms—"a range of tendencies or conventions for pragmatic language use that are not absolute or fixed but are typical or generally preferred in the L2 community" (p. 13). Thus, the purpose of instruction is
not to hold learners to a native speaker standard, but rather to give them the opportunity to acquire the knowledge of what the pragmatic norms of a given community are, and how to enact those norms.

In order to provide empirical support for a particular methodology for pragmatics instruction, a theory of learning must first be articulated. As Alcón Soler and Martínez-Flor (2008) emphasized, it is important that instructional research in ILP be grounded in theory and carried out with appropriate research methodologies.

2.3.1 Theories of Pragmatics Learning

The approach adopted for the current study relies on both the noticing hypothesis and the relevance of frequency effects to language acquisition. However, these are not the only theoretical frameworks for conceptualizing pragmatic development: sociocultural theory, language socialization, and conversation analysis have informed research in this field as well (for an overview of the applications of these theories to ILP research, see Kasper, 2009). These theories often share particular research foci. For example, the language socialization framework foregrounds the social processes inherent to language learning—clearly making it an excellent candidate for examining the pragmatic dimensions of language (Iwasaki, 2011; Kasper, 2001). Kasper (2001) advocated the use of different theoretical perspectives in ILP research in order to reach a more nuanced, deeper understanding of the field's central issues.

Schmidt's (1990; 1993; 2001) noticing hypothesis is the most common theoretical framework used in ILP research (Alcón Soler & Martínez-Flor, 2008; Kasper, 2001; Taguchi, 2011). Ishihara and Cohen (2010) explained that the noticing hypothesis is one of four frameworks most relevant to L2 pragmatic development and that it has justified the current trend of awareness-raising approaches in the instruction of pragmatics. The noticing hypothesis states
that "what must be attended to and noticed is not just the input in a global sense but whatever features of the input are relevant for the target system" (Schmidt, 1993, p. 209). Thus, within the context of pragmatics instruction, learners must attend to both pragmalinguistic forms and sociopragmatic elements in order to acquire pragmatic knowledge. This requires attention to "the action that is being accomplished, the linguistic, paralinguistic, and nonverbal forms by which the action is implemented, its immediate interactional or textual context, and the dimensions of the situational context that are indexed by linguistic and pragmatic choices" (Kasper & Roever, 2005, p. 318). Roever (2009) presented the following model of pragmatics learning (Figure 2) to demonstrate the relationship between sociopragmatic, pragmalinguistic, and general linguistic knowledge in the acquisition of pragmatics.

**Figure 2.** Roever’s (2009, p. 562) model of pragmatics learning
Roever (2009) argued that naturalistic environments may very well provide more sociopragmatic and linguistic input than instructed contexts (however, see Ren, 2012 for dispute of this claim), but that acquisition may be slow as the input is unstructured. Because certain features of the language—particularly at the pragmatic level—may be more subtle, or less likely to be encountered in the classroom (such as routine formulas and other pragmatic markers), "instructional practices that focus learners’ attention on things that they are less likely to attend to or notice on their own also have a solid justification," as the task demands will focus learners’ attention and therefore accelerate acquisition (Schmidt, 2001, p. 29).

Schmidt (2001) distinguished between noticing and understanding, where noticing is the first step in the acquisition process. In Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) interpretation of the "noticing–understanding" framework, "learners need to notice the surface features and to understand the principle, rule, or pattern involved for the learning of pragmatics" (p. 103). Studies in ILP have tested the noticing hypothesis by designing interventions in which "noticing of the target form–function–context mappings is facilitated through various instructional methods such as explicit metapragmatic information, input enhancement, consciousness raising, and repeated processing of pragmalinguistic forms" (Taguchi, 2011, p. 291). One of the central issues in instructional pragmatics is whether instruction should be explicit or implicit—that is, with or without the provision of metapragmatic information. Overall, the results of instructional studies have shown explicit instruction to be most effective in the teaching of pragmatics (Alcón Soler, 2005; Ishihara, 2010; Koike & Pearson, 2005; Rose, 2005; Takahashi, 2001; Takahashi, 2010; Yoshimi, 2001). This is likely related to the heightened ability in adults to analyze and reflect on metapragmatic information (Tateyama, Kasper, Mui, Tay, & Thananart, 1997). Takahashi (2010), in a review of studies examining the teachability of pragmatics, found that
explicit methods were superior to implicit ones, and argued that this supported Schmidt's (1990; 1993; 2001) noticing hypothesis. Treatments in the studies under review included metapragmatic information and "various forms of awareness-raising tasks such as dialogue/conversation analysis, discussions, role-plays, video viewing, narrative reconstruction, translation exercises, and self-reflection" (Takahashi, 2010, p. 399).

An awareness-raising approach to instruction is a hallmark of studies in ILP that test the noticing hypothesis. Such an approach "is designed to facilitate learners' noticing and understanding of the form–context relationship" (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010, p. 113). Ishihara and Cohen's (2010) proposed awareness-raising tasks include the analysis and practice of relevant pragmalinguistic forms and the identification and analysis of sociopragmatic norms. This supports Schmidt's (2001) proposal that "in order to acquire pragmatics, one must attend to both the linguistic form of utterances and the relevant social and contextual features with which they are associated" (p. 30).

Since pragmatic markers index certain meanings and stances in interaction, pedagogical approaches that highlight the indexical character of language can raise awareness of form–function mappings. For instance, H. Cook (2008) suggested that speech styles (i.e. honorifics, or politeness markers) in Japanese be taught using an indexical approach, meaning that instructors and textbook authors should describe the forms as context-dependent interactional tools. Learners should be exposed to the social meanings indexed by a particular form, then be allowed to choose if and when they use these forms. Van Compernolle (2013) also advocated for the instruction of sociopragmatic meaning using such an indexical approach. After attending to the form and its context, receptive and productive skills can be developed through guided practice that reflects authentic target language communication (Judd, 1999).
Explicit awareness-raising approaches that combine comprehension and production practice can be used in the instruction of a range of topics in pragmatics. As this review has demonstrated, mastery of formulaic language, particularly routine formulas, is essential for achieving pragmatic competence. R. Ellis (2008), in his list of ten principles of instructed SLA, asserted the importance of the inclusion of formulaic expressions in the language syllabus. More generally, he underlined the importance of focusing on form (specifically, form–function mappings), arguing that, in accordance with the noticing hypothesis, attention to form is required for acquisition. In a study by Bardovi-Harlig and Vellenga (2012), conventional expressions with pragmatic functions were taught to learners using tasks containing contextualized input that focused on increasing metapragmatic noticing. They found some improvement in both recognition as well as production, even though their instructional intervention did not include output-focused activities. In a study of knowledge of conventional expressions among EFL learners, Rafieyan, Sharafi-Nejad, and Eng (2014) found that awareness of these expressions was correlated with appropriate comprehension and production. Narita (2012) found that the use of pragmatic consciousness-raising activities resulted in gains on measures of metapragmatic knowledge and production of pragmatic markers in Japanese. The noticing hypothesis has been substantiated in research on pragmatics instruction, including the instruction of formulaic language with pragmatic functions.

However, the level of noticing may vary from student to student due to individual differences in learning style and strategy use (Schmidt, 2001; Takahashi, 2001). Ishihara and Cohen (2010) emphasized the importance of socio-affective differences in noticing: 'learners' motivation, acculturation, social identity, investment, and attitudes are likely to affect the ways in which learners notice pragmatic input, understand the role of contextual factors, negotiate
meaning in interaction, and modify their language production across contexts and over time" (p. 105). Furthermore, these variables will likely impact how learners choose to apply (or not apply) their pragmatic knowledge in real-life contexts.

While awareness-raising instruction is logical for foreign language learners, there is also a place for it in study abroad curricula. Brecht and Robinson (1995) examined qualitative data from study abroad participants on programs to Russia, finding that formal instruction "focused out-of-class learning, activated passive knowledge, aided in comprehension, and provided a forum for troubleshooting out-of-class communication breakdowns" (p. 323). Because immersion in a foreign culture is fraught with potential for pragmatic failure given the need to interact appropriately in the language on a frequent basis, instructional settings can provide opportunities to navigate the complexities of communication. By promoting noticing of the pragmatic dimension of language in the curriculum, study abroad learners may have greater impetus to investigate the pragmatic details of contexts with which they come in contact. This opens up a need for pragmatically focused, immediately relevant instructional interventions that promote noticing and take advantage of the rich input and opportunities for interaction available in the target language context.

Shively (2010) proposed a model for pragmatics instruction in study abroad settings that maximizes learning opportunities afforded by the environment and the availability of developing technologies. The model includes tasks focused on raising awareness of linguistic and cultural elements of authentic language samples (e.g., target language films and interactions between native speakers). Further, she argued that explicit pragmatics instruction can provide for negative feedback that learners may lack, even in a study abroad context. This feedback can also encourage students to reflect upon their experiences communicating in the target language,
thereby raising their own awareness. Winke and Teng (2010) developed a task-based tutorial program for learners studying in China during a summer program and found that experimental group participants, who went abroad and used the tutorial, improved on a spoken measure of pragmatic performance. The students in the control group, who did not spend time abroad and did not use the tutorial, did not show improvement. The authors were motivated to create the tutorial as they found that time abroad did not necessarily lead to increases in pragmatic competence. The tutorial combined a workbook that addressed speech acts across a variety of contexts with a journaling component that required participants to comment on the cultural and linguistic knowledge to which they were introduced. Students also worked with tutors who assisted them in completing task-based workbook activities that involved going out into the world (e.g., to a restaurant) to practice speech acts in real contexts. Qualitative data from the journals indicated that the tutorials may have contributed to increased awareness of the formulaic expressions characteristic of the targeted speech acts. Also, integrating interaction with a native speaker—the tutor—appeared not only to provide learners with a sympathetic interlocutor with whom to practice speech acts, but also afforded them greater opportunities to interact in Chinese, as tutors opened their social circles to the study abroad students. Since noticing may not occur naturally even in input-rich contexts, instructional methods may be beneficial in raising learners' awareness of their linguistic surroundings, resulting in pragmatic development.

While noticing appears to be necessary for acquisition, repeated exposures to language in use facilitate the learning process as well. N. Ellis (2002) argued that both first and second language learners are sensitive to the frequency of linguistic forms in usage, proposing that "much of language learning is the gradual strengthening of associations between co-occurring elements of the language and that fluent language performance is the exploitation of this
probabilistic knowledge" (p. 173). This is a hallmark of connectionist (Gasser, 1990) and emergentist (Hopper, 1998) theories of language acquisition, both of which provide a model for the surfacing of routinized, or formulaic, expressions. Language structure is dynamic and fluid, as it "comes out of discourse and is shaped by discourse in an ongoing process" (Hopper, 1998, p. 156). Language is not a neat set of rules. Rather, humans extrapolate structure from recurrent usage patterns. Viewing language in this way lends credence to the approach of focusing on the functions of particular words and phrases across contexts, as meaning is dependent "on previous uses and contexts in which the current speaker has used or heard it" (Hopper, 1998, p. 157).

Exposure to these contexts, whether naturalistically or with the aid of materials and corpus data, is then essential to acquiring the meaning(s) of linguistic forms, which may vary greatly. Each language event is unique due to a confluence of variables: speaker, location, genre, and so on. In other words, "all discourse is in some sense specialist discourse, molded to the speaker's personality (i.e., personal history), the situation (including the recent history of the interaction and the participants), the register (degree of formality), the genre, and the topic" (Hopper, 1998, p. 169). For this reason, learners need to be able to be knowledgeable about the assorted connotations of frequently occurring forms in order to function appropriately in a multitude of language usage events.

Because first language learners have plentiful opportunities to be exposed to large amounts of linguistic input in a variety of contexts, acquisition of words and their associations occurs implicitly and over time. The issue is much more complex for L2 learners, since "nativelike competence, fluency, and idiomaticity require an awful lot of figuring out which words go together" (N. Ellis, 2002, p. 157). Mastering grammatical "rules" and memorizing isolated lexical items is not sufficient for acquisition, since "[l]earning a language is not a
question of acquiring grammatical structure but of expanding a repertoire of communicative contexts" (Hopper, 1998, p. 171). The process of language acquisition is a slow one that requires extensive exposure and practice in order to understand form–function mappings (N. Ellis, 2002).

In N. Ellis' (2002) view, highlighting the role of frequency in acquisition is compatible with the noticing hypothesis and explicit teaching methods, as noticing is required for the initial registry of a form–function mapping and can be accelerated through explicit instruction. Language in acquisition is constantly in flux, and the language user's knowledge is "a statistical ensemble of language experiences that changes slightly every time a new utterance is processed" (N. Ellis, 2002, p. 162). Explicit instruction is one way of manipulating this system. First, teaching materials expose learners to a new phrase, accompanied by examples and descriptions of usage. Then, upon encountering the phrase anew and producing it in their own speech, learners adjust their form–function mappings in order to accommodate for the new data being received. Phrases become entrenched in memory because users are exposed to such sequences repeatedly. Thus, speakers tend to gravitate towards these formulaic strings because they have been proven to successfully fulfill a communicative need (Bolinger, 1976).

However, frequent occurrence alone may not facilitate acquisition. Some highly frequent expressions may be acquired by adult learners with great difficulty, while others may be acquired more easily. Schmitt and Carter (2004) suggested that the degree of transparency or opaqueness of a particular phrase might have a relationship to the learner's success in its acquisition. This could be related to the likelihood that adults use single lexical items as the building blocks for constructing language, rather than employing formulas as a child learner might (Wray, 2002). Thus, the expressions that learners use might be the result of a construction process, building up
phrases word by word, which would explain why nonnative speaker use of multi-word sequences is often nonnativelike and unidiomatic.

Still, adult language learners do have at least one major advantage over child language learners: they are equipped with the ability to think about language and its patterns explicitly. The appeal of corpus applications to instruction lies in the ability of corpora to provide access to the patterns of language frequently used in particular contexts, and thus to facilitate the noticing of form–function mappings—mappings that may take years to notice in naturalistic environments. While corpora can only provide a (hopefully representative) sample of natural language occurring in the world, they can still act as a model of typical language use. They "can provide language learners with increased exposure to authentic language examples and invaluable information about the distribution and frequency of different linguistic features in different contexts" (Vyatkina, 2013, p. 45) and thereby provide insight into the web of language in use. Materials, particularly those that employ texts that reflect actual usage (such as corpus excerpts), can be an invaluable tool in instructional pragmatics as they can raise awareness, facilitate noticing, increase exposure, and provide opportunities for practice of target features.

2.3.2 Developing Materials for Pragmatic Competence

Tomlinson (2010) advocated for a text-driven approach to materials development in which affectively and cognitively engaging texts serve as the stimulus for learning. He summarized the goals of effective materials, stating that they should:

- Expose the learners to language in authentic use
- Help learners to pay attention to features of authentic input
- Provide the learners with opportunities to use the target language to achieve communicative purposes
- Provide opportunities for outcome feedback
- Achieve impact in the sense that they arouse and sustain the learners' curiosity and attention
- Stimulate intellectual, aesthetic, and emotional involvement (p. 83)

In order to acquire language, Tomlinson (2013) argued that "learners need motivated and meaningful exposure to language in use both prior to and subsequent to activities inviting the learners to pay conscious attention to features of the language used" (p. 475). Thoughtfully designed materials can serve as a vehicle for language exposure and noticing.

As noted by Tomlinson (2012), while a body of literature has accumulated on the design and evaluation of materials, "regrettably little of it provides empirical evidence of the effects of materials on their users" (p. 169). The role of materials in the classroom ecology has similarly gone understudied. Recently, Guerrettaz and Johnston (2013) undertook a classroom study in order to better understand the nature of materials in use. According to the authors, this is crucial for the following reasons: the use of materials in classrooms is extremely widespread; these materials are all based in particular ideologies; materials interact with other features of the classroom; and materials themselves fulfill various functions—they structure and sequence activities and curriculum and support ideologies. In their study, Guerrettaz and Johnston (2013) found that the materials provided affordances for language use that may not have been intended by their creators, due to the uniqueness of each learner and the dynamic interaction between materials and their users. As Tomlinson (2013) noted, the value of materials lies in "their effect on the people who come into contact with them" (p. 22). Thus, the central point of interest for researchers is not the materials themselves, but their potential for facilitating learning and engagement.
The publication of the Guerrettaz and Johnston (2013) study was followed by a "Perspectives" column in the *Modern Language Journal* (Tarone, 2014) in which several prominent scholars proposed ideas for expanding upon their innovative research. Blyth (2014) called for research on the affordances provided by Open Educational Resources (OER). These resources are created for free distribution via the Internet, in accordance with four principles of the open education movement:

- (a) to democratize education and thereby bring more people into the "knowledge ecosystem,"
- (b) to reduce the high costs of pedagogical materials,
- (c) to reduce the time it takes to produce materials, and
- (d) to enable students and teachers to adapt materials to make them more appropriate for local contexts. (Blyth, 2012, p. 201)

OERs typically follow a modular design that lends to their flexibility, allowing them to be used in a variety of different educational contexts: in secondary and university classrooms as well as self-study. These are materials designed to be adapted to a local context, with the potential for personalization. OERs and other innovations facilitated by technology are transforming materials and their use in the classroom (Garton & Graves, 2014). Thus, research is needed to better understand the ways in which today's language learners use materials in and out of the classroom in order to improve future materials. Nonetheless, the current literature on the evaluation and development of materials (especially those focused on speaking, formulaic language, and pragmatics) can provide principles of materials design for the instruction of the topic at hand—routine formulas.

Because routine formulas are characteristic of the oral mode, guidelines for producing materials for teaching speaking are particularly relevant. Textbooks and reference materials generally underrepresent spoken language. Thus, the burden is on learners to make sense of and
internalize the linguistic features of speech (Mauranen, 2004). McCarthy and Carter (1995) explained that spoken language has its own "grammar" that differs significantly from written language, as it is characterized by vague language, modals, formulaic expressions, and evaluative idioms. These features are not frequently found in language teaching materials. On the contrary, they are routinely disregarded in dialogues, and descriptions of the mechanics of conversation are given short shrift.

As Hughes (2010) pointed out, materials for improving speaking are primarily developed in service of the goal of increasing proficiency in general through "prompts for talk, and pronunciation / fluency work" (p. 221) rather than creating activities that allow for "pragmatic or affective skills building" (p. 209). Bao (2013) argued that materials for teaching speaking should equip learners with concrete strategies and linguistic devices to participate fully in target language conversation. In addition, materials should allow for learner choice by encouraging them to express their identity in the L2 and to "use their own background and personalities" in conversational exchanges (Bao, 2013, p. 417). Unfortunately, this is seldom the case. As mentioned in Section 2.2.8, even representation of a range of available identities is typically lacking in instructional materials.

Although most language learners would presumably like to be able to converse in their target language, it is difficult to locate materials that provide structured, detailed guidance in becoming an effective and pragmatically competent speaker of a language. Based on corpus analyses, McCarten (2007) found that the language used for participating in conversation—the "vocabulary of conversation," as she termed it—is very frequent and should be addressed in conversation syllabi, organized by functional areas. Thornbury and Slade (2006) presented an extensive list of approaches to teaching speaking based on a review of the treatment of formulaic
language, fillers, discourse markers, and other hallmarks of conversational language in textbooks and in classroom research. The authors presented excerpts from English Language Teaching (ELT) materials that address this language in detail, such as a textbook by Dörnyei and Thurrell (1992) that provides instruction on various elements of conversation (interrupting, fillers, enhancing fluency, and functions, among others) separated into short units full of exercises for the classroom. This type of functional approach to teaching the mechanics of conversation is rare, perhaps due to the fact that grammar and lexis have historically been separated. The pragmatic markers and formulaic sequences needed for speaking proficiency typically straddle both categories. Thus, control of both grammar and lexis is necessary for functional, and, by extension, pragmatic competence (Sinclair, 2004). Presenting these elements in isolation neglects to illustrate how they work together to create pragmatic meaning. This problem can be remedied through the implementation of real-world examples of usage.

Thornbury and Slade (2006) especially advocated for the use of transcripts—of authentic audio and video, and of learners themselves—since seeing conversation in print can facilitate awareness raising. However, unedited authentic transcripts can be difficult for learners to interpret, due to insufficient context, infrequent language and obscure allusions, and lack of interesting content. Additionally, in selecting these excerpts, materials developers have to reckon with the problematic issue of defining where a conversation begins and ends (McCarten & McCarthy, 2010). Nevertheless, transcripts of naturally occurring conversation may still be used effectively in teaching materials. McCarten and McCarthy (2010) advocated for the use of adapted corpus texts—what they lose in authenticity, they make up for in comprehensibility and pedagogical relevance.
Transcripts of film excerpts solve some of the problems associated with the use of natural language samples, but there is a tradeoff when it comes to authenticity. Films have been used often in instructional pragmatics interventions (see Ishihara & Cohen, 2010, for an overview), but, since they are scripted and rarely include spontaneous dialogue, the question arises as to how faithfully they reproduce natural speech. Rose (2001) compared compliments in a corpus of naturally-occurring speech to compliments from forty American films, finding that, overall, "the film data corresponds fairly closely to naturally-occurring speech" (p. 318)—more so to pragmalinguistic, rather than sociopragmatic, conventions. He suggested that films be used not only used to facilitate the acquisition of listening and speaking, but also in teaching L2 pragmatics. Mishan (2004) proposed that film scripts are arguably more authentic than transcripts of natural speech, since scripts were originally written down. Audience-oriented contexts, such as talk shows and news interviews, might also be preferable to private conversation, as their context is "not as personalized, situation-dependent, or oriented towards a particular interlocutor/s as is spontaneous dialogue" (Mishan, 2004, p. 225). In any case, films have been shown to be effective when used in instructional interventions focused on pragmatics.

Alcón Soler (2005) used film excerpts in the explicit instruction of request forms in English, suggesting that they aided in increasing participants' pragmatic competence. Other types of language that contribute to conversational fluency and pragmatic competence can be taught using film as well. Brown (2013) designed materials that utilized multimedia in the teaching of casual and "impolite" language in Korean. Korean teaching contexts and materials deemphasize non-honorific speech style, or panmal. Brown (2013) noted that this is reflective of a tendency to avoid casual language in language pedagogy more generally. However, as Mugford (2013) demonstrated in a study of how learners of Spanish interpret the word güey, being able to
understand and use such casual or "impolite" language is part of expressing affiliation with a group and closeness with one's interlocutor. Brown (2013) sought to make students aware of the functions of this type of language using an approach that included consciousness-raising activities based on a television drama in order to explore the sociopragmatics of speech styles in Korean.

Oral proficiency is not solely concerned with the awareness of the pragmatics of conversation. Fluency is also a key component. McCarthy (2006) challenged the traditional notion of fluency, finding that corpus excerpts show fluent native speakers taking pauses and doing other things typical of "dysfluent" speech. He proposed a new definition of fluency that privileges the appropriate use of formulaic language, and the capacity of the speaker to cooperate with her interlocutor(s). According to McCarthy (2006), fluency is the joint responsibility of participants in a conversation. Therefore, traditional measures of fluency in which the assessor does not interact with the test-taker are flawed, as they misrepresent the notion of what it means to be fluent. Fluency, then, requires not just the ability to speak with minimal hesitation, but the more critical (from an interpersonal standpoint) ability to contribute to a fluent interaction, in which one hears and responds to her interlocutor(s). Being a fluent speaker requires the capacity to be a good conversationalist. Naturally, pragmatic competence is a necessary component, as speakers must be able to respond to their interlocutor(s) in a way that is responsive to context and to the identities of those involved in the conversation.

Rossiter, Derwing, Manimtim, and Thomson (2010) examined the nature of fluency activities in ESL textbooks and found that formulaic language and discourse markers, while crucial to increasing oral fluency, receive little attention. They also found that the textbooks they analyzed predominantly contained free-production activities, and devoted minimal space to
consciousness-raising tasks. Control of the appropriate fillers, markers, and formulas necessary for fluent speech is part of pragmatic competence, and, as discussed earlier in this review, research has shown that explicit instruction best facilitates pragmatics acquisition (Ishihara, 2010). Thornbury and Slade (2006) concluded that the explicit instruction of some features of oral language, including formulas, is beneficial—particularly for learners in a foreign language learning environment. In fact, the authors stressed the importance of basing formula selection on corpus data, in order to avoid the pitfalls of travelers' phrasebooks, which may include conversational phrases seldom encountered in actual modern usage. They proposed combining explicit instruction of spoken language with opportunities to practice, as practice would "not only provide learners with opportunities to 'test-drive' these routines, but would allow the development and automization of communication strategies" (Thornbury & Slade, 2006, p. 277). Awareness of formulas would support quicker acquisition, according to the noticing hypothesis. Rossiter et al. (2010) suggested that, in order to remedy the lack of explicit fluency instruction, teachers can "raise learners' awareness of factors that influence perceptions of fluency (e.g., formulaic sequences, discourse markers, pauses, fillers) by assigning form-focused tasks that include an explicit explanation of the meaning and use of these devices" (p. 594). While free production activities may get students to speak, they will not provide learners with the opportunity to closely analyze the elements of fluent speech.

Still, there is evidence that some ELT materials do address formulaic devices for increasing fluency. Meunier (2012) found that findings from research on formulaic language have increasingly had an impact on ELT materials. However, while publishers have rushed to incorporate insights from corpus linguistics on formulaic language (Römer, 2011), the methodology for selection of this language for inclusion in materials is suspect. According to
Koprowski (2005), a significant proportion of multi-word lexical items in recently published textbooks is of minimal use to learners. He argued that frequency and range should be the principle considerations when integrating formulaic language into textbooks, in order to ensure that learners are exposed to the phrases that are most widely used (and, by extension, most useful to them). While intuition is valuable in the vocabulary selection process, these choices may not always reflect reality faithfully. MAuranen (2004) criticized the over-reliance on intuition in selecting formulaic language for inclusion in teaching materials, insisting that selection and description of such language be empirically validated. Martinez and Schmitt (2012) established a PHRASal Expressions List (PHRASE List) with the goal of providing materials developers with a set of highly frequent formulaic sequences to integrate into textbooks, tests, and syllabi. They selected phrases on the basis of their "high frequency, meaningfulness, and relative non-compositionality"—that is, phrases that are difficult to parse based on the meanings of their constituent words (Martinez & Schmitt, 2012, p. 304). Such expressions may be challenging to acquire but are necessary for fluency.

While discussion of the deficiencies of ELT materials dominates the literature on conversation instruction, research indicates that the situation is no better—and likely worse—within the realm of Russian language teaching materials. Nearly three decades ago, Agastein (1988) criticized the poor treatment of conversational language in textbooks of Russian. However, the situation improved somewhat in the 1990s as a result of a "new generation" of textbooks that incorporated findings from SLA research (Rifkin, 1997). While Rifkin (1997) praised that wave of textbooks for the inclusion of roleplays and other activities focused on the speaking skill, the pragmatic elements of conversation (beyond basic speech acts, or functions) were unrepresented. More recently, Pavlenko (2006) examined the most popular advanced-level
Russian textbooks, analyzing how (if at all) they address narrative and conceptual proficiency—skills needed to achieve an *Advanced* rating on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI). Like Hughes (2010), she argued that "unstructured conversational practice is not the most effective way of developing advanced-level narrative skills" (Pavlenko, 2006, p. 14). These skills require deep knowledge of the genres that utilize narration and the linguistic means necessary to conform to genre norms. To address this need, Pavlenko (2006) advocated for more explicit activities that focus on cohesive devices (a type of discourse marker) and that incorporate cross-linguistic comparisons. Equipping learners with this language can lead to gains in pragmatic competence.

Unfortunately, as Usó-Juan (2008) contended, "the acquisition of pragmatic competence through textbooks or other instructional material is quite unlikely" (p. 224). Pragmatic information in materials is rarely grounded in research, and researchers have long criticized textbooks for their demonstrated lack of representativeness, insufficient contextual information, and inaccuracy when it comes to pragmatics (Cohen, 2008b; H. Cook, 2008; Diepenbroek & Derwing, 2014; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Judd, 1999; Kasper, 1997; Koike & Pearson, 2005; Meunier, 2012; Usó-Juan, 2008; Vellenga, 2004). Ishihara and Cohen (2010) included a chapter on adapting textbooks for pragmatics instruction in their volume on teaching pragmatics, in which they reviewed analyses of the inclusion of pragmatic information in textbooks. They concluded that "L2 textbooks can be insufficient both in their sampling of pragmatics, as well as in the quality of the treatment of pragmatics even when it is included" (p. 148). Pragmatics, if addressed at all, may be idealized or simply inaccurate.

Studies have shown that textbook dialogues do not reflect actual usage when it comes to the pragmatic dimension of language (Alcón Soler & Martínez-Flor, 2008). A related problem is
the lack of information on frequency and contextual variables. Cohen (2008b) noted that a textbook may include a list of apology intensifiers (e.g., so, awfully, terribly) but without any comments about which intensifiers expert speakers of the language use most, and in what contexts. Usó-Juan (2008) examined the treatment of the speech act of requesting in ELT textbooks. She found that, while the surveyed textbooks included requesting strategies, presentation was overly simplistic: there was minimal information on sociopragmatic variables in both input and output activities.

Vellenga (2004) investigated the presence of pragmatic information in ESL and EFL textbooks, concluding that pragmatics was addressed infrequently and inadequately. Based on her findings, she proposed the following avenues for the inclusion of pragmatics in textbooks: "pragmatic awareness raising activities, extralinguistic contextual information for all language samples, provision of a variety of language forms to accomplish a certain speech act to enable pragmalinguistic choices, and rich cultural information to enable sociopragmatic choices" (Vellenga, 2004, p. 15). Evaluations of the coverage of specific areas of pragmatics in textbooks also reveal deficiencies. Campillo (2008) examined the presentation of mitigation devices in ELT materials, finding that the surveyed materials included only a small portion of mitigators. She recommended that textbooks be developed with reference to research in conversation analysis (CA) in order to better represent pragmatic features of language. Other scholars have proposed the use of CA methods in ILP materials design as well (Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

Spanish language textbooks have also been found to be lacking in terms of attention to pragmatics. Koike and Pearson (2005) developed an instructional intervention to teach suggestions in Spanish as a response to the near-total absence of focused information on speech
acts in textbooks (the authors only identified one textbook with explicit attention to speech acts). De Pablos-Ortega (2011) came to a similar conclusion in an investigation of the treatment of the speech act of thanking in Spanish language textbooks, advocating for the use of contrastive analyses of speech acts to inform the presentation of pragmatic information in materials. H. Cook (2008) found that Japanese materials overemphasize the *masu* ("polite") form, likely due to authors' belief that it is better for foreigners to err on the side of formality and politeness. However, according to H. Cook (2008), lack of attention to the plain form could have social repercussions for learners, as they may find themselves unable to form closer relationships with interlocutors, if desired. She argued that textbooks should more closely reflect reality, in which the use of *masu* and plain forms depends on many factors, including participants' relationships and context. Diepenbroek and Derwing (2014) analyzed the pragmatic content of several integrated skills textbooks of ESL, dividing this content into three categories: speech acts, conversation strategies, and idioms. They found that the majority of the textbooks lacked systematic treatment of pragmatics. Although the textbooks included lists of pragmalinguistic forms, they lacked sociopragmatic information on their appropriate usage across contexts. Furthermore, language was often decontextualized, leaving learners with minimal information on the effect that interlocutor relationships, register, and other aspects have on pragmatic choices.

Scholars in the field of ILP have argued for research-based treatment of pragmatics in textbooks (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Kasper, 1997). However, there is little literature on the principles of developing materials for increasing pragmatic competence, leaving teachers with the challenging task of analyzing and presenting research on pragmatics in a pedagogically effective way (Ishihara, 2010). Cohen (2008b) advocated for the development of accessible corpora that instructors themselves can query in order to discover the extent to which textbook
dialogues reflect actual usage. This would enable teachers to determine the frequency of pragmatic markers, such as routine formulas, and would provide them with a collection of contexts in which they occur. Such information would assist learners in acquiring not only the most widely used pragmalinguistic forms, but would also help them internalize sociopragmatic details.

Within pragmatics instruction, it is important to emphasize the role that choice plays in selecting a particular form. Materials can present examples of native speaker usage while empowering learners to decide for themselves how much (if at all) they wish to conform. This approach encourages students "to critically analyze the sociocultural implications of their own language, as well as those of community members in terms of how identity, social practices, power structures, affiliation with the community are constructed and negotiated" (Ishihara, 2010, p. 944). Learners should also have the opportunity to be exposed to a range of language that carries pragmatic meaning, including the oft-ignored realm of emotional expressions.

Dewaele (2010) bemoaned the paucity of research on emotion within ILP and sought to address that research gap in his large scale study of the expression of emotions among multilinguals. He argued that context of acquisition played a significant role, finding that lower frequency of the communication of emotions in a foreign language was correlated with classroom instruction. According to his results, it appears that naturalistic contexts promote the use of emotional language. In the classroom, instructors tend to avoid teaching learners to communicate emotions, possibly due to the limited range of in-class interactions, difficulty describing and instructing emotional language, and taboos against the use of swearwords and informal language. Dewaele (2010) was careful to acknowledge the potentially offensive nature of some emotional words and expressions, suggesting that learners be exposed to them and
warned of their connotations. He suggested that since teaching materials typically expose classroom learners only minimally to "emotion scripts" and emotion vocabulary, textbook authors should make a point of including descriptions of both positive and negative emotions, along with opportunities to compare how emotion is expressed cross-linguistically. Corpus research has great potential for informing materials on emotion (e.g., Apresjan's, 2013, study comparing Russian and English emotion language), as well as for materials more generally.

2.3.3 Corpus Methodologies in Materials Development

While the field of corpus linguistics has grown significantly over the past several decades, pedagogical applications of corpus methodologies and data are still not widespread (see Römer, 2011, for an overview). Tan (2002) explained that materials based on corpus data can help learners:

a) be consciously aware of the unfamiliar usages of language they have heard or read in native speaker contexts, b) investigate how these unfamiliar usages are employed in natural authentic communication, and finally, c) experiment with these usages in spoken or written communication, so that they become familiar. (pp. 5–6)

This philosophy is grounded in Schmidt's noticing hypothesis, discussed earlier in this review. In addition to furnishing opportunities for learners to notice how language is used in context, corpus research enables authors to make more informed decisions about the language they choose to include in textbooks. Biber and Conrad (2010) advocated for the use of corpus data in developing materials for teaching grammar, noting that textbook writers do not have access to any kind of reference that will tell them what should be included in their materials. Rather, "authors' intuition, anecdotal evidence, and traditions" are the source of such decisions (Biber & Conrad, 2010, p. 1). While that can provide effective guidance to developers to some extent,
relying on such subjective information can result in textbooks that do not reflect language in use and therefore do not prepare learners to interact in the world outside of the classroom.

As mentioned in Section 2.3.2, corpus analyses can be used to evaluate the content of language textbooks by comparing dialogues and descriptions in materials to actual language in use. Lam (2010) found that the word *well* was inadequately and inaccurately represented in teaching materials. She argued for a corpus-based approach in order to better equip learners with the pragmatic devices, like *well*, needed to communicate successfully and construct an identity in the target language. Corpora of learner language can also inform materials design. Belz and Vyatkin (2005) detailed an approach to teaching German modal particles that incorporated activities based on contrastive analyses of learner and native speaker corpus data. Participants used modal particles more frequently as a result of the intervention, and their metapragmatic awareness increased. Such analyses can lead to the development of materials tailored to learner needs.

McCarten and McCarthy (2010) listed three approaches to the application of corpus data to language teaching materials: *corpus-driven* (corpus data drive linguistic descriptions), *corpus-based* (pre-existing linguistic descriptions are supported by corpus data), and *corpus-informed* (corpus data inform all choices made in the construction of a syllabus, including selection not only of grammar and vocabulary, but also of topics and methodology). Timmis (2013) proposed a fourth approach, *corpus-referred*, which "explicitly allows an honourable place for intuition, experience, local need, cultural appropriacy and pedagogic convenience in determining syllabus content and the order in which items are taught" (p. 470). This approach combines the principles of effective materials design with the explanatory power of corpora and privileges the role of the expert, who is charged with making pedagogically sound choices grounded in usage data. As
McCarten (2007) explained, a corpus is merely a tool, and therefore it "cannot tell us exactly what to teach or how to teach, and it has nothing to tell us with respect to how students learn best" (p. 3).

Furthermore, experts in pedagogy are needed to sort through raw corpus data and determine the topics and excerpts that will be most useful and effective in instructional contexts. According to Sinclair (2004), "[a] good pedagogical description of a language will organise the variation and prioritise the variants for language teaching purposes" (p. 275). However, in the process of selecting and editing corpus data, contextual information may be lost. This exacerbates one of the chief criticisms of the use of corpus methodologies in pragmatics instruction—"communicative intent and sociocultural purpose are lost to the corpus, which cannot tell us why or how something was said, or how it was received" (Mishan, 2004, p. 220). In other words, corpus excerpts lack the background information on speakers and setting that is crucial for interpreting pragmatic meaning. Ishihara and Cohen (2010) recommended that authors, when employing authentic corpus data in their materials, include the following information about the text: its context, background information on its interlocutors and their relationships, its purpose(s), its source, and its author or proprietor. These details can assist teachers and learners in better understanding the context of excerpts of authentic speech. However, the full context can never be preserved. Even corpora with extremely detailed metapragmatic information can only approximate the contextual variables present during a given usage event.

Insights from corpus linguistics have influenced the developers of ELT materials over the past few decades (see McCarten and McCarthy, 2010, for an overview). Diepenbroek and Derwing (2014) advocated for the adoption of materials driven by corpus research, noting that
the corpus-based textbook series *Touchstone* (McCarthy, McCarten, & Sandiford, 2005; 2006), "provided more consistent coverage on pragmatic themes" than any of the other textbooks they analyzed for presentation of pragmatic information (p. 17). This trend has not carried over to Russian language textbooks and references. However, it would be wise to follow the lead of ELT textbook publishers (see Furniss, 2013, for recommendations). Although there are fewer corpora of Russian, researchers nonetheless have access to one extremely well-designed one (The Russian National Corpus, http://www.ruscorpora.ru/), and the prospect of compiling one's own corpus is entirely realistic, given the speed at which technological advances have allowed for such endeavors.

Corpus data are not solely used to enhance instructional materials. They can also be used directly by learners in instructional interventions. Flowerdew (2012) divided pedagogical corpus applications into two categories: indirect and direct. Indirect applications include the use of corpus data to inform the language teaching syllabus and materials, while direct applications refer to hands-on use of corpora in the classroom, by both teacher and student. For example, in a paper using indirect applications of corpus data, Möllering (2001) created worksheets based on an analysis of modal particles in spoken German corpora. While data-driven learning (Johns, 1991), a direct pedagogical application of corpus data, is a widely used methodology in instructional interventions, language educators generally prefer indirect applications due in part to the steep learning curve for using corpora independently.

In order to apply corpus research on the pragmatics of conversational language to materials and classroom instruction, corpora of spoken language are needed. However, written corpora dominate (Römer, 2011). Spoken language corpora present their own challenges, as they differ importantly from written corpora. Not only are they more time-consuming to compile, the
fact that they consist of transcribed audio compromises their authenticity (Mauranen, 2004). Still, given that reference materials do not describe oral language as thoroughly as written language, spoken corpora are excellent resources for investigating the meaning and range of usage of poorly understood phrases. Moreover, spoken corpora can effectively illuminate the patterns and linguistic elements that characterize speech, seeing as "it is helpful to be able to freeze a large number of instances for observation, since it may be very difficult to pay attention to such recurrences in ongoing interaction" (Mauranen, 2004, p. 103). Learning the details of spoken language can be overwhelming due to the fact that speech (other than in audio and video recordings) is ephemeral. If the learner has a limited vocabulary, even frequently used chunks of language will pass by unnoticed in the flood of input. Oral corpus data can be used to inform the design of highly accurate materials that can assist learners in acquiring conversational language efficiently, in a systematic and deliberate way. McCarten and McCarthy (2010) listed the following steps in creating a syllabus for a textbook of conversational language using spoken corpus data: identify the most frequent words and phrases; analyze these items in context in order to classify their functions in conversation; organize these functions into a coherent syllabus. Using this method, the linguistic material presented to learners would be based on the most frequent language of conversation, with reference to actual functions in speech.

Research on corpus applications in materials development, as well as recommendations for the design of materials focused on speaking and pragmatics, are relevant not only to the creation of physical textbooks and references, but also to technological applications.

2.3.4 Technological Applications in Instructional Pragmatics

In a review of the use of various technologies for language teaching, Golonka, Bowles, Frank, Richardson, and Freynik (2014) found minimal evidence to support claims of the
effectiveness of CALL interventions. They argued that CALL studies are compromised by poor research design and an overemphasis on English language learning contexts. According to Golonka et al. (2014), one of the chief pitfalls in CALL research is the prioritization of the technological tool over pedagogical objectives. The authors criticized the tendency to "focus on either describing the affordances offered by particular types of technology or measuring their effects on students' affective reactions, such as increased motivation or increased enjoyment of learning activities" (p. 92). Still, they do note that effective applications of technology can, among other outcomes, "increase learner interest and motivation; provide students with increased access to target language (TL) input, interaction opportunities, and feedback" (Golonka et al., 2014, p. 70). The authors encouraged the recent tendency in CALL to focus on the benefits of technology in supporting the teaching and learning of languages, rather than on showcasing the capabilities of the technology itself. However, there is a need for further empirical evidence on actual learning outcomes resulting from the use of CALL applications.

Unfortunately, there has been little research on the effectiveness of CALL applications in the teaching and learning of Russian generally (but see Robin, 2006, and Soboleva & Tronenko, 2002). In an article on the current state of the field of CALL, Garrett (2009) listed several pressing issues of concern to researchers and practitioners. She described the need for applications devoted to the teaching of LCTLs, as technology can make instructional materials for these languages accessible to a wide audience. There is a logical place for pedagogically sound instructional materials that can assist learners, particularly of LCTLs like Russian, in acquiring language that may receive inadequate attention in the classroom, such as routine formulas. CALL applications are a cost-effective and interactive solution to this issue.
This potential for interactivity has made technological innovations particularly relevant to pragmatics instruction, since pragmatic competence is necessary for both face-to-face and virtual communication. Over the past decade, there has been an increasing number of studies incorporating the use of technology in pragmatics instruction. The growing prevalence of mobile apps, social networking, digital games, and other technological resources has multiplied the avenues for exploring pragmatics, both for teachers and learners. Taguchi and Sykes (2013) documented the current and future directions of research in technology and ILP, noting that scholars "must begin to address both online and offline behaviors as relevant, high-stakes contexts for the learning and research of interlanguage pragmatics" (p. 273). Furthermore, considering the lack of pragmatic information found in traditional textbooks (see Section 2.3.2), "the Internet is an ideal repository for pragmatics-focused materials" (Russell & Vasquez, 2011, p. 48). Decreasing costs of website creation and maintenance and increased interactivity and authenticity have made online materials an attractive option for the instruction of pragmatics. Cohen (2008a) proposed that more self-access CALL applications, such as virtual environments and online modules, be developed for students to study pragmatics on their own after teachers facilitate initial instruction in strategies for developing pragmatic competence.

Technological applications can address some of the challenges in teaching pragmatics listed by Sykes (2013):

1. limited theoretical support for curricular development,
2. lack of authentic input in teaching materials,
3. lack of instructor knowledge,
4. a dominant focus on microfeatures of language in the foreign language context,
5. time limitations in the classroom,
(6) individual student differences and learner subjectivity,
(7) feedback and assessment challenges, and
(8) immense dialectal variation (p. 73)

She proposed that technology—in particular, computer-mediated communication and virtual environments—can be used to tackle these issues. It can provide access to an enormous supply of authentic language from a variety of contexts and speakers and can be used to structure instruction according to research findings and pedagogical theories. CALL applications can utilize the latest in pragmatics research, serving as a theoretically grounded resource for instructors who may lack knowledge of this area, and who do not have the time to address pragmatic issues in the classroom. These materials can enable learners, at their own pace, to engage in noticing features of language they might not otherwise be exposed to. Technological tools can be flexibly designed to accommodate a range of learners through the provision of diverse exercise types with feedback. These issues are particularly acute for Russian language teaching. Since it is a LCTL, instructional resources and teacher training initiatives for Russian are limited as it is.

Technological interventions in pragmatics research predominantly utilize the noticing hypothesis as a theoretical framework. Schmidt (2001) noted the role of CALL applications in focusing learner attention on particular elements of the input, stating that "instructional treatments can be designed to focus learners' attention on crucial aspects of input" (p. 20).

According to Taguchi and Sykes (2013), technology-mediated teaching has potential benefits beyond the facilitation of noticing:

[i]t provides systematic work with focused aspects of language; affords opportunities for input, output, and interaction; offers individualized help through feedback, dictionaries,
and search tools; promotes autonomous learning and strategy training; enhances learners' motivation and interest in learning; facilitates cooperative learning; and expands learners' participation in authentic discourse communities. (p. 8)

According to Kasper (1998), research on pragmatics instruction indicates that "adult learners respond well to a combination of consciousness-raising activities and communicative practice," and that technological applications hold great potential in this regard (p. 201).

One type of technological tool that has been harnessed in the teaching of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge is the web-based interactive instructional module. Ishihara and Cohen (2010) listed the following characteristics of these tools: "self-study exercises, learner-directed feedback, optional tasks, and linguistic and cultural scaffolding" (p. 249). They may "contain examples of multimodal [native speaker] pragmatic performance and explicit discussions of pragmatic competence" (Belz, 2007, p. 63). Ishihara (2007) developed a web-based curriculum on speech acts in Japanese that consisted of awareness-raising activities, audio samples, and metapragmatic information grounded in research. Users submitted their exercise responses to the instructors, and reflected on their experience through journaling.

Ishihara (2007) used the noticing hypothesis to inform the curriculum by providing learners with opportunities to pay attention to both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features of the speech acts in question. Each speech act unit included metapragmatic information on the speech acts; audio dialogue samples; opportunities for learners to analyze the contexts of the speech acts (with feedback); tasks focusing on grammar, lexicon, and prosodic features; output practice; self-evaluation (with feedback); and further sociopragmatic information. Learners made journal entries, responding to prompts on:
(1) insights the learners had gained from the materials, (2) issues that arose in dealing with the content, (3) perceived usefulness of the strategies provided, (4) technological problems they might have faced, (5) perceived strengths and weaknesses of the materials, (6) suggestions for improvements and (7) experience using the speech acts in authentic contexts. (pp. 32–33)

Thus, Ishihara (2007) was able to document the impact of the website as relayed by the learners themselves. Sykes and Cohen (2008) also used a qualitative approach to evaluating a series of online modules on speech acts in Spanish that implemented a strategy-based approach to pragmatics instruction. The modules consisted of videos of the speech acts being performed, with transcripts and accompanying short-answer, multiple-choice, and listening exercises. Empirical evidence served as the basis for the material on speech acts contained in the website. Sykes and Cohen (2008) concluded that students were interested in improving their pragmatic competence, and found the materials motivating. Russell and Vasquez (2011) created a web-based tutorial on Spanish speech acts that, they maintained, "makes better use of the capabilities of the Web-based format, has a more appealing user interface design, and has greater interactivity for users" (p. 29) than the modules developed by Sykes and Cohen (2008). This is due to their added feature of a video-response DCT, rather than the written DCT of the Sykes and Cohen (2008) site. Russell and Vasquez's (2011) article thoroughly describes the process of developing online materials for teaching pragmatics. However, the authors acknowledged that the effectiveness of their tutorial needs to be empirically validated. They used the noticing hypothesis to inform the theoretical foundation of their site, in addition to following the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition's (2006) research-informed guidelines for developing web-based pragmatics materials. In a study on the effects of a CALL intervention in
an English in the Workplace program, Waugh (2013) developed a set of online units devoted to speech acts and routine formulas (*conversational gambits*). These units incorporated analysis of native speaker interactions, explicit instruction of strategies, synchronous role-play activities, and cross-linguistic comparisons of speech acts. Pre- and post-tests, consisting of oral and written DCTs, showed improvement in learners' ability to respond in a pragmatically appropriate manner.

Instructional modules are not the only technological method used in teaching pragmatics, however. The social networking community Facebook was used in a study by Blattner and Fiori (2011) that sought to increase learners' sociopragmatic awareness. Participants completed tasks in which they were required to analyze various routine formulas (specifically greetings and leave-taking expressions) as well as vocabulary use in general. According to student feedback, these activities raised their awareness of the pragmatic elements of the informal language of social media. Engagement with authentic language contexts appears to contribute to noticing. However, quantitative measures of receptive and productive knowledge are necessary to confirm this hypothesis. In a study by Sykes (2013) which gauged the effectiveness of a virtual environment on the acquisition of pragmalinguistic knowledge, it was found that participants rated their ability highly, but actual performance data indicated only moderate gains. Thus, learners' perceptions of their pragmatic ability may not be confirmed by quantitative measures.

Utashiro and Kawai (2009) obtained such quantitative data in a study in which they developed a web application to teach *reactive tokens* (i.e. *back channels*) in Japanese in a blended (partially online, partially face-to-face) learning environment. The application incorporated video of conversations between native speakers and awareness-raising, analysis, and production exercises. The researchers emphasized the importance of cooperation between
CALL and ILP, stating that findings from ILP should be integrated into CALL applications "in order to identify important target pragmatic features and develop CALL instructional materials accordingly" (Utashiro & Kawai, 2009, p. 278). Results indicated that explicit instruction via the web application was effective, as students showed some improvement in their production of the reactive tokens. In a study on the use of a CALL application in the explicit instruction of requests in Chinese, Li (2013) found that, in comparison with a control group, participants in two experimental groups (one that did input-based practice activities, and one that did output-based) displayed increased speed and accuracy in both recognizing and producing the target request forms. Learners in the input-based group performed grammaticality judgment and dialogue reading tasks, while output-based group members translated sentences and did DCTs.

CALL applications are potentially useful for both domestic and study abroad students. As mentioned previously, Shively (2010) argued for the use of technologies in instructing pragmatics to learners in study abroad contexts. Garrett (2009) also noted the potential benefits of CALL resources to learners embarking on study abroad stays, as they may not be equipped with the pragmatic competence and listening and speaking skills necessary to survive in the new culture.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of technology (and instructional interventions generally) in supporting pragmatic development, as well as to gain information on L2 pragmatics use, there is a need for reliable and empirically validated assessments of pragmatic ability.

2.3.5 Assessing Pragmatic Competence

Unfortunately, pragmatic competence is rarely a component of proficiency tests, even though it is a crucial skill (Yamashita, 2008). Given the concentration of studies on the acquisition of pragmatic competence by learners of English, assessment instruments have been
created predominantly for that language. Still, there are no widely used tests that explicitly address pragmatic competence for English, or any other language (Roever, 2009). Generally, approaches to pragmatics assessment have been insufficiently rigorous (Kasper & Rose, 2001).

Developing and refining instruments for assessing pragmatic ability is a key task in the field of ILP (Bardovi-Harlig, 2013). Within ILP research, a wide variety of instruments and methods has been used to assess pragmatic competence, from frequently administered DCTs to less commonly seen ethnographic approaches (see Golato, 2003; Ishihara, 2010; and Yamashita, 2008 for overviews). Verbal protocols have been utilized to illuminate learners' mental processes during pragmatics-related tasks (Hassall, 2008; van Compernolle, 2013). Corpus methods also have applications to the testing of L2 pragmatics. Yamashita (2008) recommended that assessment be informed by corpus data from learners of various L1 backgrounds, in order to catalog common pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic errors.

Recently, Bardovi-Harlig and Shin (2014) reviewed the various methods used in ILP research for pragmatics assessment (DCTs, roleplays, and self-assessments) with a focus on their reliability, validity, and practicality. They advocated for the implementation of empirically validated pragmatics measures in instruction, in order to legitimatize pragmatics as an area of knowledge in the language classroom. Still, creating instruments to assess pragmatic competence is difficult, given the complexity of accurately establishing context, which plays a crucial role in making decisions about pragmatic appropriateness (Roever, 2009).

In the realm of data collection, Barron and Warga (2007) and N. Ellis (2012) advocated for more research featuring the triangulation of data from psycholinguistic, first and second language, corpus, and usage-based approaches to the study of pragmatic competence. Attention additionally should be paid to the task mode in data collection: "formulas should be investigated
in the same mode as the targeted language use" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2006, p. 21). This means that researchers should strive to collect data that reflect actual usage. To that end, Boxer (2002) recommended that more studies use authentic, face-to-face data rather than relying on role plays and DCTs.

2.4 Conclusion

The current review has demonstrated the importance of routine formulas in ILP research and has documented promising approaches, particularly technological, to their instruction. The concept of routine formulas—that is, formulaic language with pragmatic functions—is nebulous and can be defined, identified, and classified variably, depending on the theoretical framework being used and the research questions being set forth. Nonetheless, it has been established that routine formulas play a crucial role in pragmatic competence and therefore deserve attention in discussions of pragmatic acquisition, comprehension, and production by language learners. In order to successfully function in target language interactions, these words and phrases cannot be dismissed by learners and instructors, as such formulaic routines "are tacit agreements, which the members of a community presume to be shared by every reasonable co-member" (Coulmas, 1981, p. 4). Learning to communicate in a new language is more than a matter of internalizing individual vocabulary items and grammatical rules. It requires learning how social interaction is codified in the language.

For first language learners, acquisition of this knowledge occurs as a result of extensive exposure to language in use across contexts. Adult learners typically do not have this kind of access to input, nor do they possess the same interactional needs of young children. Thus, the process of acquiring pragmatic competence is slow and challenging. However, instruction, particularly explicit instruction, has been shown to facilitate acquisition, as it can raise learners'
awareness of form–function mappings of routine formulas and other elements of language that communicate pragmatic meaning. This awareness leads to acquisition, according to Schmidt's (1990; 1993; 2001) noticing hypothesis. Unfortunately, pragmatics tends to be addressed inadequately in textbooks and classrooms, if it is addressed at all. This is likely due to its historically peripheral status in language teaching, as well as the fact that educators generally do not receive training in pragmatics instruction.

There is a need for effective materials that address the formulaic language necessary for pragmatically appropriate communication. The use of corpus methodologies can assist materials developers in finding authentic examples of usage and in selecting the formulas that will be most relevant and useful to learners. Ideally, research-based textbooks with a focus on pragmatics would be produced for learners of a variety of L2s. However, the small market for textbooks for LCTLs makes this unlikely for languages like Russian. Thus, ILP researchers must turn to avenues afforded by technology for the creation and distribution of effective materials.

Technological applications that provide informative, authentic, interactive, motivating, self-paced instruction on the language necessary for pragmatic competence can prepare learners for successful communication in their L2. Web authoring tools increasingly allow for the quick and easy creation of sophisticated activity types, expanding their potential for use by educators. Still, these materials, like any others, should be evaluated empirically through collection of both quantitative and qualitative data in order to gain insight on their effectiveness and on the role they play in the acquisition process.
Chapter 3
Methodology

3.1 Overall Design

A pre-/post-/delayed post-test design was used in the study at hand in order to compare the acquisition of nine routine formulas, selected with reference to spoken corpus data, in experimental and control group participants. The experimental group completed a set of interactive online instructional modules that contained excerpts from the Russian National Corpus (http://www.ruscorpora.ru/) illustrating authentic usage of the selected formulas, while the control group underwent no intervention. All participants completed an oral proficiency assessment, a background questionnaire, and the pre-/post-/delayed post-tests at predetermined intervals. Additionally, experimental group participants underwent an oral retrospective interview and control group participants completed a final questionnaire on the routine formulas selected for the project. The study addresses the following research questions:

1) Does the instructional website increase users' understanding and use of routine formulas, as measured by the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests? Are gains (if any) significantly greater in the experimental group than in the control group?

2) What is the relationship between individual factors, related to identity and context, and participants' development of routine formulas in Russian?

It was hypothesized that the instructional modules would increase users' understanding and use of routine formulas. In order to answer the first research question, test data were analyzed quantitatively with the software SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The second research question was addressed by a qualitative analysis of post-intervention interview data. The study employed data triangulation via quantitative and qualitative data collection
instruments in order to privilege learners' own voices and to paint a fuller picture of the acquisition process.

3.2 Participants

Learners of Russian were recruited for the study between June 2014 and September 2014. Recruitment emails were sent to the administrators of summer Russian programs, both in the U.S. and abroad, listed on the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL) website (http://www.aatseel.org/development/depts_and_prog/intensive_language.htm#russian). Additionally, three recruitment emails were sent to the Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures (SEELANGS) listserv over the course of the recruitment period. The study was also advertised multiple times to the researcher’s former students and fellow Russian instructors via Facebook.

Initially, only learners currently enrolled in summer Russian programs were invited to participate. However, since an insufficient number of participants was recruited, the requirements were modified to include anyone with intermediate to advanced Russian proficiency. Thus, participants included students enrolled in summer language programs (e.g., Middlebury Language Schools) both in the U.S. and abroad, independent learners of Russian, and people working in Russia.

As in Kinginger (2008), the study was open to learners of varying proficiency levels in order to see the effects of the module on a variety of students. Takahashi (2010) encouraged the study of a single pragmatic intervention with learners of varying proficiencies in order to better understand the relationship between proficiency and pragmatic learnability, as the majority of studies focus on learners of the same level. However, the data collection methods used in instructional studies typically include tasks (written DCTs and roleplays) that are too difficult for
beginners (Kasper, 1998). Thus, novice learners may be unjustly excluded when in fact they might find instruction effective. Proficiency may not be a critical factor in the acquisition of pragmatic information, and routines in particular may be amenable to instruction at the beginning levels. As Roever (2006) demonstrated, proficiency had a negligible effect on routine formula knowledge, as "[r]outines cannot be creatively constructed and must be learned as holistic items" (p. 248). He found that exposure to the L2 environment was a much better predictor. However, because the pre-/post-/delayed post-test and the instructional website developed for the current study contained unedited language drawn directly from corpus data that would likely be incomprehensible to beginners, novice learners of Russian were excluded from participation.

In total, 163 people responded via email to the call for participants. However, attrition was rampant: only 44 of these volunteers completed the first data collection task, the Computer Assisted Screening Tool (CAST). Of these, one participant dropped out after being sent the link to the questionnaire. Of the remaining 43 participants, two learners assigned to the experimental group received but did not attempt the pre-test and website; five participants assigned to the control group received but did not complete the pre-test; and two other learners assigned to the control group completed the pre-test, but none of the subsequent tests. Two groups were compared: an experimental group \((n = 18)\) and a control group \((n = 16)\).

3.3 Procedure

Potential participants were instructed to electronically sign a consent form informing them of the nature of the study and the compensation offered (Appendix A). Additionally, they were asked to indicate which group they would be able to commit to: Group A (approximately 1.5-2 hours); Group B - includes website and interview (approximately 6.5 hours). When assigning participants to the experimental and control groups, the preference of participants who
could only commit to Group A was honored. Those participants who were willing to commit to Group B were placed where needed for balance. 16 learners were assigned to Group A (the control group); 18 to Group B (the experimental group).

After returning their consent forms, participants were asked to complete the CAST, described in Section 3.6.1. Participants received an email (Appendix B) detailing the procedure for completing the CAST test. Upon completing the CAST, participants were given the link to the background questionnaire and a "participant code" to be used when filling out the forms associated with the research study, in order to ensure confidentiality. These four-character codes were generated randomly by the researcher, using an online random string generator (http://www.random.org/strings/) and sent to each participant individually via email.

Next, participants received instructions for taking the pre-test and, for experimental group members, instructions for completing the online modules within two weeks of taking the pre-test (Appendix C). Completion dates for the pre-/post-/delayed post-tests, control group final questionnaires, and retrospective interviews were recorded for each participant in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, in order to ensure consistent timing of each task.

Two weeks after submission of the pre-test, participants received a link to the post-test. Experimental group participants that had yet to complete all the tasks on the website received an email reminding them of the impending deadline. The researcher instructed participants to complete the post-test within twenty-four hours of receiving the link. Most participants completed it within that window, although a few were late.

The link to the delayed post-test was sent to participants six weeks after completion of the pre-test (four weeks after the post-test link was sent). Control group participants also received instructions for completing a final questionnaire (Appendix D), while experimental
group participants were instructed to schedule a time for the retrospective interview (Appendix E).

Upon completion of all research project tasks, study participants were compensated with Amazon gift cards. This method of compensation was chosen due to the ease of distribution, as virtual gift cards can purchased through the Amazon website (http://www.amazon.com/), and a link to the card sent to the recipient's email address. Funds were furnished by a Research and Graduate Studies Office (RGSO) Dissertation Support Grant. Experimental group participants received a $30 gift card, and control group participants received a $10 gift card.

3.4 Routine Formula Selection

A previous study of Russian conversation carried out by the researcher using a small corpus of subtitle files from Soviet and Russian films informed the selection of formulas for instruction. The purpose of that study was to determine what words and phrases are used most frequently in Russian conversation. A large corpus of spoken Russian is available online (the Russian National Corpus, located at http://www.ruscorpora.ru/en). However, its raw texts are not available for manipulation. The Russian film corpus consists of subtitle files for 21 films commonly watched and studied by learners of Russian. These texts serve as a representation of authentic Russian conversation, as they are scripted and therefore not as naturalistic as private speech samples. However, the raw film subtitle texts were readily available, and film scripts are endowed with context (both background information on the characters and the situational context of the action at any given time during the film), which is generally not available in authentic speech samples. The total word types in the corpus is 16250; total word tokens, 89357.

Word frequency and N-gram lists of formulaic sequences of two to five words in length (minimum frequency of five) were compiled using Antconc (Anthony, 2014). The N-gram lists
were examined for the current study, and strings with potential instructional value as routine formulas were isolated. The researcher supplemented this list with phrases encountered in conversation with speakers of Russian while studying abroad that proved difficult to understand and use. Formulas were then chosen according to the principles of a corpus-referred approach (Timmis, 2013). In this approach, corpus data as well as intuition, learner needs, and pedagogical principles guide the selection of language for instructional purposes. Only nine formulas were selected in order to provide learners with a manageable amount of new language to acquire. Additionally, the selected phrases, while multifunctional, have one or two main functions. Instructing learners in the usage of formulas with many varied functions was deemed unfeasible for the current project. The targeted routine formulas are commonly used in conversational Russian among speakers of all backgrounds and do not index particular identities (e.g., of a particular gender, age group, or social class). They can be used in various social configurations: among friends and family, but also among colleagues or strangers, even when there is a power imbalance. Furthermore, they are not in and of themselves impolite, although they can be spoken with a “rude” intonation and have vulgar variants (compare to the English Holy cow! vs. Holy shit!). Table 1 contains the list of the nine selected formulas along with rough idiomatic English translations and frequency counts from the Russian National Corpus spoken subcorpus, which contains 10,754,403 words.

For the sake of comparison, two routine formulas commonly addressed in textbooks, do svidaniia [goodbye] and menia zovut [my name is] occur 1,476 (normalized frequency: 137) and 317 (normalized frequency: 29) times in the oral subcorpus, respectively. Frequency counts were obtained by querying the routine formulas in the subcorpus. However, they are rough estimates, as results were not examined in order to eliminate non-formulaic occurrences of the phrases. For
example, *da net* occurred in one instance in the context "*da-net voprosy*" [“yes-no questions”]—that is, not functioning as a routine formula.

**Table 1.** Targeted routine formulas with translations and corpus frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routine formula</th>
<th>English translation</th>
<th>Oral subcorpus frequency (of 10,754,403 words)</th>
<th>Normalized frequency (per 1 million N-grams)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V chem delo?</td>
<td>What's the problem?</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da net!</td>
<td>Nah!</td>
<td>2419</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da ty chto!</td>
<td>You're kidding!</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nado zhe!</td>
<td>You don't say!</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichego sebe!</td>
<td>Wow!</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichego strashnogo.</td>
<td>No big deal.</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu i kak?</td>
<td>So how was it?</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu i chto?</td>
<td>So what?</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...cht li?</td>
<td>...is it?</td>
<td>4144</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translations were checked against several bilingual English-Russian references, including *Russian-English Dictionary of Idioms* (Lubensky, 2014), and the ABBYY Lingvo (http://www.lingvo-online.ru/en) and Oxford (http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/) online dictionaries. Translations of the targeted routine formulas in each reference are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Targeted routine formulas with dictionary translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routine formula</th>
<th>Lubensky (2014)</th>
<th>ABBYY Lingvo</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V chem delo?</td>
<td>what's going on?; what's happening?; what's up?; what's the matter (the problem, the trouble)?; what's it (this) all about?; [lim.] what's wrong?; what gives?</td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>none given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da net!</td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>of course not!; not likely!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da ty chto!</td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>none given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nado zhe!</td>
<td>what do you know!; wouldn't you know (it)!; good heavens!; well, I'll be!; you don't say!; go figure!; well, fancy that!; (just) think of it!; who would have guessed</td>
<td>you don't say!</td>
<td>well, I never!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An evaluation of eight of the most commonly used beginning and intermediate Russian as a foreign language textbooks was undertaken in order to investigate how (if at all) instructional materials address the selected routine formulas. This was done in order to ensure that study participants were minimally exposed to the targeted phrases. Textbooks were chosen according to data from the Committee on College and Pre-College Russian (CCPCR), located at
Each year, CCPCR collects information from Russian programs in American colleges and universities on the textbook(s) being used in first- and second-year courses. While response is voluntary, and therefore the list does not include every secondary Russian program, 60 colleges and universities sent in data for the 2013-2014 academic year. Table 3 shows the most popular textbooks according to CCPCR (only textbooks used in five or more colleges or universities are shown here). On the original list, *Russian Stage One* (Lekić, Davidson, & Gor, 2008) was listed as a single textbook, although it consists of two volumes. Textbooks were grouped on the CCPCR list by the course in which they are used (first- or second-year Russian). However, while not indicated on the list, some programs use both *Golosa* books (Robin, Evans-Romaine, & Shatalina, 2012) or both *Nachalo* books (Lubensky, Ervin, McLellan, & Jarvis, 2002) over the course of two semesters. Thus, these categories are not exact. Also, textbook edition was not noted on the CCPCR website. For this review, the most recent editions were used.

Table 3. CCPCR survey results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Course Used</th>
<th>Number of Colleges/Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Golosa: A Basic Course in Russian, Book One</em></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;-Year</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Robin, Evans-Romaine, &amp; Shatalina, 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Golosa: A Basic Course in Russian, Book Two</em></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;-Year</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Robin, Evans-Romaine, &amp; Shatalina, 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V puti: Russian Grammar in Context</em> (Kagan, Miller, &amp; Kudyma, 2006)</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;-Year</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nachalo, Book One</em> (Lubensky, Ervin, McLellan, &amp; Jarvis, 2002)</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;-Year</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Russian Stage One: Live from Russia!</em> (Lekić, Davidson, &amp; Gor, 2008)</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;-Year</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nachalo, Book Two</em> (Lubensky, Ervin, McLellan, &amp; Jarvis, 2002)</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;-Year</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Russian Stage Two: Welcome Back! (Dolgova & Martin, 2010)

Each textbook was analyzed page-by-page for inclusion of routine formulas of any kind. A word or phrase was classified as a routine formula if it included Bardovi-Harlig’s (2012) three components of formulaic language within pragmatics: “the form as a recurrent sequence, its occurrence in specific social contexts, and the idea of the social contract which extends to members of a particular speech community” (p. 207). Thus, both single- and multi-word items were included.

Each routine formula occurrence was recorded in a spreadsheet, along with the following information: textbook; page number; type of occurrence (e.g., in a vocabulary list; for productive use in a dialogue creation activity); definition/explanation (e.g., glosses, metapragmatic information); and context (e.g., the sentence the formula occurred in). Table 4 shows the coverage of the nine formulas selected for the current study.

Table 4. Occurrence of targeted routine formulas in Russian textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routine Formula</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>LR1</th>
<th>LR2</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N2</th>
<th>VP</th>
<th>WB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V chem delo?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da net!</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da ty chto!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nado zhe!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichego sebe!</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichego strashnogo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu i kak?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu i chto?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...cht to li?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While each routine formula was found in at least one textbook, no single routine was found across all textbooks. *V puti* (Kagan, Miller, & Kudyma, 2006) and *Russian Stage Two: Welcome Back!* (Dolgova & Martin, 2010) each contain the largest proportion of targeted formulas (five out of nine). This is likely due to the fact that these textbooks are typically used at the intermediate level of instruction. Table 5 gives more detail on the nature of the occurrence of each of the routine formulas.

**Table 5.** Type of occurrence of targeted routine formulas in Russian textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routine Formula</th>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Type of Occurrence</th>
<th>Definition/Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>V chem delo?</em></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Dialogue text</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Vocabulary list</td>
<td>glossed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Dialogue text</td>
<td>glossed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Dialogue text</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Vocabulary list</td>
<td>glossed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Reading text</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Cloze text</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Dialogue text</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Da net!</em></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Reading text</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>Dialogue text</td>
<td>glossed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>Vocabulary list</td>
<td>glossed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Dialogue model</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Grammar exercise text</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Dialogue text</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Cloze text</td>
<td>glossed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Da ty chto!</em></td>
<td>LR2</td>
<td>Reading text [formal variant <em>Da vy chto</em>]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LR2</td>
<td>Matching activity [formal variant <em>Da vy chto</em>]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nado zhe!</em></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Vocabulary list</td>
<td>glossed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nichego sebe!</em></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Reading text</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Cloze text</td>
<td>glossed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nichego strashnogo.</em></td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Cloze text</td>
<td>glossed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Cloze text</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As documented in Table 5, of the 30 occurrences of the targeted routine formulas, the majority (18) are not accompanied by any additional information (e.g., a gloss, or an explanation of usage). Glosses, when provided, are typically idiomatic English translations for the particular dialogue or sentence. An explanation that the phrase could have a different translation depending on the context was never present. For example, in V puti (Kagan, Miller, & Kudyma, 2006), Da net appears incidentally in a cloze text, glossed as “No, on the contrary.” While this translation is appropriate here, this routine formula can also express uncertainty, in which case that translation would be inappropriate. In only one case does a routine formula appear with information on function: chto li? is included in a vocabulary list in Russian Stage Two: Welcome Back! (Dolgova & Martin, 2010), grouped with other phrases under the heading “To express surprise.” However, it is presented as an optional addition to the word Pravda [Is it true].

Although several of the formulas (6 out of 9) are included in vocabulary lists (in the “useful expressions” or “other words and phrases” rubrics), and thus, presumably, intended to be memorized and used, they are rarely activated in output-focused exercises. These phrases predominantly occur incidentally in texts for readings, or in cloze texts focused on listening comprehension or grammatical issues (e.g., “select the appropriate verb form”). There are a handful of exceptions: in Nachalo Book Two (Lubensky, Ervin, McLellan, & Jarvis, 2002), Da net! occurs in a dialogue intended to be used as a model for practice with a partner. However, there is no explicit statement expressing this intention. This is also the case with the two
occurrences of *Nu i kak* in *Russian Stage One: Live from Russia! Book Two* (Lekić, Davidson, & Gor, 2008). This textbook also features *Da vy chto* (the variant of *Da ty chto* with the formal pronoun *vy*) in an activity where learners, after reading a text, are supposed to match phrases from the story with a synonymous phrase. Since *Da vy chto* is not glossed, presumably learners should infer its meaning from context.

As Kasper and Schmidt (1996) and Bardovi-Harlig (2001) summarized, pragmatic information in textbooks may be defective and inauthentic. Utashiro and Kawai (2009) noticed the same for reactive tokens in Japanese. This analysis of popular Russian language textbooks supports these findings, showing that beginning and intermediate textbooks generally include the routine formulas targeted for the current study only incidentally, almost always without any explanation of usage or opportunities for practice. The instructional website developed for the current study used authentic texts (corpus excerpts and video clips) as input sources in order to ensure that the exercises reflected real-life usage.

### 3.5 Instructional Website Design

Several platforms were evaluated for developing the instructional website. Weebly (http://www.weebly.com/) was chosen due to its attractive and user-friendly interface, and the fact that it allows embedded video and forms. A paid plan was selected as it provided access to more editing features and website support. Forms were needed to collect and store user input: responses to exercises, and feedback on the website itself. Each form required users to input their participant code in order to keep track of individual user data. The data from submitted forms were automatically stored in a spreadsheet on the Weebly administrative page, accessible only to the researcher. The goals of the open education movement (Blyth, 2012) drove the design of the instructional modules: they were developed using a low-cost, easy-to-use website builder in
order to model the creation of a CALL application for other educators who may not have the necessary programming skills or institutional support to build interactive websites. Additionally, they utilized a modular format that allows for adaptation by users in any context.

The landing page of the instructional site (http://nadozhe.weebly.com/) includes the title of the website, *Nado zhe!*, and instructions on its use. A navigational bar at the top of each page contains the following sections: Home, Modules, Review, Feedback, and Contact. From the Modules button, users can access the nine modules (each focusing on a different routine formula). The Review page (located at http://nadozhe.weebly.com/review.html) is a nine question test targeting the routine formulas addressed on the website, intended to be taken upon completion of all modules. At the top of the page, a message informs participants that they may refer back to individual modules for guidance. Each question consists of an excerpt from the corpus (not used in the module or in the pre-/post-/delayed post-test) with the targeted formula removed. For the first five questions, test-takers must select from one of four multiple choice options in order to complete the dialogue. Multiple choice distractors were routine formulas from the website that could not be used to fulfill the function needed in the given dialogue. The final four questions were open-ended cloze tasks in which users produced the missing routine formula by typing it into a text box.

The Feedback page (located at http://nadozhe.weebly.com/feedback.html) consists of a form that solicited information from participants on their experience using the website. It addresses technical difficulties, usefulness of the website including language examples and individual exercise types, the opportunity to suggest improvements, and comments on the formulas themselves (when and how learners heard and used them, and in what contexts). This form informed the qualitative analysis and gathered data on the functionality of the website. The
final page on the website, the contact page (http://nadozhe.weebly.com/contact.html), contains contact information for the website developer/researcher.

In order to obtain corpus excerpts featuring the formulas under instruction, the oral and multimedia subcorpora of the Russian National Corpus were queried. A corpus-referred approach was used to integrate corpus data into the instructional modules. Excerpts were chosen based on their comprehensibility, their pedagogical usefulness, and their prototypicality, in terms of the function of the targeted routine formula. While there were plenty of instances of usage to choose from, those which were more conventional and easier to parse were chosen for inclusion. Video excerpts from the multimedia subcorpus were selected on the basis of their potential to engage learners and their representativeness of popular Russian and Soviet films. The corpus excerpts presented in the website were minimally edited in order to preserve their authenticity. However, decisions were made from a pedagogical standpoint on their selection and the extent to which their contexts were preserved (e.g., where to place the boundaries of the excerpts, and information about the speakers themselves). The excerpts were reformatted to resemble instructional dialogues, as the raw excerpts may be difficult for learners to read:

**Excerpt 3.1**


[Поля, fem] But good for the girl actually / I also think / that sleeping with someone on the first date isn't very good. You like her at least / or has my Iul'ka conquered you for good? [Sasha, male] Well / I'd say partially. [Polia, fem] I also went to the movies yesterday. I went to see “The Mist.” [Sasha, male] Well how was it? I've been seeing the ads for a while. [Polia, female] At first I didn't like it at all / it was really scary / and confusing / even kind of creepy. But then I realized / that it's a really cool movie. [Sasha, male] Who made it? [Youth conversations // From the NKRI collection, 2007]
Non-essential turns were removed, turns were formatted to be more distinct, and speaker information was deleted:

*Excerpt 3.2*

— Я вчера тоже в кино ходила. Ходила на «Мглу».
— Ну и как? Я анонсы видел еще давно.
— Сначала мне вообще не понравилось, очень все страшно, запутанно, и даже мерзко. Но потом я поняла, что очень классный фильм.

Excerpt 3.2

— I also went to the movies yesterday. I went to see “The Mist.”
— Nu i kak? I've been seeing the ads for a while.
— At first I didn't like it at all, it was really scary and confusing, disgusting even. But then I realized that it's a really cool movie.

Source information accompanied each excerpt included on the website, as per Russian National Corpus guidelines. Furthermore, at the bottom of each module, the following disclaimer was included:

*All film clips and excerpts from written and oral texts presented on this site (unless otherwise noted) have been taken from the Russian National Corpus for non-commercial educational use.*

Corpus excerpts were used throughout each module, in both instructional presentations and interactive exercises.

The website exercises were designed with the noticing hypothesis as the underlying theory. Judd (1999) proposed a model for teaching pragmatic competence that consists of the following components: “(1) teacher analysis of speech acts, (2) cognitive awareness skills, (3) receptive/integrative skills, (4) controlled productive skills, and (5) free, integrated practice” (p. 162). He was referring to speech acts in particular, but the model is applicable to routine formulas as well. The goal of activities that promote cognitive awareness, according to Judd (1999), is to allow for learners to become cognizant of targeted features of L2 input. If learner attention is not drawn towards these features, they will be unlikely to notice and therefore,
according to the noticing hypothesis, to acquire the language in question. Receptive/integrative skill-building exercises allow for learners to improve their ability to understand the routine formulas in context, while the last two activity types encourage them to activate their newfound knowledge. The instructional website contains each of the components of Judd's (1999) model, designed with the primary purpose of raising learners' awareness of the targeted forms and their functions in conversation. Furthermore, the website fulfills the five functions of materials listed by Tomlinson (2012): it is informative, instructional, experiential, eliciting, and exploratory.

Table 6 presents the general module structure. However, not every module contained all elements. Study participants were required to complete every exercise by inputting their responses into forms embedded in the module pages. These responses were archived for future research.

**Table 6. Instructional website module structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activating background knowledge</td>
<td>Have you heard the phrase <em>Nu i kak?</em> before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you think is the function of <em>Nu i kak?</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary definitions</td>
<td>Возглас, выражающий удивление, недовольство или недоверие. [An exclamation, expressing surprise, dissatisfaction, or disbelief.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference materials</td>
<td>—<em>Всё в порядке?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—<em>Да нет, о чём вы говорите?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Какой порядок?!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—<em>Is everything in order?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—<em>Da net, what are you talking about?!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing's in order!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

В зависимости от контекста [этот оборот может] выражать или мягкое, вежливое, “успокаивающее” возражение (а), или “горячее”, решительное (эмоционально окрашенное) возражение (б). [Depending on the context, [this phrase can] express either mild, polite, “reassuring” objection (a), or “impassioned,” emphatic (emotionally colored) objection (b)]

*G. I. Volodina, A kak ob etom skazat’? (2008)*
Summarizing information in dictionary definitions and reference materials

According to the dictionary definitions, what emotion does *Nichego sebe*! primarily express?
- dissatisfaction
- indignation
- surprise
- excitement

Idiomatic translation

What English expressions would you use to perform the same functions as those described above?

Data-driven learning with Twitter

[Click here to look at the latest tweets on Twitter featuring the phrase *Nichego sebe*!](#) Find a tweet you understand and think about what emotion is being expressed. Copy and paste the tweet and the emotion being expressed in the box below.

Uses of the phrase

*...chto li* occurs frequently at the end of a question as a tag that the speaker uses to emphasize that s/he is asking a question:

*О магнитофоне* —Дай посмотреть! —Только не выключай! —Записываешь *чтo ли*? —Да.

*Holiday conversation between young people, Moscow region // trainees, 2005*

*—Билеты купила, *чтo ли*? —Купила.*

*Short telephone conversations // From the Ul'ianovskii University collection, 2007*

Cloze

Read the following dialogues. Uses of *chto li* have been removed; indicate in the blank where it should be.

— Как же он назывался? Не могу вспомнить. «Надежда»?
— «Романтик».
— «Романтик», да.

— What was it called? I can't remember. “Hope”?
— “The Romantic.”

[Conversation at the market about Dal'negorsk in the past and present // Dal'negostochnii GU, Database “Live speech of Dal'nevostochniks,” 2009]
In the box below, match the turns (left column) with the appropriate response (right column):

1. Это собаки! Всё, я сюда на роликах больше не поеду кататься...
2. Так прикольно! Такое сочетание прикольное, даа? Маша Малиновская...

a. Ничего себе! Их там так много! Пошли кругом обойдем...
b. Ничего себе! Фамилия шикарная!

1. Those are dogs! That's it, I'm not coming here to roller-skate any more...
2. So cool! Such a cool combination, yeah? Masha Malinovskaia.

a. Nichego sebe! There's so many of them! Let's go around...
b. Nichego sebe! What a grand last name!

Watch the following short film clips containing the phrase Nichego sebe. Pay close attention to the intonation, as well as the function and meaning of this phrase. Watch the clips several times and practice repeating Nichego sebe with the same intonation as the actors.

Write a short dialogue that incorporates the phrase Da ty chto!

Dictionary and reference materials were included in the modules in order to exploit all available resources for understanding these formulas and to raise learner awareness of formula functions and meanings. The researcher queried an online repository of Russian dictionaries and encyclopedias (http://dic.academic.ru/) that includes specialized linguistic references for any mention of the targeted formulas. Physical references were also examined for information to include on the instructional website, but only two provided focus on any of the formulas: a reference book on Russian interjections (Kveselevich & Sasina, 2001) and a textbook on Russian conversation (Volodina, 2008). Reference materials additionally provide legitimacy. In their study of folk linguistic theories of language learning among students of Russian, Miller and
Ginsberg (1995) found that there is “a strong suspicion that those words not legitimatized through inclusion in dictionaries are unsuitable or incorrect” (p. 299).

The functional descriptions of each formula were based on the researcher's analysis of corpus excerpts, with a particular focus on form, function, and typical contexts. Analyses of some of the selected routine formulas were performed in the past for various course projects, and insights from those small studies were incorporated where appropriate. Per Judd's (1999) recommendation, natural media—in this case, film clips—were included to assist students in understanding the formulas. The modules integrate both implicit instruction, in which “the pragmatic feature is included in contexts of use and practised in various activities,” and explicit instruction, in which “the targeted pragmatic feature is made the object of metapragmatic treatment through description, explanation, or discussion” (Kasper, 2001, p. 515). The goal was to include a variety of exercise types that would appeal to a range of user preferences and that would maximize the likelihood that learners would notice and therefore acquire the targeted routine formulas. As the aforementioned review of Russian textbooks indicated, L2 Russian learners are seldom exposed to (and almost never encouraged to notice the functions of) routine formulas of the sort addressed in this study. The instructional website described here is innovative in that it aims to raise awareness of the subtleties of their use in real-life, authentic contexts.

In the instructional website, English was used alongside authentic Russian corpus examples. However, this does not imply endorsement of solely the native speaker as a model. Use of English was a deliberate choice, although one that has been met with controversy in language pedagogy. V. Cook (2001) pushed educators to reconsider the predominant narrative about the use of the L1 in teaching—that it is harmful, that it impedes acquisition, and so on. He
argued that these beliefs are based in false parallels to first language acquisition, and that there are occasions when teachers and learners might benefit from using the L1. For instance, using the L1 can increase efficiency and may aid in learning the L2 (V. Cook, 2001). Explicit descriptions of the functions of the routine formulas were included in order to give learners detailed information to help them master their appropriate use. English was used as the vehicle for this information because the focus was not on learners’ comprehension of the language of functional description. Requiring them to parse this genre of somewhat technical linguistic language would keep them from the task at hand.

After construction of the website and development of the exercises was completed, all elements of the site were tested for functionality by the researcher. Additionally, a native speaker of Russian with extensive Russian teaching experience examined the site for accuracy. The site was not made open to the public during the data collection period, but was made publicly available upon completion of the study.

3.6 Data Collection Instruments

As Barron and Warga (2007) noted, elicited data (gathered through production and multiple choice questionnaires, interviews, and roleplays) commonly characterize large scale acquisitional studies. While elicited data may not be as “authentic” as naturally occurring data, they are much easier to collect. Still, Barron and Warga (2007) advised that “triangulation of data sources represents a practical alternative and one that should be attempted in future studies” (p. 116). Multiple data sources have been used in the study at hand in order to facilitate such triangulation and thereby illuminate the nature of the acquisition and use of the targeted routine formulas.
3.6.1 Computer Assisted Screening Tool (CAST)

The Computer Assisted Screening Tool (CAST) is a web-based assessment of spoken language proficiency developed for a range of languages by the San Diego State University Language Acquisition Resource Center. Many potential proficiency tests were evaluated by the researcher, including grammaticality judgment tests, the Computerized Dynamic Assessment of Language Proficiency (CODA) hosted by the Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research (CALPER) (http://calper.la.psu.edu/dyna_assess.php?page=exams), and the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) self-assessment of speaking ability (http://govtilr.org/Publications/speakingssa.html). The CAST was selected because it can be administered and rated completely online, via a web interface, free of cost. According to their website (https://cast.sdsu.edu/servlets/cast.home): “The CAST is an online oral proficiency assessment designed to measure oral performance in a variety of languages at the intermediate and advanced levels. Feedback is aligned with ACTFL and ILR oral proficiency guidelines.” The test estimates performance on an official OPI. Test-takers select their predicted level of performance: intermediate or advanced. Study participants were advised to select the intermediate level if they had two years or less of Russian language study, and to select the advanced level if they had more than three years of Russian language study and/or had spent time in a Russian-speaking country. They were given the option to exit the test and select the other level if the test they chose was too easy or too difficult.

After registering for the test using a code provided by the researcher, test-takers were given five prompts to which they had to respond. The prompts were randomly selected for each test-taker and are similar to the types of questions and scenarios used on ACTFL and ILR OPIs. Prompts are labeled by the functions elicited at the particular level. For example, advanced level
prompts require test-takers to “describe in past/present time,” “narrate in past/present/future time,” and “handle a situation with a complication,” while intermediate level prompts focus on the functions “ask questions to obtain information,” “simple transaction,” “get directions/instructions,” and “simple description.” All functions are represented in each test, and cover a range of contexts: arts/entertainment, family/friends, travel/transportation, leisure time, popular culture, health/fitness, business/commerce, work/profession, and so on. These are intended to elicit language that is ratable in reference to either the intermediate or advanced OPI guidelines. Test-takers read and listen to a description of the situation, then listen to the prompt. They are then given one opportunity to record their response.

The CAST tests were rated twice: by the researcher and by a paid second rater in order to establish interrater reliability. Tests were given one of three ratings: pass, not pass, or approaching. Rating was holistic and sought to determine the ability of test-takers to sustain proficiency at the level of the chosen test—intermediate (intermediate low on the ACTFL scale) or advanced (advanced low on the ACTFL scale). A score of approaching indicates that level proficiency was not sustained across all five prompts. The CAST scores were used to obtain data on oral proficiency, which would aid in determining the mediating effect (if any) of oral proficiency on pre-/post-/delayed post-test performance. CAST results were used to funnel participants into two categories: Advanced (those who received a rating of pass on the Advanced CAST), and Not Advanced (those who received not pass or approaching on the Advanced CAST, or any rating on the Intermediate CAST). Interrater reliability was 0.90, calculated with Cronbach's alpha. This was done in order to get a general sense of participants' speaking proficiency. Since test-takers chose their test level, and since the CAST assessment was designed
only to ascertain proficiency at two threshold levels, it is not suitable for fine-grained proficiency ratings.

3.6.2 Background Questionnaire

A background questionnaire was developed in order to elicit information from participants about their experience learning and using Russian and to ascertain their level of exposure to the Russian language, covering Russian language coursework, time spent abroad, contact with Russian speakers, and other engagement with the language (e.g., watching television or reading in Russian). The form was created with the free Internet-based tool Google Forms, which allows users to create their own forms accessible at a unique HTML address for distribution via email. Respondents click the link to access the form, and when they submit the completed form, results are collated in a Google spreadsheet that is accessible only to the form creator.

The first part of the background questionnaire addressed participant identification (the participant code randomly assigned to each participant) and demographic information (age, gender, native language). Answer options for this section were open-ended short answer text boxes in order to allow for a diversity of response. For example, instead of being restricted to male and female, respondents could input the label of their choice. Next, the questionnaire requested information on participants' current status regarding their Russian language study by way of a multiple choice question: “What type of program are you currently enrolled in?” Options included regular and intensive university/college Russian language classes; summer study abroad with or without homestay; summer language program with or without a language pledge; private Russian language classes/tutoring; none; other (with a text box for specifying). A language pledge was defined in the questionnaire as a requirement to speak Russian most or all
of the time. Participants were asked to write in the name of their program, college, or university, as well as its location and start/end dates (in the case of a summer program).

The next page of the questionnaire asked for the amount of time the participant had studied Russian, and at what age s/he began to study the language, again via open-ended short answer text boxes. This was followed by questions that sought to determine the level of participant engagement with the Russian language in a variety of contexts. Participants were asked where they studied and/or learned Russian: in elementary/high school; in college/university; in graduate school; while traveling or living in a Russian-speaking country; with family members that speak Russian; with friends that speak Russian; independently (self-study); or other (with a text box for specifying). Options were given with checkboxes in order to allow for multiple selections if applicable. An open-ended question asking respondents to explain in detail the circumstances under which they studied/learned/used Russian followed. An example was given to guide their answers. Next, respondents were asked to list all of the textbooks they had used in their study of Russian, in a class and/or independently.

The final question gauged the extent to which participants engaged with the Russian language through various activities. While it was not modeled after the Language Contact Profile (Freed, Dewey, Segalowitz, & Halter, 2004), it shares some commonalities. Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011), in their study of the acquisition of conventional expressions (similar to routine formulas), distributed a background questionnaire addressing contact variables, such as time spent speaking in the target language to both native speakers and international students, and time spent watching TV in the target language. This was done in order to examine the effects of “patterns of contact” on learners' acquisition of the conventional expressions under study. While Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011) focused on oral and aural communication in their background
questionnaire, the present study included contact with other media because the routine formulas being studied do occur in other modes, albeit less frequently. Using a matrix-style question type, respondents were given a choice of how much time they engaged in a list of activities in Russian: not at all; less than 1 hour per week; 1-2 hours per week; 2-4 hours per week; 4-6 hours per week; more than 6 hours per week. Categories were provided in order to focus learners' responses and for the sake of simplifying analysis later on. The list given was as follows: read novels/fiction; read nonfiction books/articles; listen to music; listen to radio/podcasts; watch television/movies; chat/email; talk with other Russian speakers in person; talk with other Russian speakers via Skype or phone. The purpose of including such a variety of activities was to investigate whether participants' comprehension and use (or lack thereof) of the targeted routine formulas could be attributed to their level of exposure to Russian in a range of contexts.

3.6.3 Pre-/Post-/Delayed Post-Test

A test of knowledge and production of the routine formulas under instruction was developed for use as a pre-/post-/delayed post-test data collection instrument (Appendix F). Because the instrument included audio recordings, the Survey Monkey (http://www.surveymonkey.com/) tool was used to develop and distribute the test via a web link. Survey Monkey allows for greater flexibility than Google Forms, which does not have the capability to embed audio. Three native speakers of Russian evaluated the test by completing it, pointing out problems, and giving suggestions on improving the instrument. Their feedback was incorporated into the final version of the test. A delayed post-test was administered in order to obtain data on the durability of the instructional intervention. Takahashi (2010) recommended this measure be included in studies on pragmatic learnability in order to obtain more robust results on the effectiveness of a given intervention. One form was used for all tests, making it
potentially possible that participants could learn from the test-taking itself. However, because the administration of the tests was separated by several weeks, and because experimental group members interacted with the instructional website throughout that time, memory effects were hoped to be minimal. Furthermore, the scores of the control group participants could be used to determine if there was a retest or practice effect in the experimental group.

The instrument developed by Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011) in their study of the recognition and production of conventional expressions by ESL learners was used as a model for portions of the test. The test consists of four sections assessing both productive and receptive knowledge of the routine formulas presented in the instructional website. Each section is fairly short in order to minimize the time commitment needed to complete the task and to prevent fatigue. The first section contains two DCTs in which test takers type in the missing phrase from conversation excerpts retrieved from the Russian National Corpus. These excerpts were selected on the basis of their intelligibility and the relative simplicity of their grammatical and lexical elements. Golato (2003) addressed the issue of data collection procedures in pragmatics research, arguing that DCTs, for example, do not measure authentic language use. Still, DCTs continue to be widely used due to “their simplicity of use and high degree of control over variables [which] lead to easy replicability” (Golato, 2003, p. 93). She suggested that DCTs are essentially metapragmatic, as they measure what respondents believe is pragmatically acceptable in a given context.

Usó-Juan and Martínez-Flor (2014) proposed interactive DCTs as a remedy for the lack of turn-taking (which is an essential element of conversation) in traditional DCTs. The current study also implemented an alternative to the traditional DCT that accounts for turn-taking. By using authentic language extracted from corpus data, respondents are forced to select from a
narrow range of possible responses. Thus, the DCT endeavors to elicit a word or phrase appropriate to that very specific context. It is a test of pragmalinguistic knowledge. The task requires the ability to infer pragmatic meaning from context and to choose from one's pragmalinguistic resources the most appropriate response. Test takers had to infer what the appropriate turn was, based on contextual clues, and then type in their response (via an open-ended text input box). They were permitted to use a dictionary if the dialogue contained unfamiliar words, so that lack of knowledge of lexical items would not be a barrier to comprehension. Although the phrases removed from the original dialogues were targeted routine formulas, other pragmatically appropriate responses were acceptable. Responses on the two open-ended questions were randomized and rated by two independent raters using the scale in Table 7, based on Taguchi (2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 = Pragmatically appropriate &amp; native-like</td>
<td>The utterance is pragmatically appropriate. This is what a native speaker would usually say in the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Pragmatically appropriate &amp; not native-like</td>
<td>The utterance is pragmatically appropriate. However, it is not native-like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Pragmatically inappropriate</td>
<td>The utterance is not appropriate for the context, or is unintelligible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section was followed by an aural recognition task. Participants listened to eighteen phrases, recorded by a native speaker of Russian, and marked their familiarity with each phrase. The instructions were: “Click each link to hear the phrase, then check the box corresponding to your familiarity with each phrase.” The phrases included the nine routine formulas addressed in the instructional module, as well as nine distractors (Table 8). As in the Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011) study, the distractors were nonce phrases: modified versions of the formulas in
which a lexical or grammatical element was altered, resulting in a phrase without pragmatic meaning.

**Table 8. Routine formulas and distractors on aural recognition task**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routine Formula</th>
<th>Associated Distractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V chem delo?</td>
<td>V kakom dele?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da net!</td>
<td>Net da!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da ty chto!</td>
<td>A ty kak!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nado zhe!</td>
<td>Nuzhno zhe!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichego sebe!</td>
<td>Chego sebe!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichego strashnogo.</td>
<td>Nichego strannogo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu i kak?</td>
<td>Nu i kakoi?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu i chto?</td>
<td>Vot i chto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...chtli?</td>
<td>Kak li?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After listening to a phrase, respondents chose from one of three options, following Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011): *I often hear this, I sometimes hear this, I never hear this*. These options were given in order to ascertain receptive familiarity of the targeted formulas, and to determine whether or not the instructional website resulted in gains in this familiarity.

In the next section, participants completed multiple-choice DCTs similar to the two in the first section. They were asked to “select the best-sounding response for the blanks in the following authentic Russian conversations.” Each of the four dialogues in this section was followed by four options that respondents were to select from. The options included the formula that originally appeared in the corpus excerpt, along with three other routines that are pragmatically inappropriate in the given context.

In the final section of the test, learners read two corpus excerpts that were intact and followed these instructions: “Please select the emotion that the speaker is expressing with the underlined word/phrase in the following authentic Russian conversations.” Each excerpt was followed by four different emotion words, only one of which could be expressed by the given phrase in that particular context.
While the reliability and validity of this particular instrument were not confirmed, it must be noted that it is advantageous to investigate these issues when an assessment is used in a high-stakes testing situation (Bardovi-Harlig & Shin, 2014), especially since scholars have challenged the validity of DCTs in general as measures of pragmatic competence (Ishihara, 2010). But these qualities were not addressed in the study at hand as it was low-stakes, and the instrument was developed in order to satisfy practicality demands.

3.6.4 Retrospective Interview

Experimental group participants participated in an interview with the researcher upon completion of all study tasks. Interviews took place over Skype (http://www.skype.com/) and were recorded using SkypeAutoRecorder (http://skypeautorecorder.codeplex.com/) and Amolto Call Recorder for Skype (http://amolto.com/). This method was chosen due to the ease of recording calls: both call recorders are free applications that automatically record calls and save the recordings as mp3 files. At the beginning of each call, the interviewee was notified of the fact that the call was being recorded, that the recordings would be accessible only to the researcher, that recording transcripts would be used to inform the study analysis, and that any excerpts or quotes from the interviews would be associated with pseudonyms. Verbal confirmation that the interviewee had understood and was willing to be recorded was then requested.

The interview consisted of eight questions, but the interviewee was told that s/he could interject at any time with comments, even if they were off-topic. The researcher asked all interviewees the same eight open-ended questions (Appendix G), as well as supplementary questions in order to clarify responses or solicit deeper feedback. This was done in order to avoid restricting interviewees to providing feedback only related to the questions asked.
The retrospective interview has been used previously to collect feedback from learners on their experience using a CALL application (Sykes & Cohen, 2008). Kasper and Schmidt (1996) warned against focusing solely on cognitive ability when examining the development of pragmatic competence in learners, recommending the use of data collection techniques that tap into questions of learner identity. As discussed in Chapter 2, Kinginger's (2008) use of interviews and written reflections unearthed important findings on the significance of individual differences, context, and identity in the learning process. The retrospective interview was included in the current study both in order to gain more detailed feedback than the online written form might elicit, as well as to gain insight into the role that identity plays in the use of routine formulas. By collecting qualitative feedback from participants, this study has endeavored to take into account the subjective experiences of learners as they discover, comprehend, and produce routine formulas in Russian. The formulaic language in question is highly colloquial and reflective of authentic speech between native speakers, but learners may prefer to avoid such language, depending on the identity they wish to embody amongst Russian speakers.

3.6.5 Control Group Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed on Google Forms and was distributed to control group participants upon completion of their final task, the delayed post-test. This was done in order to elicit qualitative data from this group about the routine formulas being targeted. Respondents gave their participant code and indicated their level of familiarity with and ability to use the targeted formulas. They were also asked to provide examples of times they had heard the phrases and to provide information on how they feel about using the phrases (if they use any of them). Finally, they were asked if they would be interested in learning about how to use the phrases (or
similar colloquial Russian phrases) in conversation, and why or why not that was the case. A box was also provided for general comments related to the phrases or the research project.

3.7 Rating and Transcription

As previously mentioned, the researcher and a second rater rated the pre-/post-/delayed post-test results. Points were awarded for pragmatically appropriate (open-ended DCTs; see Table 7) or correct (multiple choice) responses. In the aural recognition task, each *I never hear this* response received 0 points, *I sometimes hear this* received 1 point, and *I often hear this* received 2 points, in order to calculate a Learner Recognition Score, following Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011).

Data elicited by the feedback form on the instructional website were aggregated in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. In the analysis chapter, quantitative data are presented in tables, while qualitative data are quoted for illustrative purposes.

Interviews were transcribed by the researcher, but the transcription was not fine-grained: pauses and prosodic information were not included. Each interviewee was assigned a pseudonym, which was linked to the respective participant code in a separate, password-protected document. The researcher read the transcribed interviews in their entirety to identify and mark key themes. Relevant passages were then copied into a separate document and organized by theme. Themes are discussed in a qualitative analysis and supported by relevant interview data excerpts.
Chapter 4

Results and Discussion

4.1 Overview

This chapter contains an analysis and discussion, with regard to the study's research questions, of the results from the various data collection instruments: background information on participants (with data from the background questionnaire and CAST assessment), pre-/post-/delayed post-test scores, the instructional website feedback form (experimental group), the retrospective interview (experimental group), and the final questionnaire (control group).

4.2 Background Questionnaire and CAST Assessment

Table 9 provides information on the makeup of the control (n = 16) and experimental (n = 18) groups. Within the control group, learners were enrolled in regular (6) or intensive (1) university classes, a domestic summer immersion program (5), or were not enrolled in Russian language classes at all (4). Among the experimental group, participants were enrolled in regular university classes (2), a domestic summer immersion program (10), a study abroad program (1), or were not enrolled in Russian language classes at all (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. Participant information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Group (n = 16)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (male:female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age (range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time studying Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age study of Russian began</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral proficiency rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native language(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total intensity of engagement score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This participant was born in Ukraine and studied Russian from age 6 to age 11, when her family immigrated to Canada. She was enrolled in a second-year Russian course while participating in this study.*
The results of the post-test were not recorded correctly for one of the experimental group participants (Susan), necessitating that this participant be excluded from the quantitative analysis. However, her feedback on the website has been included in the discussion of the qualitative results from the website feedback form and the retrospective interview.

4.3 Pre-/Post-/Delayed Post-Test Results

Table 10 shows the means and standard deviations for the test scores of the experimental and control groups. The graph in Figure 3 displays the mean scores for each test, separated by treatment group. There was a maximum of 10 possible points (one point each for six multiple choice questions; two points each for two DCTs). Responses on the two open-ended questions were randomized and rated by two independent raters (see Chapter 3 for details). Interrater reliability was 0.84, calculated using Cronbach's alpha.

**Table 10. Mean pre-, post-, and delayed post-test scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Delayed post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.** Mean pre-, post-, and delayed post-test scores
According to the mean scores, the experimental group showed improvement on average across the administrations of the test, while the control group average score decreased between pre- and post-test, then increased on the delayed post-test. Statistical analysis of these results is provided in Section 4.3.2.

4.3.1 Responses to Open-Ended DCTs

The first two questions on the pre-/post-/delayed post-test were DCTs that required test-takers to insert a routine formula appropriate to the context. Dialogues were retrieved from the Russian National Corpus that contained lexicon understandable to an intermediate or advanced student of Russian. In order to investigate the differences in responses between the experimental and control groups from test to test, participant responses to both open-ended DCTs were tallied. Any responses that were given two or more times within a group (experimental and control) are listed in Tables 11 and 12. Related variants of a phrase are given in parentheses. An asterisk indicates that the variant is grammatically incorrect. The remaining responses (not shown) were unique to the group.

In the first dialogue, the speaker Sasha is surprised at the amount of people invited to the party, and uses the routine formula Nichego sebe to express this surprise.

Excerpt 4.1

| Саша | А где праздновать будете? | Таня | У Олега дома. |
| Саша | Сколько народу будет? | Таня | Двенадцать человек. |
| Саша | Ничего себе! А как вы поместитесь? | Таня | А у Олега особняк, места много. Не хочешь с нами? |

Microdialogues // From Ul'ianovskii University materials, 2007
A shorter version of this dialogue was used as an example of usage in the instructional website, in the Nichego sebe! module. As shown in Table 11, a large share of experimental group participants used the original routine formula, Nichego sebe, in the post- (56%) and delayed post-tests (50%). Other frequent responses were Da ty chto and Nado zhe—both addressed in the instructional module, and both appropriate for the dialogue as well. The control group displays more variety in the phrases used on each test: the most frequent is Tak mnogo [so many], which, while pragmatically acceptable, is not a routine formula.

Table 11. Responses to first open-ended DCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-test</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nichego/ne figa sebe</strong>¹ (5)</td>
<td>Tak mnogo [So many] (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gospodi [Good Lord] (2)</td>
<td>Nichego sebe (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zdorovo [Great] (2)</td>
<td>Other (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tak mnogo [So many] (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-test</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nichego sebe</strong> (10)</td>
<td>Tak mnogo (mnogie*) [So many (manys*)] (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Da ty chto (3)</td>
<td>Ogo [Oh] (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nado zhe (2)</td>
<td>Nichego sebe (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (3)</td>
<td>Other (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delayed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nichego sebe</strong> (9)</td>
<td>Tak mnogo (mnogie*) [So many (manys*)] (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>post-test</strong></td>
<td>Da ty chto (7)</td>
<td>Nichego sebe (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (2)</td>
<td>Other (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹slang variant

A similar trend can be observed in the responses to the second open-ended DCT. In this dialogue, Olesia asks Tania how her trip to the club was (in the original dialogue the name of the club is used, but here the name was replaced with the generic noun in order to make clear the destination in question). She uses the routine formula Nu i kak, which was addressed in the instructional website. Unlike the first open-ended dialogue, this dialogue was not included
anywhere in the website. While experimental group participants may have simply remembered the correct phrase for the first open-ended DCT, that would not have been possible for this DCT.

**Excerpt 4.2**

<Олеся> Как субботу провела?
<Тания> Отлично, мы с девчонками в [клуб] «Пятое солнце» ходили.
<Олеся> Ну и как?
<Тания> Здорово было, знакомых много встретила.
<Олеся> Ясно.

Разговоры студенток о неприятностях // Из коллекции Ульяновского университета, 2007

Table 12 lists the responses to the second open-ended DCT. Again, there is a dramatic convergence on the routine formula *Nu i kak* on the post- (83%) and delayed post-tests (89%) within the experimental group. Within the control group, there is a wider variety of responses on all three tests.

**Table 12. Responses to second open-ended DCT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-test</strong></td>
<td>(I/A) <em>Kak bylo</em> ([And] <em>how was it</em>) (8)</td>
<td><em>Kak bylo</em> [How was it] (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kak byl klub</em> [How was the club] (2)</td>
<td><em>A kak eto bylo</em> [And how was it] (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kak byl</em> [How was*] (2)</td>
<td><em>Nu i kak</em> tam bylo/tebe [was it there/for you*] (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Nu i kak</em> (2)</td>
<td>Other (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-test</strong></td>
<td><em>Nu i kak</em> (15)</td>
<td><em>Kak bylo</em> [How was it] (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (3)</td>
<td><em>Nu i kak</em> (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delayed</strong></td>
<td><em>Nu i kak</em> (16)</td>
<td><em>(A) Kak bylo</em> [How was it] (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>post-test</strong></td>
<td>Other (2)</td>
<td><em>Nu i kak</em> (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*informal

Responses to the open-ended DCTs demonstrate the effect of the online modules on the use of the routine formulas. Experimental group participants clearly converged on the pragmatically
appropriate routine formula after exposure to the instructional website, while control group participants continued to input a wider variety of responses (some pragmatically appropriate, some less so).

4.3.2 Statistical Analysis of Test Scores

Normality assumptions were met for the scores on the pre-test for both the control and experimental groups. However, distribution of experimental group scores on the post- and delayed post-tests was skewed, necessitating the use of a non-parametric test to analyze the difference between those tests. An independent samples t-test was performed on the pre-test. It was found that there was not a statistically significant difference between the experimental and control groups ($p = 0.22$). This indicates that the two groups were comparable at the outset of the study. Another independent samples t-test was done in order to determine if there was any difference on the pre-test between participants who were classified as Advanced or Not Advanced, according to the CAST results. The results showed no significant difference between those two groups ($p = 0.07$), indicating that oral proficiency was not related to performance on the pre-test.

In order to determine whether or not the difference between control group performance on pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests was significant, a Friedman test was used. The difference was not significant (chi-square = 2.22, $df = 2$, $p = 0.33$). This eliminates the possibility of a practice effect. A Friedman test was also performed on the experimental group test scores. There was a significant difference between tests (chi-square = 8.63, $df = 2$, $p = 0.01$). A Wilcoxon signed rank test showed that the differences between pre- and post-test ($Z = -1.17$, $p = 0.24$), and between post- and delayed post-test ($Z = -1.56$, $p = 0.12$) were not significant. However, the
improvement from pre- to delayed post-test was statistically significant ($Z = -2.21, p = 0.03$).

### 4.3.3 Aural Recognition of Routine Formulas

Table 13 displays the aural comprehension ratings: mean total recognition score for all routine formulas and all nonce phrases. The graph in Figure 4 displays the mean total recognition scores for each test, separated by treatment group and type of phrase (routine formulas and nonce phrases).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13. Mean aural recognition scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental: Routine Formulas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control: Routine Formulas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental: Nonce Phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control: Nonce Phrases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 4. Mean aural recognition scores](image-url)
Familiarity with routine formulas on the pre-test was positively correlated with intensity of engagement ($r = 0.45$, $p < 0.01$). It was also positively correlated with the amount of time the participant had studied Russian ($r = 0.6$, $p = 0.00$). Independent samples t-tests were performed on pre-, post-, and delayed post-test scores for both formulas and nonce phrases. The results indicated that there was not a significant difference between the experimental and control groups. Friedman tests showed no significant difference between tests for recognition of formulas in the experimental group (chi-square = 4.84, $df = 2$, $p = 0.09$), and in the control group (chi-square = 2.95, $df = 2$, $p = 0.23$). However, a Friedman test did find a significant difference between learner recognition scores of nonce phrases in the experimental group (chi-square = 6.35, $df = 2$, $p = 0.04$). The Wilcoxon test showed that the difference lay between the pre- and post-tests ($Z = -2.76$, $p < 0.01$), which indicates that the decrease in the experimental group from pre- to post-test for the nonce phrase recognition scores was statistically significant.

### 4.4 Instructional Website Feedback Form

Table 14 shows the responses to the close-ended questions on the post-intervention feedback form (http://nadozhe.weebly.com/feedback.html) filled out by experimental group participants. 17 responses were received, as one participant did not complete the feedback form. A summary of responses to the open-ended feedback form questions follows.

| Q1: Overall, did you find that using the modules increased your awareness of the ways the phrases presented are used in Russian conversation? | Yes: 10 (59%) | Somewhat: 7 (41%) |
| Q2: Did you have any technical difficulties using this website? | No: 12 (71%) | Yes: 5 (29%) |
**Q3:** How would you describe the modules in this website? (Please select all that apply).

- Useful: 15 (88%)
- Informative: 13 (76%)
- Engaging: 12 (71%)
- Fun: 9 (53%)
- Easy to use: 8 (47%)
- Challenging: 8 (47%)
- Entertaining: 6 (35%)
- Motivating: 6 (35%)
- Too easy: 5 (29%)
- Overwhelming: 3 (18%)
- Too difficult: 3 (18%)
- Too detailed: 3 (18%)
- Unclear: 1 (6%)
- Boring: 1 (6%)
- Irrelevant: 0 (0%)
- Hard to use: 0 (0%)

**Q4:** Generally, was the Russian in the conversation and film excerpts:

- Easy to understand: 8 (47%)
- Somewhat difficult to understand, but I didn’t have to use a dictionary: 6 (35%)
- Difficult to understand - I had to use a dictionary: 3 (18%)

**Q5:** Approximately how much time did you spend on each module?

- 15 minutes on average

**Q6:** Which parts of the modules did you find MOST helpful? (You may select more than one option).

- Excerpts from authentic conversations: 12 (71%)
- Explanations of usage: 10 (59%)
- Film clips: 10 (59%)
- Excerpts from reference materials (dictionaries, etc.): 9 (53%)
- Activities using Twitter: 8 (47%)
- Dialogue writing activities: 7 (41%)
- Multiple choice activities: 5 (29%)
- Fill-in-the-blank activities: 4 (24%)
- Dialogue matching activities: 3 (18%)
- Excerpts from literature: 3 (18%)

**Q7:** Which parts of the modules did you find LEAST helpful? (You may select more than one option).

- Dialogue matching activities: 6 (35%)
- Activities using Twitter: 5 (29%)
- Fill-in-the-blank activities: 5 (29%)
- Excerpts from reference materials (dictionaries, etc.): 4 (24%)
- Dialogue writing activities: 3 (18%)
- Excerpts from literature: 3 (18%)
- Film clips: 1 (6%)
- Multiple choice activities: 1 (6%)

**Q8:** Were the individual modules...

- The right length: 11 (65%)
- Too short: 4 (24%)
- Too long: 2 (12%)
Q9: Would this website be most effective...
As part of homework for a Russian class?: 9 (53%)
As part of self-study?: 8 (47%)

Q10: Do you think you will use the phrases presented in the modules while speaking Russian?
Yes - I already have started to use one or more of them: 12 (71%)
Yes - I haven't yet but intend to: 4 (24%)
Maybe: 1 (6%)

Q11: Which phrases do you think you will use, if any?
Nichego strashnogo: 17 (100%)
V chem delo: 17 (100%)
Da net!: 13 (76%)
Nu i kak?: 12 (71%)
Nu i chto?: 12 (71%)
Nichego sebe!: 11 (65%)
...chto li?: 11 (65%)
Da ty chto!: 7 (41%)
Nado zhe!: 6 (35%)

Q12: Since beginning to use this website, have you encountered the phrases presented in the modules in other contexts, such as in conversation or in Russian texts (e.g., movies, songs, writing)?
Yes: 11 (65%)
No: 6 (35%)

Q13: What other types of activities/features would you find helpful in learning conversational Russian phrases? (You may select more than one option).
Getting feedback on whether I am using the phrases appropriately: 17 (100%)
Watching videos of scripted dialogues featuring the phrases: 8 (47%)
Using the phrase in a recorded response to an audio prompt: 6 (35%)
Seeking examples of usage of the phrases in Russian-language webpages, television shows, and other sources: 5 (29%)

Responses to the feedback form indicate that all experimental group participants found that the instructional website increased their awareness of conversational usage of the targeted formulas to a greater (59%) or lesser (41%) extent. Most participants (71%) had no technical difficulties with the modules. The majority of users described the website as useful (88%), informative (76%), engaging (71%), and fun (53%). 47% percent of respondents described the Russian used in the excerpts on the website easy to understand, while 35% said they were somewhat difficult to understand but that they did not have to use a dictionary. On average, users spent 15 minutes
on each module, and the majority found the following parts of the modules most helpful: excerpts from authentic conversations (71%); explanations of usage (59%); film clips (59%); and excerpts from reference materials including dictionaries (53%). The least helpful module component, according to 35% of the experimental group participants, was the dialogue matching activity. Most respondents (65%) said that the modules were the right length. Participants were nearly evenly split on their opinions on the best use of the website: as part of homework in a Russian class (53%) or as part of self-study (47%). Regarding usage of the targeted routine formulas, most learners (71%) responded that they had already started to use one or more of the phrases from the modules. Another 24% said they had not begun to use them but intended to. All the experimental group participants said they thought they would use the phrases Nichego strashnogo and V chem delo, and a majority of participants said they would use Da net!, Nu i kak?, Nu i chto?, Nichego sebe!, and ...chto li?. 65% of respondents noted that they had encountered the phrases targeted in the modules in other contexts since using the website. Finally, all respondents said they would find feedback on appropriate usage of the phrases helpful, while 47% indicated that videos of scripted dialogues with the targeted formulas would be helpful, 35% said that audio prompts with the ability to record a response with the formula would be helpful, and 29% wanted to see examples of usage of the formulas in Russian-language webpages, television shows, and other sources.

4.4.1 Additional Comments on the Website

Participants were also asked to include any other comments (suggestions for improvement, complaints, etc.) about the website. One praised the interactivity, while another liked the Twitter exercises:
I can't emphasize enough how useful I found Twitter, since it was totally natural, colloquial Russian - which is something that is so hard to come by as part of language learning classes.

There were criticisms about the modules being too short, repetitive, and lacking variety; occasionally being overwhelming because too many functions were included for a particular phrase; and about the inclusion of too many dictionary examples. One respondent suggested that a glossary for difficult words in the usage examples be included. Two users found the order of activities in each module deficient. Another mentioned that the instructions were not always clear (but that this lack of specificity makes the modules more appealing to self-study learners).

Some of the descriptions were found to be inadequate:

For some reason, maybe because I've encountered this particular phrase decidedly less often in conversational situations, I found the explanation of the phrase *nado zhe* somewhat lacking. I still don't feel like I have a full command of it.

Finally, as shown in Q13, users wanted feedback on their answers, although they seemed to find the website useful regardless:

Feedback would, of course, be helpful, but not strictly necessary. I can imagine these modules being a fine resource for self-study or review (they were in my case!), though they might also be easily adapted to an academic setting by enabling feedback, etc.

Participants also mentioned the issue of providing feedback in the retrospective interview data (see Section 4.5.5).

4.4.2 Using the Routine Formulas

Users were asked to comment on how they felt using the routine formulas. Five respondents mentioned that they felt awkward or strange using them, as they were still unsure of
their meanings. However, five respondents said they felt more fluent or natural when using the phrases in their spoken Russian:

**Excerpt 4.6**

1. More fluent, but at times I wasn't sure if I was using them correctly. Regardless, I have been more aware of them when other speakers say them, which in turn makes me understand the appropriate contexts in which these phrases can be used.

Another participant commented on the value of learning the routine formulas:

**Excerpt 4.7**

1. I think these types of phrases are really important in everyday speech. It would be frustrating to not understand them in English, and once I learned them I realized how much I needed them. I don't know why these aren't a big part of learning Russian in college.

One participant said he might not use the phrases because they are too difficult to use and because he feels uncomfortable using them. Another said she felt she can communicate well enough without them.

### 4.4.3 Experience with Routine Formulas in Other Contexts

Eleven of the participants responded to an open-ended question asking where they had encountered the phrases from the website. Five wrote that they heard them frequently in conversation with Russian speakers. Four mentioned that they had come across the routine formulas on the Internet (Twitter, YouTube comments). Respondents also noted they encountered the phrases in movies, in the target country, and from instructors.

**Excerpt 4.8**

1. I tend to hear *Nichego sebe* [and] *Nichego strashnogo* frequently in conversations and in colloquial online forums, Twitter, etc. By frequently I mean literally all the time. They are very heavily used and I think that the modules really helped me to feel comfortable with these phrases.

One user recounted how she maintains her colloquial Russian with the help of the phrases:
I am a mentor for prospective study abroad students at [my university]. Since beginning this module, I have been corresponding with a former mentoree via email in Russian. We have both been using many of the phrases covered in this module since our aim is to teach each other (not explicitly, but through context) the slang expressions used in the different regions of Eastern Europe where we studied abroad. All the expressions covered in this module are common and relevant!

Responses gathered via the website feedback form shed some light on the effectiveness of the website and on learners’ experience using the targeted routine formulas. However, the retrospective interview data collected from 17 of the 18 experimental group participants paint a much fuller and richer picture.

4.5 Retrospective Interview Results

After being transcribed, experimental group interviews were read in their entirety to identify and mark key themes. Relevant passages were copied into a separate document and organized by theme. A discussion of these themes, supported by relevant interview data excerpts, follows. Participant interview responses are often quoted for illustrative purposes in order to allow for the inclusion of learners' own voices. Summarized responses are followed by the learner's name in parentheses. Participants are identified by pseudonyms, which are given in Table 15 with additional information about each participant in order to provide context and reference. The participant Susan did not complete the post-test. While her results were not included in the quantitative analysis of test scores, her interview data are included in the analysis that follows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Pre:Post: Delayed&lt;br&gt;Scores</th>
<th>Proficiency (based on CAST)</th>
<th>Years studied Russian</th>
<th>Intensity of engagement score</th>
<th>Target country experience</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8:4:6</td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>summer language program w/ pledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4:7:8</td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>summer language program w/o pledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5:6:6</td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>summer language program w/o pledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6:9:8</td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>summer language program w/ pledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5:2:6</td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>summer language program w/ pledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9:10:10</td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>summer language program w/ pledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cody</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6:8:10</td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>summer language program w/o pledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7:8:8</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>summer language program w/ pledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5:9:8</td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>summer language program w/o pledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7:7:8</td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>summer language program w/o pledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7:7:9</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>summer study abroad w/o homestay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7:10:10</td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7:5:3</td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>regular university/college language classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6:8:9</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>regular university/college language classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8:7:9</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5:NA:5</td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9:9:8</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8:9:9</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Russian Flagship Program graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a all names are pseudonyms  
b this participant was unable to be reached for an interview  
c this participant's score on the post-test was not recorded properly; however, her feedback via the website form and retrospective interview have been included in the qualitative analysis
4.5.1 Perception of Routine Formulas

Experimental group participants commented on the nature of the routine formulas themselves, calling them “things that generally don't get translated” (Craig), “common conversational phrases” (Joseph), “stuff that you don’t actually learn about” (Samantha). Amber expressed surprise that this type of conversational language was never taught to her. These phrases help one feel more Russian because they are not simply literal translations of English phrases:

Excerpt 4.10 David

1 it wasn't necessarily some direct translation of what I was saying from English to
2 Russian, I was actually using a Russian phrase, or you know, intonation or whatever

Without these phrases, “you could miss quite a lot” in conversation (Nicole). There was a tendency to describe these expressions as “real” Russian (the words slang, colloquial, authentic, conversational, native, informal, casual were also used in reference to routine formulas), as opposed to classroom or “traditional” Russian which is stiff and formal (Amber). When this kind of language is neglected in the classroom:

Excerpt 4.11 Craig

1 you're left, you know, knowing in theory how to read things but you just kind of talk like
2 a 19th century person

This may not only entail using archaic language, but also an inability to speak casually and to communicate with emotion. Several participants noted the utility of routine formulas in expressing emotions:

Excerpt 4.12 Joseph

1 I feel like those are [unintelligible] are great transition words that are really good at
2 expressing certain emotions... because they’re very colloquial phrases that everyday
3 people use, and they’re really good at expressing certain emotions
Imagine if you were, you know, trying to learn English, and you never learned the word *Oh my gosh*, or things like that. Or *Wow*, it would be almost impossible to express your feelings to somebody.

Without such conversational language, Amber (Excerpt 4.13) recognized the difficulty of interacting with others, given the important emotion-expressing function of routine formulas. While one might have the sociopragmatic knowledge that indicated that a reaction like surprise was needed in a conversation, pragmalinguistic resources would be absent.

Some interviewees addressed the register associated with the routine formulas, describing them as informal phrases that they would not use with older people, professors, and people they use the formal pronoun *vy* with. They reserved their use for friends and peers.

Participants also noticed the polysemy of these phrases, which Susan characterized as “shades of meaning.” For Arthur (Excerpt 4.14), the difficulty of these phrases lies in a tendency to focus on single lexical units, since a literal translation of each component word does not reveal the true meaning or function of the phrase:

*Excerpt 4.14 Arthur*

1 you have to think of it collectively, as opposed to each individual word, which is what I
2 was doing initially, so I think that's what, um, really prevented me from, um,
3 understanding, uh, and feeling like, uh, I understood people, in conversation.

This brings to mind Sinclair's (1991) idiom principle: phrases like the routine formulas targeted in this study actually function as “semi-preconstructed phrases that constitute single choices” (p. 110). Without awareness of this principle, L2 users will focus on individual lexical items as Arthur (Excerpt 4.14) did.

Keith, a participant with extensive experience speaking Russian in a target country, identified the routine formulas as “basic.” However, since they are typically not found in
dictionaries, which Andrew noted, it is difficult to learn them without repeated, contextualized exposure.

**4.5.2 Learning Routine Formulas**

The interviewees reflected on their range of experiences learning the routine formulas, both naturalistically and through instruction. In naturalistic contexts, repeated exposure was necessary, according to the accounts of learners who had spent time abroad. In early encounters with a particular phrase, its meaning was unclear. When Arthur (Excerpt 4.15) initially encountered one of the routine formulas, he was confused:

*Excerpt 4.15* Arthur

1  [while living in Moscow] I remember there was a specific moment when all I heard was,
2  every sentence ending with *chtli*. And I remember thinking, What in the world does that mean?

David's (Excerpt 4.16) process of learning the phrase *Nichego sebe*, which was used frequently by an interlocutor of his, again brings to mind Sinclair's (1991) idiom principle:

*Excerpt 4.16* David

1  Because the word *nichego*, like if you split those two words up, I just, I couldn't understand quite what he meant by it. I was, I was confused. I kind of understood from the context and after hearing him say it over and over and after, you know, listening to everything else he was saying, it was an expression

Contextual clues helped him to realize that the two words belonged together, as one cohesive unit.

Although the routine formulas may have perplexed learners at first, many interviewees were able to acquire a phrase after hearing it repeatedly. Multiple exposures strengthened the mapping between the form and its function(s). Keith (Excerpt 4.17) said that after enough instances of hearing *Da net*, he was able to understand it:
Excerpt 4.17 Keith

[it's] something that, that just over time, that didn't need to be explained, it just, it clicked.

Stephanie (Excerpt 4.18) also learned one of the phrases, *Nu i kak*, from repeated exposures:

Excerpt 4.18 Stephanie

that was the phrase everybody was using when they met me again, they'd say *Nu kak? Nu i kak tebe poezdka* [How was your trip]? *Nu i kak tebe Izrail'* [How was Israel]? [...] I figured it out from context but I, I remember... having to think hard about the wording, because of the ellipsis in that phrase.

Joseph (Excerpt 4.19) was able to observe the phrases in use, and became conscious of the contexts they were associated with:

Excerpt 4.19 Joseph

the more time I spent, uh, in the Ukraine, the more, and the more I heard the phrases, the more I realized like when to use them, and I kind of inferred the meaning, based off what other people were saying.

Observing contextual factors of routine formulas in use informed Claudia's (Excerpt 4.20) own usage:

Excerpt 4.20 Claudia

I just kind of go by what I've gleaned from my own encounters, like what I hear young people say, versus what I hear older people say, or what I hear people say in, um, informal situations, versus formal situations. So I think I kind of just rely on my own experiences in that regard.

These learners were made aware of the routine formulas by exposure to them in action. Deep knowledge of the expressions grew through multiple contextualized instances of their uses. For Claudia (Excerpt 4.21), instructional materials were unlikely to replace those experiences:

Excerpt 4.21 Claudia

just the sheer number of examples that you can, um, encounter in real-life interactions with native speakers is something that's hard to replicate even with a website
Several learners maintained that this type of language was best learned in conversation, since pedagogical materials may not adequately describe their use and functions:

*Excerpt 4.22 Susan*

1. when textbooks like, define those things you quickly find the problem with their definition anyway, and, you know, because it's living language, and it changes, and it can mean more than one thing

Before using the website, some learners were exposed to the routine formulas in other instructional contexts as well: in a textbook dialogue (Nicole and Terry), or through explicit instruction from a teacher, as Rachel (Excerpt 4.23) described:

*Excerpt 4.23 Rachel*

1. they like made a point of being like, Hey guys, so like, this girl, she's really cute, she says *Nichego sebe* a lot, what does it mean? And so it always stuck with me

Adam (Excerpt 4.24) had a similar experience with the phrase *Da net*:

*Excerpt 4.24 Adam*

1. a couple of people in our class were asking our teacher about Russian colloquialisms, and any, if they have any similar, random, off the topic sayings that a lot of times happen in English, and so she went through and explained how, uh, *Da net*, um... and that was, one that stuck out a little bit. [...]the teacher] just kind of, mentioned it, and explained it

Amber (Excerpt 4.25) talked about a teacher who was “very formal” but would explain colloquialisms if asked:

*Excerpt 4.25 Amber*

1. when I asked her about *Nichego sebe* she did talk to me about it, and, um, and she did tell me that people used it, but then I never heard her use it in class

A particular phrase might be actively taught, either by a teacher or by a host family, as in Stephanie's (Excerpt 4.26) experience:
I used *Da net* all the time when I was in Vladimir because that was a favorite phrase of my host family, they thought that, it was a pretty... humorous point of their language and they enjoyed teaching their host students every summer exactly what that meant, so [laughter] everybody would gather around and, explain to me what *Da net* meant, and then I'd be quizzed on it afterwards, and so we went through this whole lesson about six times [...] So, that was kind of our, uh, our catchphrase in the apartment. We'd use *Da net* to joke all of the time.

Stephanie's (Excerpt 4.27) use of routine formulas was supported and even encouraged by her native speaker interlocutors:

I got a lot of encouragement from the kids that I spent time with, and from the members of my host family. Whenever I used, mm, say a nonstandard expression like that, they would be delighted

Many interviewees mentioned their reliance on native speakers for clarification on the functions and usage contexts for the routine formulas they picked up. David (Excerpt 4.28) described another instance of learning *Da net*:

*Da net*. Yeah I heard that one for the first time the second trip around to Russia, and I had to ask them what exactly, like in what context they used it, cause I wasn't, you know, wasn't positive, what it, when they used it, and what it meant at the time. I just remember having to ask my host mom

Expert input was not always solicited, as in Samantha's (Excerpt 4.29) case, when she received feedback from a teacher after using *chtö li* incorrectly:

she kind of just corrected me with like, Oh, you only use it in this kind of situation I was like, oh okay I'll remember that for next time

Amber (Excerpt 4.30) explained that, even though pedagogical materials such as the instructional website helped her to understand the routine formulas, she still liked to have clarification (in this
excerpt, from an expert) in order to completely understand and use them. She guessed that repeated exposure might eliminate this necessity, however:

Excerpt 4.30 Amber

1 I remember finally, a teacher said [Nu da—not one of the routine formulas targeted in this study], and I asked her to like, write it down, and explain it, and then afterwards I was able to use it. And I, I feel like if I didn't have some sort of idea, I wouldn't be comfortable using it. Or maybe if I lived in Russia for three years and finally had heard it so much that I just used it

Instead of conferring with a native speaker, Shelly had another method: she used reference tools (an online translator's dictionary) to clarify the usage and functions of routine formulas from the instructional website.

Another method for confirming appropriate usage was by observing the effect of routine formulas on interlocutors, as Claudia (Excerpt 4.31) described:

Excerpt 4.31 Claudia

1 I think that just comes from um, experience of chatting with Russian friends a lot, um, and gauging their reactions, you know, like... if I use a phrase, and they don't skip a beat, you know, then, then I know I'm doing it right.

Arthur (Excerpt 4.32) also assumed he had used the formulas correctly based on interlocutors' reactions:

Excerpt 4.32 Arthur

1 I don't think anyone, no one laughed in my face like it was a serious mistake, so I think I used it correctly.

Practice was an important part of the acquisition process. Amber (Excerpt 4.33), who described her need to practice language repeatedly, said she did not learn languages naturally:

Excerpt 4.33 Amber

1 I'm also a person who needs to learn it and then practice it multiple times. I'm not like a natural language learner, where I can just see it once and be able to use it and understand
However, none of the interviewees claimed that they were able to fully acquire a phrase after hearing it once, as a “natural” language learner would, in Amber's (Excerpt 4.33) estimation. Many learners had supportive interlocutors (teachers, friends, host families) who provided a safe space to experiment with conversational language. Thus, they were able to practice such language extensively in authentic contexts. Stephanie’s host family in particular created an atmosphere where she was able to practice routine formulas repeatedly with minimal risk, and with feedback on their appropriate use (Excerpts 4.26 and 4.27). Even though classrooms would, ostensibly, also serve as comfortable places to practice using these conversational expressions, this may not hold true for all classrooms. Adam did not see the classroom as a safe space for trying out the phrases, as he was likely to get points taken off if he used them incorrectly. He anticipated that “being able to just play around with the language and experiment” in a “natural” setting would facilitate his acquisition of the phrases.

4.5.3 Using Routine Formulas

Experimental group participants were asked about their experiences using the phrases on the website. When asked about concrete instances of using the routine formulas, participants described these occasions in terms of functions: Nichego sebe when someone “did something cool” (Joseph), Nichego strashnogo when someone inadvertently hit or ran into the speaker (Samantha, David) or interrupted her (Shelly), Nu i kak for getting more information out of someone (Andrew, David), Da net in response to something “outrageous” (Terry). Learners differed in their approaches to using the phrases. Grace felt she was able to use routine formulas spontaneously, while Terry made a point of practicing them in conversation. Rachel only felt
comfortable using the phrases after becoming familiar with the form in writing. Andrew felt self-conscious using them if he was unsure of their correct usage.

Usage appeared to be dependent on several factors. A learner might have a favorite phrase for reasons they did not articulate. Grace said she liked *chto li* but worried that she used it too frequently. Stephanie's favorite was *Nichego sebe*. David (Excerpt 4.34), a participant in a summer language program, noticed that his fellow Russian learners gravitated towards certain routine formulas, perhaps as a result of being exposed to them in the classroom:

*Excerpt 4.34 David*

1. *Nichego sebe*, that was one that I think, depending on the class, and each class had their teacher, and each teacher had their favorite phrase, but I remember my friend Jason [pseudonym]. I think mentioning *Nichego sebe*, like I think either he had just learned it in class or his teacher used it a lot, so they kind of mimic their teachers.

Comfort using a particular phrase was related, in Claudia's (Excerpt 4.35) case, to similarity to an English phrase, in both meaning and usage:

*Excerpt 4.35 Claudia*

1. I think, uh, some of them kind of have analogs in the English language, or they feel kind of similar to, to what I would say in my own native language, so, you know, like um, *Nichego strashnogo*, like, that's something that you would pretty commonly say in English, you know like Oh that's no big deal, That's not so bad, or something like that, um, so... I, I think, you know there's certain ones that I gravitate towards more often because they feel more natural to me in that way.

Nicole (Excerpt 4.36) also felt like the expressions with English equivalents felt more natural to use:

*Excerpt 4.36 Nicole*

1. Like, uh, *nado zhe*, that, that kind of, it doesn't feel natural. But others... I mean, *chto li*, I think that's kind of something that's easy to input, that we can kind of just replace the fillers that we use in English and find, like, our fillers in Russian.

Shelly (Excerpt 4.37), on the other hand, found that she could not use *chto li* naturally:
Excerpt 4.37 Shelly

1. I didn't really feel like I got a really good grasp, like I wouldn't be comfortable using that
2. on my own, like, knowing when it's appropriate to use that or not, er, like it just didn't
3. really feel... natural

Use of the phrases was also tied to repeated exposure, and occasionally to having it explained by
an expert. Shelly said she used "Nichego strashnogo" and recalled that her teacher used that phrase
frequently. Arthur described that using routine formulas was awkward at the outset due to his
uncertainty that he was using them correctly. However, he became more and more comfortable
the more he was exposed to them.

One important factor in deciding whether or not to use a routine formula was relationship
with the interlocutor. Many interviewees tended to use routine formulas with speakers they were
close to, in contexts that were low-risk: with classmates, teachers, friends, and host families.

David (Excerpt 4.38) felt comfortable using them with friends or his host mother:

Excerpt 4.38 David

1. The other ones that I was not confident with obviously I was, you know, scared to make a
2. fool of myself so I, with most people I wouldn't use them, except for you know every
3. once in a while when I was with a good friend or a host mom, she totally understood that
4. I was gonna make a fool of myself anyway, you know, it didn't matter.

While Craig (Excerpt 4.39) was unsure of the appropriateness of using a routine formula with a
teacher, the fact that this particular teacher was "not an especially formal instructor" put him at
ease:

Excerpt 4.39 Craig

1. certainly with the instructor I was kinda like, I, so I hope I'm using this correctly and I
2. hope that it's appropriate to be using it... um, and... um... but I, I wasn't too worried.

He felt he had the freedom to experiment with the routine formulas in low-stakes interactions
like this one, as he knew that using them inappropriately “won't be the end of the world.”
These phrases allowed learners to participate more fully in group interactions, as they enabled them to signal understanding and to perform communicative functions. Keith (Excerpt 4.40) said that, while he did not believe that the routine formulas helped him to express himself, he did recognize their utility in gaining membership to a speech community and to form more intimate relationships with interlocutors:

Excerpt 4.40 Keith

1 it does give you a little bit of an in [... it allows me] to come closer to... to the person with whom I'm speaking. Uh... Because I can, I can meet native speakers more than halfway.

This is not limited to native speaker communities, however. Nicole (Excerpt 4.41) recounted her experience with the formula *Da net* in an immersive language program where students are only allowed to use the target language:

Excerpt 4.41 Nicole

1 we used *Da net* a lot because we saw it in [a movie], the character kind of very frequently used *Da net*, and so [laughter] it became kind of like a little joke [...] and we would all use it because it was, like, something very simple that we could use to, uh express ourself [sic], you know, in [the program], there's a language pledge and so you're kind of... constrained at the beginning.

This group of students was exposed to this particular routine formula outside of the classroom, and they were able to adopt it as a tool for expressing themselves and communicating their sense of humor. Drawing from her experience using *Da net* in her summer program, Nicole (Excerpt 4.42) said that these types of phrases enabled her to create an identity for herself in the L2:

Excerpt 4.42 Nicole

1 I think learning the phrases... kind of help [sic] you figure out where your personality is in Russian and what it sounds like

Finding one's L2 identity, according to Nicole (Excerpt 4.42), enables the L2 user to take risks and become more confident. This identity is not necessarily a translation of one's L1 identity:
Nicole's ability to reflect on foreign language identity may be attributable in part to her status as a bilingual speaker of Spanish and English.

Other interviewees mentioned humor. Claudia (Excerpt 4.44) explained how using the phrase *chto li* helped her to be funny in her L2:

*Excerpt 4.44 Claudia*

1. some of the first jokes I was able to tell in Russian, or some of the first times that I was able to feel that my sense of humor came across in Russian, was when I learned how to say *chto li* at the end of a sentence.

Claudia (Excerpt 4.45) also used the phrase *Nichego sebe* to humorous effect:

*Excerpt 4.45 Claudia*

1. if nothing else, like, even just saying something like *Nichego sebe*, uh, in a certain situation, can make people laugh. It can, it can at least recognize that you are observing something funny, in a situation.

Not only did the routine formula allow Claudia (Excerpt 4.45) to be funny in Russian, it also signaled to her interlocutors that she could recognize and appropriately comment on humorous situations, thus fulfilling an important social function. The use of such colloquialisms may also indicate to interlocutors that the learner has advanced proficiency. According to Keith, routine formulas serve as a cue to native speakers that a person has “really good,” as opposed to “pretty good,” language skills. This perception may lead L1 Russian speakers to speak with the learner differently—perhaps as they would with another native speaker.

Interviewees also cited the role of routine formulas in improving fluency—if only the illusion of fluency, according to Craig (Excerpt 4.46):
Fluency is a joint responsibility of speakers, according to McCarthy (2006). Routine formulas aid in the co-construction of speech by helping conversation flow. Rachel and Shelly both mentioned this feature of the phrases.

4.5.4 Barriers to Using Routine Formulas

While interviewees seemed to be comfortable using routine formulas after gaining sufficient exposure to internalize their functions, and in low-risk situations with sympathetic interlocutors, there nonetheless were barriers to their use. One of these barriers was proficiency. Nicole recounted her reliance on “bare necessity caveman-style Russian” during her first sojourn abroad as it facilitated smooth transactions and ensured that she was understood. The risk of using routine formulas inappropriately was too great in encounters where she was struggling to communicate her basic message.

Other participants simply did not have opportunities for using routine formulas. One interviewee, Craig (Excerpt 4.47), who had learned Russian in the classroom and had not spent time abroad in a Russian-speaking environment, lacked the appropriate contexts to use most of the expressions:

Excerpt 4.47 Craig

1 I don't have exciting enough conversations in Russian to need the surprise expressions, 2 um, and no one tells me anything especially tragic, so Nichego strashnogo not so much.

However, his characterization of Nichego strashnogo as a reaction to something tragic is not accurate. Rather, it functions as a way to assure your interlocutor that something is not a big deal. This demonstrates Craig's inadequate understanding of the meaning of this particular formula.
Others had access to suitable contexts but did not have access to sufficiently proficient speakers. A few participants, including Shelly (Excerpt 4.48), commented on their inability to use the formulas for communication with other L2 Russian speakers, who were unfamiliar with them (particularly if they had not spent time abroad):

*Excerpt 4.48 Shelly*

1 I remember the one *Da ty chto*, I said that in class, like the day after I learned it and the
guy just... he didn't understand what I was saying [laughter], you know. And I was like,
3 it's an expression nevermind.

Even if a learner has mastered these phrases, they will not be usable in conversation if their interlocutors are not familiar with such language.

**4.5.5 Reactions to the Instructional Website**

For learners who had heard and used the targeted routine formulas before the study, the instructional website helped them gain confidence in using the phrases (Claudia) and increased their awareness of a wider range of the expressions' functions and appropriate contexts of use. This empowered some participants to use them more frequently, like Arthur, who started saying *Nu i kak* after learning more about it on the website.

According to Joseph, the website helped him understand more functions of the routine formulas than he had been aware of before. Stephanie and Arthur (Excerpt 4.49) both noted that the website helped refine their understanding of the routine formulas:

*Excerpt 4.49 Arthur*

1 I had a general understanding of it but then like seeing it, like on paper, explained, on the
2 website, um, I think helped clarify

Additionally, the website appeared to have an effect on the automatization of the targeted routine formulas. Nicole said she was able to recognize the phrases more quickly “because they were
presented as kind of like a set phrase,” while Claudia mentioned that she uses them more readily since “they're a little bit more integrated into my vocabulary.”

For participants with limited classroom instruction in Russian and who had spent limited or no time in a country where Russian is spoken, the website appeared to increase awareness of the targeted routine formulas. Several participants started noticing the phrases in use after engaging with the website. This could be due to the phenomenon that Amber mentioned: “once you learn a word you see it everywhere.” Without this awareness, learners may have been exposed to routine formulas but these occurrences went by unnoticed. Terry suggested that, before gaining awareness of the routine formulas and their contexts of use, he ignored the phrases in films because he did not understand them, and assumed they were unimportant.

By far the most popular element of the website was the inclusion of excerpts from Russian and Soviet films. For Claudia (Excerpt 4.50), these clips in particular helped expand her knowledge of appropriate usage contexts:

Excerpt 4.50 Claudia

1 having, um, the different, um, examples of usages from the film clips I felt really helped,
2 to kind of, um, give me an idea of different scenarios that I might not have encountered in
3 my own interactions in which those expressions would be used

The clips were useful because they provided an opportunity to hear natural language in use.

Susan suggested that film clips might be useful as a replacement for exposure to “everyday people talking” for learners who are not in frequent contact with the language. Additionally, the video format allowed for users to be exposed to paralinguistic information such as tone:

Excerpt 4.51 Amber

1 it was such a natural, we're not, you know, it's not We're teaching you how to use
2 Nichego sebe, kind of thing, it was, it was very natural, and I think with these little things,
3 the tone people say it, is so important... that it was very nice to be able to see that.
Improving listening skills by watching the clips served as a means to recognize the formulas in
the real world. Andrew said that he was able to pick up the phrases while listening to the radio
after hearing them in the film clips. By presenting the formulas in writing, or in video clips that
can be played multiple times, learners have the opportunity to “catch” and analyze them. The
overwhelming speed and ephemeral nature of speech can keep learners from noticing these
phrases.

Several participants appreciated the variety of activity types included on the website,
including Claudia (Excerpt 4.52):

*Excerpt 4.52 Claudia*

1 I thought that was a really... rich way to, um, familiarize yourself with new vocabulary.

According to Craig (Excerpt 4.53), the different parts of the website complemented each other
and provided many opportunities to consolidate information on the functions of the routine
formulas in context:

*Excerpt 4.53 Craig*

1 [the short video clips] reinforced, you know, meaning and usage from the dictionary
definitions and exercises prior to that

Many interviewees were in favor of addressing conversational language in pedagogical
materials. David (Excerpt 4.54) wished that he had been familiar with this type of conversational
language before spending time abroad. He saw the website as a useful tool to prepare learners for
the phrases they would be hearing abroad:

*Excerpt 4.54 David*

1 I honestly wish I had, you know, been introduced to this website, for example, before I
2 left for Russia, meaning, as part of my introductory Russian classes. So when I knew I
3 was going to Russia, and I heard someone say *Nichego sebe* over and over and over again
I would actually know, like, kinda what he meant by it.

While instructional materials might prepare learners for hearing routine formulas and increase their confidence in using these phrases, interviewees nonetheless emphasized the importance of interaction in mastering this language. The use of pedagogical materials and real interaction with L1 Russian speakers in tandem was attractive to most participants. Thus, the most effective approach to teaching routine formulas (from the perspective of learners) might be a combination of these two elements:

*Excerpt 4.55* Samantha

1. I think it'd be helpful if it was kinda taught in a textbook setting but at the same time, I mean it's also helpful if you speak with native Russians and they use it because they can like tell you when to use it, what it means, and like what settings and everything.

*Excerpt 4.56* Claudia

1. I think kind of a combination of the two would be ideal, because, in the real world you'll never have the chance to stop somebody after they say *Nu i kak?* and ask them like, What are all of the situations in which you could use that phrase, you know, What are the various shades of meaning that that can convey? You could never do that, but the website that you had me work with was great for that

*Excerpt 4.57* Rachel

1. But I think that, you know, when you have contexts for something it helps you, ahead of time, then it helps you be more confident using it, and the only way you're gonna get good at it is if you use it.

*Excerpt 4.58* Stephanie

1. I think that this would be a wonderful resource for prospective study abroad students. I would've really benefitted from... going through a module like this before I left[...] you [would] already have those phrases in, in context, all you need is the immersion experience to really cement it into your knowledge

However, language proficiency may be a mitigating factor in the effectiveness of the website, even as a preparatory tool. Two users with more limited Russian learning experience, Adam and
Shelly, felt that the website was slightly beyond their level of proficiency. Adam felt that he first needed a solid foundation in grammar and vocabulary, saying his speech was too “clunky” and “disjointed” to use any of the phrases. Shelly said she had to look up vocabulary in order to understand the dialogues. Grace also mentioned that the vocabulary was too difficult for lower proficiency learners. This was a challenge in the Twitter activity, where learners had to explain an instance of a particular routine formula found using the Twitter search function. Amber suggested that a materials developer could choose a handful of clear uses of the phrase on Twitter in order to exclude “sarcastic” or otherwise atypical uses.

A few learners commented on the lack of feedback on the website, but reactions to the usefulness of feedback were mixed. Andrew said that the lack of instant feedback forced him to read the explanations of usage and to be thoughtful about his answers to the module exercises. But Susan said that having no feedback was “dangerous” because a user might never know whether or not s/he was understanding and using the routine formulas correctly.

One interviewee, Craig (Excerpt 4.59), suggested that the website include more fine-grained information on the differences between routine formulas with overlapping functions:

*Excerpt 4.59 Craig*

1 maybe a comparative summary of those particular issues, um, because it, I wasn't entirely
2 sure if the expressions of surprise were, like is this a question of personal taste, you just
3 pick one and go with it, um, are, like, are there particular situations where one is more
4 appropriate than another

This addresses the crux of the issue of nativelike selection (Pawley & Syder, 1983). While the website provided a range of expressions to acquire for use in speech, Craig (Excerpt 4.59) lacked the skill of selection needed to choose the appropriate routine formula, based on a nativelike knowledge of its connotations and the contexts in which it is appropriate. Instructional materials
have the potential to fill this gap, but the website in the current study was perhaps not sufficiently detailed to do this.

While all of the experimental group participants completed the instructional website, a few interviewees, like David (Excerpt 4.60), continued to use it as a reference after completing the modules:

*Excerpt 4.60 David*

1 I actually referred to, um, even after I did the... the initial going through it all, I referred
2 back to it and like, looking at the phrases again cause I, some of the ones like I'm not
3 quite comfortable with yet, I don't feel like I quite understand so I referred back

Experimental group participants had unique experiences with the website. This appears to be a function of level of familiarity with the targeted routine formulas, learning styles, overall proficiency, and other factors. For learners with advanced proficiency and extensive in-country experience, like Keith, the website may have only been useful as a review. For low proficiency learners, like Adam, it may have only been effective as a means of gaining awareness of previously unfamiliar phrases. The results of the retrospective interviews indicate that routine formulas may be most amenable to instruction at the intermediate and advanced levels.

**4.6 Control Group Questionnaire**

15 of the 16 control group participants completed the final control questionnaire. Their responses are discussed here.

*Q1: Please indicate your level of familiarity with and ability to use the following phrases.*

Interestingly, the majority of control group members indicated that they were able to understand and use most of the routine formulas targeted for the study (see Table 16). However, their test results do not support these claims. It is possible that they are only familiar with a single function of a given phrase, or that they are using it incorrectly.
Table 16. Responses to Q1 on the control group questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I understand the function/meaning, and can use this in conversation</th>
<th>I understand the function/meaning, but can't use it</th>
<th>I've heard/seen this but don't know what it means</th>
<th>I haven't heard/seen this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>V chem delo?</strong></td>
<td>69% (11)</td>
<td>19% (3)</td>
<td>6% (1)</td>
<td>6% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Da net!</strong></td>
<td>75% (12)</td>
<td>19% (3)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>6% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Da ty chto!</strong></td>
<td>63% (10)</td>
<td>19% (3)</td>
<td>13% (2)</td>
<td>6% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nado zhe!</strong></td>
<td>44% (7)</td>
<td>38% (6)</td>
<td>13% (2)</td>
<td>6% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nichego sebe!</strong></td>
<td>44% (7)</td>
<td>25% (4)</td>
<td>19% (3)</td>
<td>13% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nichego strashnogo.</strong></td>
<td>81% (13)</td>
<td>6% (1)</td>
<td>6% (1)</td>
<td>6% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nu i kak?</strong></td>
<td>69% (11)</td>
<td>25% (4)</td>
<td>6% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nu i chto?</strong></td>
<td>75% (12)</td>
<td>13% (2)</td>
<td>13% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>...chto li?</strong></td>
<td>56% (9)</td>
<td>31% (5)</td>
<td>6% (1)</td>
<td>6% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: In what contexts have you heard these phrases used, if any? Who used the phrases? Did you understand the function/meaning of the phrases?

Significant proportions of respondents said they had heard the phrases in conversations (6), in TV and films (6), and from teachers or in class (6). Four control group participants mentioned that they had heard them used by friends; three had heard them from native speakers of Russian; two from advanced learners of Russian; and two from a host family member. Other sources of exposure were: a lecture on Russian slang; an extracurricular club in which Russian slang was discussed; a reference book; a textbook. One participant said he felt that women tend to use these phrases more than men, according to his experience hearing them from his host mother and sister (but not from his host brother). Interestingly, this is the only participant in either the experimental or control group that mentioned any kind of gender preference for using the routine formulas.
Three respondents mentioned that they guessed the meaning of the phrases from context. One of them asked native speakers for explicit information on their meaning and use. According to another respondent, although she could usually figure out the meaning from context when hearing Russians use them while she was abroad in Moscow, she was unable to use them herself. One participant expressed deep knowledge of the phrases:

Excerpt 4.61

Most of these expressions are used in situations of surprise; some have negative connotations. Many are used when the speaker is reacting to something unbelievable (ex: -Вчера Катя вышла замуж и никому не сообщала об этом. -Да ты что?? [- Yesterday Katia got married and didn't tell anyone about it. -Da ty chto??]) Other expressions are more cynical, showing skepticism and sarcasm (Ты вчера писала 10,000 слов? Ты Пушкин, что ли? [You wrote 10,000 words yesterday? Are you Pushkin, chto li?]) Others are more defensive in nature (-Ты спала весь день вчера! -Ну и что? Я была* очень устала. [-You slept all day yesterday! -Nu i chto? I was really got* tired.])

This respondent had spent a year studying abroad in St. Petersburg and two summers studying Russian in intensive programs. Furthermore, she was categorized as having Advanced proficiency based on her CAST results. These factors may have contributed to her understanding of the routine formulas.

Q3: If you use any of these phrases, how does using them make you feel? E.g., more fluent; awkward because I'm not quite sure how/when to use them; etc.

Most of the respondents said the use of the expressions made them feel more fluent (9).

Other positive words and phrases used in response to this question: “colloquial” (3); “like a native speaker”; “adept at conversing”; “comfortable”; “respected”; “good.” One respondent said these phrases help to make conversation flow.

Excerpt 4.62

I like using the phrases I know because they make conversation more casual and they make me feel that I am getting a better grasp on the language.
Control group participants also mentioned some negative words and phrases: “awkward”; “false”; “self-conscious”; “unfamiliar”; “uncertain”; “less formal/cultured”. One respondent described in detail her negative experience using the phrases:

Excerpt 4.63

1 I feel a little bit false using the phrases Nichego strannogo [this is one of the nonce phrases] and Nichego strashnogo because I didn’t hear “real Russians” using them and I am especially self-conscious when talking in Russian not least because many of the “real Russian” teacher [sic] sound harsh when correcting students and I (regrettably) prefer not to subject myself to what appears to be derision. On the few occasions when I have the courage to use phrases such as V chem delo, Da net, or Nado zhe, the words have been addressed to my American peers who either don’t understand or aren’t sure whether I have used the expressions accurately; in short, my uses are not successful.

The degree to which the phrases helped respondents feel more fluent depended on their control over the phrase:

Excerpt 4.64

1 I feel more fluent using Nichego sebe and Nichego strashnogo because I'm confident about their meaning/function, but I feel awkward using other phrases because I'm not sure if I'm doing it correctly.

These responses from the control group participants echo many of the statements made by experimental group members, who used routine formulas for similar reasons, and whose use of the phrases was tied to comfort in their knowledge of them and to the presence of interlocutors who would understand them.

Q4: Would you be interested in learning how to use these phrases (or similar colloquial Russian phrases) in conversation?

All sixteen respondents answered Yes to this question.
Q5: [follow up to Q4] Why or why not?

Many respondents mentioned that native speakers frequently use these phrases in everyday conversation, and that this type of language is an important part of using and understanding Russian fluently. It is necessary for communication (especially with young people, as one learner responded).

Excerpt 4.65

1 It's interesting to learn short phrases because that's honestly how people speak. Several respondents mentioned that this language can aid in speaking fluently and naturally. Two participants said they enjoyed learning about this colloquial language in particular.

A few control group participants mentioned that colloquial language does not receive enough attention in the classroom. Rather, “textbook Russian” dominates:

Excerpt 4.66

1 Such phrases advance a speaker past the level of usual “textbook Russian” and make him/her seem more natural. Learning to use these phrases is important, according to the questionnaire respondents, because they do not translate literally, and their meanings are context-dependent. Knowledge of their appropriate use is necessary if one wishes to use them comfortably.

Q6: Other Comments

One respondent addressed the first question about familiarity with the phrases, stating that since she had been exposed to them on the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests, she was unsure whether or not she was familiar with the routine formulas as a result of her own experience with them, or because of her exposure to them on the tests.
4.7 Discussion of the Results

This study has addressed the following research questions:

1) Does the instructional website increase users’ understanding and use of routine formulas, as measured by the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests? Are gains (if any) significantly greater in the experimental group than in the control group?

2) What is the relationship between individual factors, related to identity and context, and participants' development of routine formulas in Russian?

In reference to Research Question 1, results indicate that the awareness-raising instructional intervention improved learners' production of the targeted routine formulas and resulted in lower Learner Recognition Scores for nonce phrases. Both the experimental and control groups were comparable at the outset, even though the control group participants included more Advanced proficiency learners (8 of 16, as compared to 6 of 18 in the experimental group), and had a higher average intensity of engagement score (11.94 vs. 10.72) than the experimental group. This indicates that comprehension and use of routine formulas is not necessarily contingent upon proficiency and engagement levels. It is possible that a combination of factors including individual differences (such as motivation to learn conversational language) and in-country residence interacts with learners' knowledge of these phrases.

Only the experimental group showed significant improvement in their test scores. Since one form was used for all three assessments, there was a possibility that the improvement in test-takers' scores over time was due to a practice effect. The experimental design minimized this effect to the fullest extent possible as test administrations were separated by several weeks. If there had been a practice effect, the control group would have shown significant improvement over time, which they did not.
The statistical analysis only showed a significant change between the experimental group's pre- and delayed post-test scores, indicating that participants' learning matured over time. This could be attributed to their increased awareness of the routine formulas as they encountered them after completing the website. As noted in their feedback form responses, experimental group members came across the phrases in conversation and on the Internet. This supports Schmidt's noticing hypothesis (1990; 1993; 2001), as bringing the phrases to learners' attention appears to have facilitated their acquisition.

Control group participants on average had a higher Learner Recognition Score for formulas in the pre-test than experimental group members, but this difference was not found to be statistically significant. Intensity of engagement and length of time spent studying Russian were both correlated with increased aural familiarity with the routine formulas at the outset. This is understandable, as more extensive contact with the language would allow learners to encounter such phrases more frequently. However, neither the experimental nor the control group showed a statistically significant increase in aural recognition of formulas. This might be an effect of the wording of the ratings on that portion of the instrument—while a learner might recognize a phrase as formulaic, s/he may rarely encounter it and rate it I never hear this. Regarding the nonce phrases, the Learner Recognition Scores were much lower on average than for the formulas, which would be expected. The intervention appears to have had an effect on these scores, as experimental group participants rated the nonce phrases significantly lower on the post-test than on the pre-test, while the control group did not. However, this effect was not durable.

Responses to the website within the experimental group were overall very positive. Users found the material useful and fun, and agreed that it helped to raise their awareness of the
functions of the targeted formulas. Both experimental and control group participants noted the importance of such language in successful and fluent spoken communication. While Miller and Ginsberg (1995) found that learners of Russian may consider language with pragmatic functions an extra feature best acquired abroad, all participants in the current study saw the routine formulas as crucial to fluent speech, and were open to being instructed on their use. The control group participants unanimously expressed the desire to learn this kind of language, as it tends to be overlooked in classroom instruction.

In reference to the second research question, a qualitative analysis of interview data has shed light on the factors that influence participants' development of routine formulas. Bardovi-Harlig (2006) listed two functions of formulaic language in acquisition and use: as facilitating communicative and production strategies. Participants in the study addressed both types of strategies: communicative strategies include appearing nativelike and building confidence that they can get their intended message across, while production strategies relate to increased fluency and alleviating processing load. Learners, particularly those with immersion experience (either a sojourn abroad or an intensive language program), recognized that the routine formulas targeted in the study were characteristic of native use and can be used as tools for increasing fluency. They also perform important social functions. According to Wray (2002), formulaic language “can be the badge of belonging to a speech community” (p. 24). This was supported by participants' anecdotal evidence of using a particular routine formula in a group. For instance, Stephanie's use of routine formulas contributed to her position as a valued member of her host family (Excerpt 4.26 and 4.27), Nicole used Da net as a way to fit in with a community of other L2 Russian learners (Excerpt 4.41), and Claudia discussed how the formulas facilitated her
expression of humor, which in turn enabled her to connect with Russian speakers (Excerpts 4.44 and 4.45).

Participants addressed the need for access to this language in use. Without access, learning could not occur. Several interviewees recounted their experiences observing and/or participating in usage events. Acquisition of routine formulas was dependent upon frequency of exposure. This supports N. Ellis’ (2002) argument that frequency is an essential component of the acquisition process. In sojourns abroad, acquisition occurred over time as a result of frequent encounters with routine formulas. However, interview data indicate that explicit instruction (facilitated by teachers, host family members, or pedagogical materials) made these exposures more salient and memorable, thus possibly speeding the learning process.

Taguchi (2013) and Roever (2006) both found that time spent in a country where the target language is spoken was a better predictor of appropriate formulaic language use than proficiency. The current study is too small to support such claims, but the qualitative analysis of the interview data does indicate that participants who had spent time abroad were aware of the routine formulas and had experience using them. Furthermore, many learners, in both the experimental and control groups, mentioned that they had not received much exposure (if any) to the phrases in the classroom. Time in the target country may, first and foremost, provide access to a wider range of usage events that language learners can observe and participate in. In accordance with Schmidt's noticing hypothesis (1990; 1993; 2001), these exposures make learners aware of routine formulas and their contexts of use. Being in a country where the L2 is spoken can also enable social interaction with native speakers. Several interviewees discussed the role that friends and host families played in aiding their acquisition of routine formulas.

Thus, simply residing abroad may not be sufficient. As Kinginger (2008) demonstrated, learners'
production of colloquial language was linked to their participation in French interaction. Still, it is possible that use of these phrases does not extend to other contexts, as participants may only use them with interlocutors they know to be sympathetic.

The main reason for using an avoidance strategy, according to participants, was the potential for pragmatic error related to routine formulas. Pragmalinguistic failure was associated with lacking the language necessary to express emotions: Amber explained how difficult it would be to communicate feelings in English without phrases like *Oh my gosh* and *Wow* (Excerpt 4.13). Learners were conscious of the possibility of sociopragmatic failure if they were to use the formulas in “formal” contexts. For many, this meant with people whom they address with the formal pronoun *vy*. Several participants expressed apprehension about using this conversational language because they lacked knowledge of what tone it conveys. While the instructional website contained information on the functions of the routine formulas, it did not address restrictions on use. These expressions are used in a variety of contexts and among people with various relationship configurations. However, they may be perceived by learners as riskier to use than the “traditional” language taught in the classroom as they are characteristic of conversational language, are associated with emotion, and are typically not lexically transparent (and therefore are more difficult to decode). This reflects the tendency to avoid casual (Brown, 2013) and emotional language (Dewaele, 2010) in the language classroom. By declining to use these forms, learners could presumably avoid pragmatic error altogether.

Use of formulaic language has been associated in the literature with language acquisition. For instance, chunks have been shown to serve as the building blocks of language in young learners (Hakuta, 1974; Wong Fillmore, 1976). However, the adult language learners who participated in the current study seemed to use routine formulas only after achieving intermediate
or advanced proficiency. It is likely that, in the early stages of language development, learners may rely on more common formulaic sequences (like *please* and *thank you*) that are used in simple transactions (e.g., basic service encounters), or that have close analogs in the L1. The routine formulas addressed here perform more complex functions in conversation. Beginning learners would likely not have the grammatical and lexical control necessary for participating in interactions in which quick interpretations of meaning and appropriate reactions are essential.

Some experimental group participants felt that the instructional website was beyond their level. This finding corroborates Hassall's (2008) and Frank's (2010) proposition that low proficiency learners are too concerned with grammatical and lexical accuracy to attend to pragmatics. This perception of difficulty may also be a function of data collection methods, as Kasper (1998) argued: written DCTs and other activities that require a certain level of proficiency may be too complex for low proficiency learners. While they may have benefited from instruction, their responses might not reflect that. According to Pawley (2007), formulaic language like routine formulas belongs neither to the grammar nor to the lexicon. Learners confronted with these phrases may be perplexed by their perceived irregularity, as David was when he encountered *Nichego sebe* (Excerpt 4.16). The routine formulas chosen for the study are not lexically transparent. As Schmitt and Carter (2004) hypothesized, ease of acquisition is likely related to a formulaic sequence's degree of transparency.

The analysis of quantitative and qualitative data lends support to the claim that an awareness-raising instructional intervention can aid in the acquisition of routine formulas, both by exposing learners to these phrases and their uses and by strengthening and expanding learners' knowledge of their form–function–context mappings. This confirms Ishihara's (2010) conclusion that explicit instruction facilitates pragmatics acquisition. Corpus examples served as sample
usage events (albeit decontextualized ones) that increased learners' exposure to routine formulas in use (Vyatkina, 2013). Film clips performed a similar function. Increased comprehension can lead to production, as it builds learners' confidence that they can understand and use the routine formulas appropriately, which in turn empowers them to practice integrating them into their speech. However, real-world usage is contingent upon interlocutor(s): participants felt comfortable using the phrases with sympathetic conversation partners who would not be offended by inappropriate use, and who ideally could provide feedback on their performance.

The apparent widespread neglect of this type of conversational language in the classroom, according to participants, indicates that, while instructors could effectively serve as sympathetic interlocutors, this happens rarely. Learners lacking conversation partners who are willing to support their learning process are clearly at a disadvantage when it comes to acquiring routine formulas. In their study on a method for teaching pragmatics abroad, Winke and Teng (2010) supplied learners with native speaking tutors who filled this role. Such interventions may prove most effective in scaffolding the process of pragmatic acquisition in an L2. Sykes (2013) proposed that technological interventions can also promote learners' development of pragmatic competence in realistic interactions (e.g., computer-mediated communication such as chat, games, and virtual environments). While the website developed for the current study did not provide for authentic opportunities for practice using the routine formulas, such tools could possibly bridge this gap and better prepare learners for producing routine formulas in real conversations.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.1 Summary of Findings and Pedagogical Applications

This study provides further evidence to support the noticing hypothesis, as the experimental group displayed improved knowledge of the routine formulas that they were encouraged to notice in the instructional intervention. Furthermore, it has demonstrated that CALL applications that use awareness-raising techniques and make use of corpus methodologies have potential for teaching L2 pragmatics. The instructional website developed for this study was, in accordance with the noticing hypothesis, designed to make learners conscious of routine formula usage with reference to authentic texts. Corpus research can shed light on the pragmatic functions of formulaic language in real-world conversation. These insights, as well as excerpts from spoken corpora, can be harnessed in the creation of instructional interventions.

Technology holds great promise for the teaching of LCTLs like Russian, as there are limited pedagogical resources for these languages. Blyth (2013) and Godwin-Jones (2013) addressed the special significance of technology for LCTLs: since the market for commercially produced textbooks and references is much smaller for these languages, there are fewer high-quality resources for specific skills and for advanced proficiency learners. Technological innovations provide a low-cost and accessible solution to this problem, particularly in areas that are typically poorly integrated in foreign language curricula, such as pragmatics (Roever, 2009). Taguchi (2011) recognized that technology is well suited for “cultural comparisons, explicit pragmatic information, awareness-raising of pragmalinguistic forms and their situational variations, focused practice, and feedback” (p. 297). CALL applications allow for learners to engage with pragmatics autonomously, in accordance with their own learning style and at their
own pace. Still, research in ILP on LCTLs is needed in order to inform materials and CALL programs that are accurate and pedagogically sound.

Results from both quantitative and qualitative analyses demonstrate that the website developed for the current study meets the criteria, informed by research in SLA, listed by Chapelle (2001) for evaluating CALL applications: language learning potential; learner fit; meaning focus; authenticity; positive impact; and practicality. It provides both input and output focused activities highlighting a neglected area of spoken Russian, and it incorporates insights from pedagogical approaches to the design of materials focusing on the interrelated areas of conversation and fluency, formulaic language, and pragmatics, thereby fulfilling the language learning potential criterion. The website addresses learners with intermediate proficiency in the language who have only been minimally exposed (if at all) to the contained formulas, and also more advanced learners who are able to use the site to review and perfect their conversational language. It contains “rich, interesting input that provides an opportunity to comprehend and/or produce meaning” (Chapelle, 2009, p. 748). The language is authentic, as it is drawn from corpus data and films produced for fluent speakers of Russian, and the tasks are generally authentic, as they require learners to comprehend natural language and to practice using the language in focus (albeit in the written, rather than spoken, mode). Positive impact was confirmed by learner feedback on the website. It met this criterion by engaging users cognitively and affectively. Finally, the website was developed with practicality in mind: it is hosted online and therefore is widely available, and uses a simple format that the average Internet user would find accessible.

This study has investigated the affordances of a particular CALL application in the instruction of pragmatics, in accordance with Guerrettaz and Johnston's (2013) recommendations for more research on the impact of materials on learners. Analysis of this impact has been
facilitated both by quantitative data on learning gains as well as qualitative data focused on participants’ subjective experiences using the website and the routine formulas contained therein. This and similar investigations can assist in understanding both the process of pragmatic development as well as the role that materials play in acquisition.

5.2 Limitations

One of the major limitations of the current study is the small sample size. Although many learners of Russian responded to the call for participants, attrition was rampant, and only a fraction (43 of 163) of initial respondents completed the preliminary tasks leading up to the pre-test. This is likely due to the fact that experiment administration was done completely virtually, via email. Participation required completing many tasks over approximately two months. Even though compensation was provided and the actual time required to perform the tasks was small, many volunteers dropped out of the study. While the sample used in the current study represents a fairly diverse range of learners, larger numbers of participants could be acquired using convenience samples (e.g., students in classes taught by a researcher). This would ensure timely and thorough completion of the tasks as well. Furthermore, because the population tested here was self-selected, it is possible that the study participants are more motivated than the average learner, given their willingness to complete tasks for only a small monetary reward.

Another limitation concerns the design of the website itself, which could be improved in a number of ways. Sociopragmatic considerations were not integrated into the website, as the routine formulas, while colloquial, are still fairly neutral and can be used appropriately in most contexts. Also, the modules did not require users to provide any spoken input. Rather, activities focused on awareness-raising, comprehension of transcribed conversations, and written output. Oral production exercises were not included due to the investment of time necessary for rating
and providing feedback to each individual user. Feedback in general was not integrated, as the primary goal of the website was to promote noticing among learners. While the website appears to have succeeded in this goal to some extent, it would likely be improved by the inclusion of mechanisms for providing feedback.

In the website feedback form, the majority of users indicated that the instructional modules would be best used in a Russian language class, where a teacher would be able to provide individualized feedback on students’ performance. However, for self-study purposes, feedback embedded in the website itself would be helpful, as several respondents noted that even after completing the modules they were still unclear on whether or not they were using the routine formulas appropriately. Since the tests administered to all participants did not measure their actual oral production (only simulated, in the form of DCTs), experimental group members may have only increased their metapragmatic knowledge without a corresponding improvement in spoken production. Furthermore, since the targeted formulas are essential to conversation, practice in real contexts with live interlocutors, perhaps in the form of role-plays, would likely be valuable. Still, real-world interaction with expert speakers of a language is much less structured than in the classroom, and it is difficult to predict and gauge how L2 users will behave linguistically and pragmatically in authentic contexts. In order to truly assess the nature and extent of routine formula use among learners of Russian, naturally occurring data would need to be collected and analyzed. For example, a corpus of recordings of interaction between study abroad learners and their host families and friends would give researchers the ability to more accurately examine L2 user behavior than DCT or self-report data would.

Finally, a more intensive and time-consuming intervention might result in larger gains in pragmatic knowledge. Experimental group participants spent, on average, two hours and fifteen
minutes using the website over the course of two weeks. On one hand, this indicates that even minimal instruction on routine formulas is beneficial. On the other hand, the benefits may not be durable beyond the delayed post-test, or improvement may solely be on metapragmatic knowledge. Additionally, in order to gauge the effectiveness of this particular intervention, comparisons between materials based on different methodological frameworks that utilize alternative content and exercises and varying time investments are necessary. While the results of this study indicate that an awareness-raising website is useful for increasing user knowledge of routine formulas, other interventions may lead to greater gains. It is also possible that the pedagogical principles underlying instruction and activity types are irrelevant, and that by teaching this language at all, learner acquisition is likely.

5.3 Future Directions

The body of scholarship on CALL and pragmatics instruction has been slowly growing over the past decade. However, further research is needed: on a diversity of technological tools, on a variety of L2s, and for a greater range of types of pragmatic knowledge. Investigating the effectiveness of technology (especially computer-mediated communication interventions, such as chat and virtual environments) within ILP can pave the way for higher quality resources for learners, thus better preparing them for successful communication in their L2. Furthermore, research on the impact of materials in general on the learning process can also inform the development of effective instructional resources that are reflective of real-world pragmatic usage.

As mentioned in Section 5.2, investigations of the effects of more intensive interventions that incorporate feedback and oral production activities, including role-plays, could be profitably pursued in future research. Such modifications would ensure that learners have sufficient
opportunities to practice the language under instruction, and that they are comprehending and using targeted expressions appropriately.

One emerging area of research is the contrastive study of pragmatic markers across languages and across speakers (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen, 2009). Future research on this topic could examine the ways in which markers vary cross-linguistically in order to determine potential trouble spots for language learners. Also, corpus-driven comparisons of the use of pragmatic markers and formulaic language by experts and learners of Russian could locate gaps in learner knowledge, by analyzing how they use (or misuse) pragmatic markers. These analyses could, in turn, inform teaching materials. Further corpus research in general is necessary for more thorough and accurate descriptions of routine formulas, as well as formulaic language and pragmatic markers generally. Fine-grained information on both form (particularly prosodic features) and function (specifically, how meanings and connotations vary across contexts and speakers) can aid learners in achieving pragmatic competence.

Lastly, there is still a great need for research focused on the ways that identity and individual differences interact with the acquisition of L2 pragmatics. This can be pursued through in-depth, longitudinal case studies that utilize a variety of data sources, especially introspective data (e.g., interviews and journal entries), documentation of language use (e.g., conversation transcripts), and assessments of pragmatic ability (e.g., tests of pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics). Advancements in technologies have facilitated the collection and analysis of large amounts of data. Case studies like Schmidt and Frota's (1986) can now be more thoroughly and efficiently carried out with the compilation of learner corpora of language usage events. By pursuing in-depth research that triangulates learners' language usage, performance, and subjective experience, the process of acquisition in ILP can be better understood.
Appendix A

Informed Consent

Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: A Web-Based Instructional Module for the Teaching of Routine Formulas in Russian for Study Abroad and Domestic Settings

Principal Investigator: Edie Furniss, Graduate student
Department of Applied Linguistics
The Pennsylvania State University
304 Sparks Building
University Park, PA 16802
eaf202@psu.edu
[telephone number redacted]

1. **Purpose of the Study:** The purpose of this research is to investigate the effect of a web-based awareness-raising instructional module on the productive and receptive knowledge of Russian routine formulas by intermediate and advanced learners of Russian. The research is also intended to examine the relationship between individual factors related to identity and participants’ development of routine formulas in Russian.

2. **Procedures to be followed:** You will be asked to complete the following tasks: a background questionnaire about your Russian language learning experience; an online oral proficiency task using the CAST assessment; and a pre-test that assesses knowledge and production of particular expressions common in Russian conversational speech. If you are an experimental group participant, you will then be given access to a web-based module which you will need to complete within two weeks. This will entail reading through each page of the module and responding to quiz and survey questions after each page via online form that will be sent to the researcher automatically. Two weeks after completing the pre-test, you will complete a post-test. One month after completing the post-test, you will complete a delayed post-test. If you are an experimental group participant, you may then be asked to participate in a recorded retrospective interview (in person or via Skype) regarding your use of the web-based module and anecdotal evidence of your use of the expressions under instruction.

3. **Benefits:** The benefits to you include learning more about routine formulas in Russian, which may improve your conversational ability in Russian. The benefits to society include learning more about how to better teach learners of Russian certain elements of conversational language. In addition, participants will receive financial compensation (an Amazon gift certificate of up to $35 depending on level of participation) upon completion of all tasks.
4. **Duration/Time:** Each task can be done at your own pace but will need to be completed by certain dates (the researcher will inform you of these dates). Each task will require approximately the following amount of time: background questionnaire - 10 minutes; CAST online assessment - 30 minutes; pre-test - 20 minutes; web-based instructional module - 4 hours; post-test - 20 minutes; delayed post-test - 20 minutes; retrospective interview - 20 minutes. Depending on your level of participation, you may or may not be required to complete all of these tasks.

5. **Statement of Confidentiality:** Your participation in this research is confidential. The audio data will be stored and secured in password-protected digital files. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, audio clips and/or written transcripts may be used to illustrate the effect of the web-based module. Other forms of data (e.g., interview) collected during the study will also be stored in electronic password-protected files and archived for future research projects, educational, and/or training purposes. Your name and any other personally identifiable information will never be used. Instead, pseudonyms will be used when referring to specific participants. The following people will have access to the anonymized CAST assessment recordings: the Principle Investigator, Edie Furniss; her Advisor, Dr. Celeste Kinginger; CAST administrators and researchers; additional CAST assessment raters. However, only the Principle Investigator, Edie Furniss, and the CAST administrators will see which participants are linked to CAST test IDs. Only the Principle Investigator will have access to the retrospective interview recordings.

6. **Data Archiving for Future Use:** Normally, audio files will be destroyed five (5) years after your participation in this study. However, audio files can be valuable resources for research, educational, and training purposes. By signing this informed consent form, you are agreeing to allow the researcher to archive audio files of your participation in this research for future research, educational, and/or training purposes in the field of second language learning and teaching. Your data will remain password-protected and confidential.

7. **Right to Ask Questions:** Please contact the researcher, Edie Furniss ([eaf202@psu.edu](mailto:eaf202@psu.edu)) or her advisor, Dr. Celeste Kinginger ([cxk37@psu.edu](mailto:cxk37@psu.edu)), with questions, complaints or concerns about this research. Questions about research procedures can be answered by the research team.

8. **Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer or participate in any activities you do not want to participate in. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you would receive otherwise.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to take part in this research study. If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please type your name and indicate the date below.

Participant Electronic Signature ____________________________ Date ____________________________
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CAST Instructions Email

Thank you for submitting your signed consent form. Next, you will need to do the online proficiency assessment. It will take approximately 15-30 minutes. Please do the following at your earliest convenience.

1. The test has two levels, intermediate and advanced. Participants with two years or less of Russian language study will probably find the intermediate test best suited to their level. Participants with more than three years of Russian language study, and participants who have spent time in a Russian speaking country, will probably find the advanced test best suited to their level. If the test you choose is too easy or too difficult for you, you may quit that test and retake it at the other level. Click on one of the following links to go to the test site:

   Intermediate
   Advanced
   https://cast.sdsu.edu/servlets/cast.TechTest?selectedLang=ruAdvanced

2. Follow the instructions to test your audio and microphone.

3. On the next screen, choose “Start a new test.”

4. On the CAST Registration page, fill in your name and email. You do NOT have to provide your address - you may fill in a fake address (e.g., 123 Main St., Philadelphia, PA 15765).

   The registration code is: RussianStudy

   Select your test language and level.

5. Read and follow the instructions for the next pages.

6. Once you have finished the test, please email me at eaf202@psu.edu and I will send you instructions for the next step of the study.

Please email me if you have any questions. Thank you!

Best,

Edie Furniss
Ph.D. Candidate (ABD)
Department of Applied Linguistics
The Pennsylvania State University
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Website Instructions Email

Thank you for completing the background questionnaire. Next, you will need to do the pre-test at the link below:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/W2F82X2

Once you have completed the pre-test, you will have **exactly 2 weeks** within which to work through the experimental website, completing all exercises in each module and submitting the Review and Feedback pages as well. The link is below:

http://nadozhe.weebly.com/

Please **do not** share this link at the moment; the website will be shared publicly upon completion of the experiment.

You may do the modules in any order you like, and may use the website however suits you best (e.g., working on it for 10 minutes a day, or going through the whole thing over several hours). Just **make sure to submit all exercises and forms on the website before reaching the two week deadline**.

If you have any questions or technical difficulties, please email me.

Best,
Edie Furniss
Ph.D. Candidate (ABD)
Department of Applied Linguistics
The Pennsylvania State University
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Control Questionnaire Email

Please take the following (final) test for the study (should take 15-20 minutes) within the next 24 hours:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Q2C9Y69

After you've done that test, please complete the final questionnaire:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1e4EMoef_YU-8AlbTS7fh8AFGyJb55kHM5Wj2w0qe1-E/viewform?usp=send_form

When you have completed these steps, you will be done with the experiment and you will receive your Amazon gift card.

Best,
Edie
Appendix E

Retrospective Interview Email

Please take the following (final) test for the study (should take 15-20 minutes) within the next 24 hours:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Q2C9Y69

After you have completed this, please email me in order to set up your short Skype interview. After the interview, you will be done with the study and you will receive your Amazon gift card.

Best,
Edie
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Pre-/Post-/Delayed Post-Test

Please complete the questionnaire to the best of your ability. All information is confidential and will be password-protected. Only the Principle Investigator of this research project, Edie Furniss (eaf202@psu.edu), will have access to your responses.

1. Participant Code (this has been provided by the researcher)

____________________

Fill in the blank
Please fill in the blanks in the following authentic Russian conversations. Your response may be a single word or a phrase. More than one correct response is possible.

You may use a dictionary to look up any unfamiliar words in the conversations.

Click this link for an on-screen Cyrillic keyboard, if you need it.

2. Fill in the blank.

Саша: А где праздновать будете?  
Таня: У Олега дома.  
Саша: Сколько народу будет?  
Таня: Двенадцать человек.  
Саша: ________________! А как вы поместитесь?  
Таня: А у Олега особняк, места много. Не хочешь с нами?  
____________________ [Nichego sebe!]

3. Fill in the blank.

Олеся: Как субботу провела?  
Таня: Отлично, мы с девчонками в клуб ходили.  
Олеся: ____________?  
Таня: Здорово было, знакомых много встретила.  
Олеся: Ясно.  
____________________ [Nu i kak?]
4. Click each link to hear the phrase, then check the box corresponding to your familiarity with each phrase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>I often hear this</th>
<th>I sometimes hear this</th>
<th>I never hear this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 1</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 2</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 3</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 4</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 5</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 6</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 7</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 8</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 9</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 10</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 11</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 12</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 13</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 14</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 15</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 16</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 17</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 18</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple choice fill-in-the-blank
Please select the best-sounding response for the blanks in the following authentic Russian conversations.

5. Choose the best phrase to fill in the blank.

Мама: Ты сегодня поможешь, а то я устала очень...
Дочь: Я не хочу сегодня!!
Мама: Мало ли что ты не хочешь, я вот тоже не хочу работать, а работаю.
Дочь: ___________! Я не буду тебе помогать вообще, если сегодня не пойду гулять!
Мать: И не надо, неблагодарная!

○ К чёрту [Go to hell]
○ Да ты что [Da ty chto]
○ Ну и что [Nu i chto]
○ Очень жаль [Too bad]

Mom: You'll help me today, I'm really tired...
Daughter: I don't want to today!
Mom: It doesn't matter if you don't want to, I also don't want to work but I do.
Daughter: ___________! If I don't go out today I'm not going to help you at all!
Mom: Then don't, you ungrateful girl!
6. Сергей: (рассматривает подарок) А чё такие тяжелые? Серебряные ____________?  
Вера: Не знаю.  
○ конечно [of course]  
○ вот это да [wow]  
○ может быть [maybe]  
○ что ли [chto li]

7. Даша: А у тебя какой размер?  
Алена: Сорок два.  
Даша: ____________?  
Алена: Да, я вообще похудела.  
○ А как же [Of course]  
○ Что такое [What is it]  
○ В чём дело [V chem delo]  
○ Да ты что [Da ty chto]

8. Вадим: Я творческий человек по натуре. Я пишу музыку, играю в нескольких группах.  
Лия: В нескольких?! ______________!  
○ Да нет [Da net]  
○ Честное слово [Honest]  
○ Надо же [Nado zhe]  
○ Что ли [Chto li]

Multiple-choice

Please select the emotion that the speaker is expressing with the underlined word/phrase in the following authentic Russian conversations.

Д.: Ничего себе!  
А.: И она говорит “холодно”. “Холодно,”  
Д.: Ничего себе!  
A.: Some kind of public dinner, he gave her a fur coat right before it.  
D.: Nичего себе!  
A.: And she says “it's cold.” “It's cold” she
говорит она, “принеси щубу”.

○ delight
○ surprise
○ disapproval
○ embarrassment

10.
Саша: Привет! Идешь сегодня в «Пятое»?
Максим: Да нет. А ты собрался, что ли?
Саша: Конечно!

○ uncertainty
○ surprise
○ disgust
○ strong agreement
Appendix G

Retrospective Interview Questions

1. Did you encounter the expressions presented in the module in other contexts, such as in conversation or in Russian texts (e.g., movies, songs, writing)? If so, where did you encounter them?

2. Did you find that you were better able to understand the expressions presented in the module when you encountered them in Russian conversation/texts?

3. Did you ever use the expressions presented in the module in your spoken Russian? If so, when and with whom? Please give concrete examples if you remember them.

4. If you used the expressions presented in the module, how did using them make you feel (e.g., more fluent; awkward because I wasn’t quite sure how/when to use them; etc.)?

5. Please comment on any other aspect of the web-based module or the expressions presented in it that you feel would be useful to the researcher.

6. Which phrases were less common/less used?

7. Do you find a self-study module effective?

8. Do you think conversational language is better used in conversation or from a textbook/website?
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