Pragmatics Matters

Issue 46, Autumn 2015

語用論事情

2015年秋第46号

JALT Pragmatics SIG Newsletter

全国語学教育学会 語用論部会 ニュースレター

Contents:
Page

From the editor

Greetings to all Pragmatics SIG members. The second term is well underway and the arrival of autumn brings some relief from the heat of the Japanese summer. Autumn also brings the flagship JALT event of the year, the JALT National conference, this year being held at Granship Shizuoka on 21st,22nd and 23rd of November. As usual, pragmatics SIG is well represented in the schedule. Details of the pragmatics themed presentations can be found below and at the conference website. http://jalt.org/2015/schedule.php
In addition to the JALT conference information, this issue also contains a paper by Phillip Riccobono detailing use of explicit positive assessment (EPA) by Korean learners of English in a university setting in South Korea. We also have a review of the 14th International Pragmatics Association (IPrA) conference by Mami Otani who was in attendance and presented at the conference.

Linking Explicit Positive Assessment to Culture: The Case of Student Group-Leaders

Philip Riccobono

Kyung Hee University

Abstract
Waring's Using Explicit Positive Assessment (EPA) in the Language Classroom: IRF, Feedback, and Learning Opportunities (2008) examined the pedagogical effects of teachers' usage of EPA on ESL students in the United States. However, the research in this study extends past Waring's work as it evaluates L2 South Korean university students' usage of EPA during a 'peer' discussion. Whereas Waring's focus relied on examining EPA affecting learning opportunities, this study additionally explores the sociocultural ramifications of EPA. Moreover, this study's data rendered distinctive results in relation to EPA usage frequency and interlocutors' discourse. Vis a vis' conversation analysis this study assesses EPA usage (or there lack of) and its relation to Korean and East Asian cultural norms in an EFL university class.

Introduction and Theoretical Framework
Waring's Using Explicit Positive Assessment (EPA) in the Language Classroom: IRF, Feedback, and Learning Opportunities (2008) examined the pedagogical effects remarks by ESL teachers that contain EPA: positive assessment terms such as good, very good, excellent, perfect, and alike. This use of the term excludes both matter-of-fact receipts (MFR), such as okay, right, or correct (Hellermann, 2003). More specifically, Waring (2008) focused on teachers using an EPA when closing out an Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF): a sequence and pattern of discourse between teacher (or student-leader for this study) and students and learner in a sequence-closing event. IRF acts as a central concept in classroom discourse (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975).

While Waring (2008) examined teacher usage of EPA on ESL (to end an IRF) on students in the United States in terms of creating further learning opportunities for L2s, the research in this study extends past Waring's work as it evaluates EFL South Korean university student leaders' usage of EPA during a 'peer' discussion and also whether using an EPA either creates or deters further learning opportunities. Whereas Waring's focus relied on examining EPA affecting learning opportunities, this study additionally explores the sociocultural ramifications of EPA usage (or non-usage). This study also seeks to find if student-leaders do not use an EPA, and instead use an EMA, and what may have caused this. Finally, this study examines if group dynamics change and leadership is jeopardized due to the lack of EPA or EMA execution.

A few widely known concepts in TESOL lay the foundation for the purpose of Waring's (2008) study and subsequently this paper: Sociocultural Theory (ST), which says that learning is conceptualized as participation rather than acquisition (Donato, 2000). In relation to the ST, an EPA has the propensity to either promote or derail participation for learners; in the same vein, another key concept which plays into this study: Conversation Analysis (CA) which can detail the instructional practices that either create or inhibit the

opportunities for participation and ultimately learning opportunities (Lerner, 1995). Waring (2008) mentions ST as it relates to EPA in terms of either promoting or diverting participation from learners.

In CA terms, at least some of what occupies the F position (of an IRF) can be called the sequence-closing third (SCT) (Schegloff, 2007). The F position will gain particular attention in this study's data as this SCT will either represent itself as an EPA or EMA; the difference between just these two terms uttered by the subjects in this study allows for discussion into sociocultural classroom discourse norms for students of South Korea and other cultures outside of Western pedagogy.

Methodology

As this study seeks to analyze student interactions, it utilizes CA as it details the instructional practices that either create or inhibit the opportunities for participation, learning opportunities (Lerner, 1995). This study collected data from 15 EFL university students belonging to three different learning groups of an EFL class at a university located outside of Daegu, South Korea. The paper compares two different groups of Korean university students from an intermediate speaking class with different leaders: Group 1- Music major: female student leader with five females. Group 2, led by a female English major had four other students in the group: two males and two females. The student leaders chosen displayed exceptional discussion skills in previous classes throughout the semester over 15 weeks of meeting.

In analyzing and transcribing the quantitative data transcripts, this study used the interaction analysis (IA) transcriptions conventions approach from Fagersten (2012). With data recorded for this paper coming from an intermediate level speaking class, the interactions recorded for this study come from three different students leading their own group of 3-4 other students. The activity led by group leaders is different from those used by Waring in her research: homework assignment with set answers. In the case of this study, the class met for 30 hours over 15 weeks. Each group in this study participated in the same activity: (see appendix 2); the activity consisted of student-group-leaders discussing a survey with peers designed to generate various answers, whereas Waring's study allowed for less chance of varying answers and discussion. Furthermore, this study afforded leader participants ample opportunities to engage in EPA.

In this universal activity, students took a 10-question survey on their favorite places to engage in certain common occurrences: ex. Eat fast food, hang out with friends, buy books, etc. During this activity a group discussion took place by a student leader who has exhibited, above-all, strong discussion skills in class. The students knew all members of their groups prior to completing the survey. Students received a reminder of their group members by writing the leaders names on the board with other members of said group minutes before the discussions. I clearly defined the role of the leader both verbally and by underlining the name of the leader when writing it on the whiteboard. I listed the leader first. No students questioned or commented on the groups formed. I met with the leaders two weeks prior to the group discussion in an effort to ensure they first felt comfortable and competent in their role leading a discussion. Subsequently, the leaders and I conferred minutes before the meeting to review their role. I explained that they would lead this discussion and try to keep it going for as long as possible, ask follow-up questions to other student's answers and to give them praise if they felt necessary. I did not explain the purpose of my study in terms of EPA usage. I explained to the class that I would video record them for the two hour class and will use parts of it for my research. The students signed permission forms distributed to them in both Korean and English; all students

signed off. The student leaders confirmed that they understood their role and felt comfortable with it.

Results and Discussion
The student, who majored in English, surprisingly, did not conduct the most flowing discussion of the two comparison groups. The music major did. Despite that, the English major's group had more discussion amongst peers. By the English major student leader (ESL) not using an EPA in some sequences with L3, L3 found an opportunity to what some may look at as taking power away from the student leader or finding this as an opportunity to play a role in the zone of proximal development (ZPD) with other group members. In the group led by the music major, the student leader halted the use of EPA more often than the English major and incidentally kept the discussion going longer, generating more answers from peers. Therefore, the results of this study do fall in line with Waring in terms of the impact of EPA on learner participation.

The music-major (MSL) student leader began the group discussion, establishing her role as seen in line 1 of Extract 1 below- even though students knew she would lead the group per my instructions and seeing her name on the whiteboard as the student leader, the MSL clearly stated she would conduct the discussion for this group. This may have confirmed roles more so than the other student leader that did not ascertain her role. Extract 1 begins the initial sequence in the entire interlocution.

Extract 1, Group 1
1.MSL: I will ask some questions for you. (2) Okay?
2.MSL: Mira, what's your favorite place to eat fast food?
3. L1: Um, Lotteria. I love Hot Crisp Burger.
4. MSL: ?Ohhhhhhhh! Hot Crisp Burger set?
5. L1: Yes, cola.
6. MSL: Cola and French fry?
7. L1: Yes
8. MSL: Okay

In the case of Group 1, the MSL began the group discussion with establishing her role to the group, using "Okay"; this does not represent an EMA. The MLS did not use an EPA or EMA in Line 4 and instead asked more about the Hot Crisp Burger in lines 4 and 6 as the sequence continues. This coincides with Waring's (2008) notion of withholding EPA indicates an IRF sequence is not yet closed. The Hot Crisp Burger set sufficed as a correct answer. This falls in line with Waring's (2008) finding that both correct and incorrect answers should not end a discussion, creating learning opportunities for L2s. Therefore by the MSL withholding an EMA or EPA, it made it advantageous for the learners in this group by creating more interaction time. The MSL's methodology concurs with Waring's (2008) notion that teachers need to treat correct answers just as opportunistic as incorrect answers in an effort to push learners into thinking more, instead of regurgitating answers.

Extract 2, Group 1
1. MSL: what's your favorite place to buy clothes? (2) you?
2. L3: department store. Ummm, too busy but I like to ummmm. (3) ((2)) (2). Ahh, I like going to department store.
3. MSL: you like some? What do you like, some brand?
4. L3: I like Doc Marten

5. MSL: ?mmmmm
6. L3: Adidas
7. MSL: laughing. ahhh, okay, thank you.

In extract 2, MSL uses EMAs "okay" and "thank you". However, a complimentary or praiseworthy EPA such as 'good', 'great' or 'excellent' does not occur at any point from the MSL. A suggestive reason for this may be that, as according to Gratier, Greenfield, and Issac (2009), the rationale behind low individual praise may stem from the students' culture. In classrooms outside of the Western world of education, a more collective or group approach exists in discourse opposed to the Western individualistic approach. Outside of the West higher levels of praise in the classroom have potential to create conflict with students with a more collectivistic worldview (Gratier, Greenfield, and Issac, 2009). Therefore the student-leaders may have chosen not to exercise EPA usage (only EMA) at any point in this study as a result of discourse unfamiliar to them and their cultural background.

Extract 3, Group 2
1. ESL: Where's your favorite place to buy clothes
2. L1: My favorite place is Internet shop.
3. ESL: ? [Internet shop?]
4. L1: Yes
5. ESL: Ohhhhhhhh.
6. L2: = Shopping mall?
7. ESL =Shopping mall?
8. L1: Yes
9. L2: Do you have a favorite site?
10. L1: No (laughing)
11. L2: /No?/

The group led by the English major (ESL) had one student, L2, negotiate a new role for themselves in the group at times, taking over the discussion- see line 6 and 11. Perhaps this student did not understand the student leader's questioning, leading to a communication breakdown. After L2 understood the question and gave a suitable answer, the ESL did not use a clearly marked EPA or EMA to end the sequence, which facilitated L2 to ask other students in the group the same question asked to them by the group leader.

As in the case of group 2 we saw that by withholding EPA, the possibility of a power-struggle may ensue between a given student leaders and learner 2. However, on the flip side of the coin, one may argue that more dialogue ensued; a better understanding or further clarification occurred for both student leader and students as a result of no EPA.

Extract 4
1. ESL: what's your favorite place to hangout with friends?
2. L2: I play ice rink stadium with my girl friend. I like. And you?
3. ESL: (2) I. I. uhhhh, I actually go ?restaurant.
4. L2: restaurant?
5. ESL: to meet people, (1)meet someone and talk and eat delicious food.
6.L2: talking about your friend, in restaurant?
7. ESL: yeah
8. ESL: =what's your favorite place to hangout with friends?
9. L3: (3) theatre

10. ESL: theatre?
11. L3: yes
12. ESL: and you eat popcorn?
13. L3: yes
14. ESL: okay (very low voice)

(Note the above latched talk – ESL asked her own question to L3 (line 8) shortly after responding L2's question (line 7) attempting to regain the floor as the leader in the activity.)

In Extract 3, a discussion of places to shop, the ESL played a role as mediator amongst the group, however, later in extract 4, both L2 and ESL became active partners in the discussion with guided support moving reciprocally, by both asking questions to the group. In general, results showed that group discussions and its scaffolding may be mutual rather than unidirectional. As in this instance, the ESL may have realized this notion and decided to share the questioning of other peers with the group; at a post-class meeting the ESL explained they felt relieved that L2 assisted in questioning other students. The ESL and L2 collaboration shows mutual scaffolding as the L2 may have created a position for himself in the group in the realm of the Vygotsky's (1978) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (DeGuerrero &Villamil, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978)

Also, as we see in the second line of extract 4 ESL's rising intonation appears to act as a form of questioning the correct usage of the word restaurant: a check for understanding between L2 and ESL or negotiation of meaning (Long, 1996). The sharing of the leader role by the ESL and the L2 can be considered ZPD in the sense it succeeded in eliciting more engaged interaction among the group members. To close out this sequence ESL uses a very faint "okay" as an EMA. This concurs with the aforementioned tacit communicative cultural discourse the ESL feels accustom to.

Implications and Conclusion

Schools of thought exist that attempt to explain the usage, or in this case, non-usage of EPA by Korean university students. One conclusion leads to gathering that the usage or non-usage of EPA by Korean EFL university students also has a relationship to their tacit communicative style. The two student-leaders from this study did indeed implement EMA, not EPA while leading a group discussion amongst peers. However, they also halted its usage by asking follow-up questions, enabling further discussion amongst their respective groups. When students used EMA, it both ended sequences and halted further learning opportunities for further elaboration amongst peers. In the case of this study, when students did not force EPA or EMA, they did not suppress opportunities for voicing misunderstanding or alternative answers. Perhaps not clearly defining the role of leader in a group will eliminate EPA and result in a less unidirectional and more mutual event. Moreover, aside from EPA usage this study may lead to research on how important is it for a student and/or teacher to define the role of each group member prior to a student-led discussion; as evident Group 2 of this study exhibits how the defined roles shape the group dynamics in certain ways.

Unlike Waring, data collected for this study shows that lack of EMA acted as a sequence-closing event, signifying the end of a particular question; no students attempted to expand a question further after an EMA. EPA usage does not encompass both matter-of-fact receipts, such as okay, right, or correct, and implicit positive feedback, which is either embodied in carefully intoned repetitions (Hellermann, 2003) or assumed by an instructor

going forward to another item (Seedhouse, 2004).

      Unforeseen, one non-leader participant asked questions to their student leader as well as other learners in the group, going beyond his defined role in the group. The study shows a strong correlation between tacit communicative style or discourse or cultural attunement dictated by the strength or exclamation of a given EPA i.e. good, great, excellent. The findings of this research falls in line with Gratier, Greenfield, and Issac (2009) in that the lack thereof of an EPA may come due to the participants' tacit cultural discourse that focuses on the collective as opposed to the individual. Essentially, the lack of EPA or EMA, which subsequently led in one group to further discussion and negotiation for meaning amongst group members coincides with Vygotsky's (1978) ZPD. Using an EMA and not an EPA, perhaps comes due to a student leader's tacit discourse. Finally, the lack of EPA, which subsequently leads to further discussion and negotiation for meaning amongst group members, coincides with Vygotsky's (ZPD) Zone of Proximal Development. These implications will assist EFL /ESL teachers in knowing when to hold EPA and EMA or encourage their students subscribe to this discourse when leading discussions in an effort to facilitate scaffolding and further discussion and negotiation for meaning as in the case of ZPD.

References

De Guerrero, M., & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. The Modern Language Journal, 84(1), 51-68.

Fägersten, K. B. (2012). *Who's Swearing Now? The Social Aspects of Conversational Swearing*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Gratier, M., Greenfield, P. M., & Isaac, A. (2009). Tacit communicative style and cultural attunement in classroom interaction. Mind, Culture, and Activity, 16(4), 296-316.

Hellermann, J. (2003). The interactive work of prosody in the IRF exchange: Teacher repetition in feedbackmoves. Language in Society, 32, 79–104.

Lerner, G. H. (1995). Turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities. Discourse Processes, 19, 111–131.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. Handbook of second language acquisition, 2(2), 413-468.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils. Oxford Univ Press.

Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. The Modern Language Journal, 92(4), 577-594.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: (IA) transcriptions conventions approach from Fagersten (2012
ESL: - English-major student leader
MSL: - music-major student leader
L: - learner
(4)   - silence given length in seconds
?   - rising intonation –question or other
/ok/ok/ok   - overlapping or simultaneous utterances by student leader and learner

APPENDIX B: Discussion Survey

Is there a bank near here? • Unit 10

Conversation PLUS —Your favorite places

1 Look at the questions in the survey. Add a question. Then write your answers.

What's your favorite place to …
1. eat fast food?
2. buy clothes?
3. listen to music?
4. go on a date?
5. watch people?
6. hang out with friends?
7. buy books?
8. meet people?
9. relax on the weekend?
10. (your choice)

2 GROUP WORK. Tell each other about your favorite places. Ask questions and try to give extra information!

My favorite place to buy clothes is the mall.
Why do you like it?
Where is it?

3 CLASS ACTIVITY. Share your information with the class.
The Bongo Room is my favorite place to listen to music. It's always open late, and it has live bands every weekend. It's near the…

Now I can...
SPEAKING ☐ talk about places around town.
GRAMMAR ☐ use *there is* and *there are.*
LISTENING ☐ understand exchanges about tourist facilities.
READING ☐ understand short texts about favorite places.

Conference Report: 14th International Pragmatics Conference

Mami Otani

Kyoto Women's University

The 14th International Pragmatics Conference was held from July 26 to 31, 2015 in Antwerp in Belgium, by the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA). Held first in Viareggio, Italy in 1985, this conference has a history of thirty years. The venues were cities in Europe, North America, Australia, India, and also Japan. This interdisciplinary conference covers a wide range of fields such as linguistics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, neurology, computer science, and so on. Its objectives are twofold: an understanding of the actual processes of language use, and an understanding of the ways in which usage conditions have contributed to the emergence of linguistic structures and strategies.

The 14th international conference was held at Antwerp University and was attended by over 1300 participants from all over the world. The largest number of the participants was from the United States (140 participants) followed by Japan (136 participants). This shows the level of interest of the researchers and instructors of Japan in pragmatics, and proves that they regard it as an important realm for language research and education. The conference consisted of about 1000 plenary lectures, regular lectures, panels, and posters with a great variety of topics. Among them, the most predominant fields were conversation and discourse analysis.

What was most impressive at the conference was the opening comment by IPrA President, Jan-Ola Östman. Although he was not able to come to Antwerp because of his illness, he attended the opening ceremony through Skype. He strongly insisted that our research on pragmatics can contribute toward solving misunderstandings and conflicts that are becoming widespread in our world, such as the ongoing problems in Syria or Ukraine. His firm comment greatly encouraged us and gave rise to a sense of unity among the audience from all over the world.

Out of the numerous presentations, I would like to introduce two stimulating presentations that I participated in here. One of them is the plenary lecture by Stephen Levinson titled *Turn-taking and the Pragmatic Origins of Language*. In this lecture, Prof. Levinson introduced his massive research findings on turn-taking from work done throughout his lifetime, and showed how cognitive processing controls turn-taking. Of course, his research and findings are extremely interesting. However, at the same time, what impressed me was the long and elaborate process involved in his research. His lecture revealed how sincerely and elaborately he pursued his research questions and accumulated the results over several decades. It showed the audience how we as researchers, need to conduct research persistently for the pursuit of truth.

Another one of the panels was by Scott Saft and Sachiko Ide, titled *Emancipatory Pragmatics: Another Look at Organization in Social Interaction.* This panel consisted of three sessions and ten panelists from East Asia, Southeast Asia, Middle East, Africa, and so on. They discussed a *ba* (field =場) theory by Ide. The *ba* theory was originally introduced to explain Japanese language and culture from the non-western perspective. However, in this panel, each panelist from a different part of the world applied the theory to their own language and culture, and showed its effectiveness to explain their own language or communication. Most linguistic theories were formulated in the West, and we tend to apply them to non-western languages or cultures, as in the case of Japanese. The *ba* theory, however, offers a new challenge in terms of explaining languages and their cultural contexts from non-western perspectives.

The next conference is going to be held in Belfast, Northern Ireland from July 16 to 21, 2017. The details of the paper submissions will be announced on the HP at the end of this year. I look forward to seeing a number of members of JALT Pragmatics SIG at the conference.

Conference Review: 2015 KOTESOL International Conference Pragmatics in ESP, Student Emails and more

Philip S. Riccobono

Kyung Hee University

The 2015 Korea TESOL (KOTESOL) International Conference & English Expo themed Transitions in Education – Transitions in ELT took place October 10-11, 2015 at COEX Convention Center in Seoul, South Korea. COEX has no shortage of restaurants, cafes and even an underground shopping mall with a multiplex cinema. The conference generated turnout from around the globe; participants I met travelled from South Korea, China, Japan, USA, Canada, Australia and the UK. "This year, we selected about 165 presentations out of about 280 submissions," said Phil Owen, 2015 Conference Chair. The conference had not shortage of variety in presentations "with eight to 14 sessions in each of the 13 hours over 2 days, I'm sure you could find something to spark your imagination and boost your teaching creativity," mentioned Owen. Sessions had a variety of types, from hour-long town hall meetings on current issues in English Education to 45-minute time slots devoted to teaching methods and strategies to 25 minutes meetings sharing current research.

Personally, this conference felt like a reunion of sorts with my past meeting my present world. I caught up with friends and former colleagues from Korea during my years spent teaching university EFL and studying there while also running into friends from Japan where I currently reside and teach. My former colleague (in Korea) and fellow research collaborator, Patrick McIver, Catholic University of Daegu, and I had a nice turnout for our presentation, *Amazing Race to Alternative Assessment & Attitudes,* including familiar faces from Japan and Korea as well as folks who also made as far as China and the US. Patrick and I uncovered our research on an alternative assessment/project that measured the effects of

creativity and cognitive curiosity on university EFL students in South Korea. I hope to meet you at our poster presentation during JALT International in November- a shameless plug!

As conference attendees and presenters, one of our biggest challenges deals with picking and choosing from the vast list of sessions to attend. Despite that, I share with you a few sessions which particularly apply to pragmatics: Mark Rebuck, Meijo University, and his *Authentic Resources and Four Other Keys For ESP*; *Developing Students' Vocabulary and Pragmatic Sense For Effective Email Writing* by Jennifer Kreisz, Induk University, Seoul, South Korea.

I selfishly chose Mark Rebuck as my first session at KOTESOL: he has helped me tremendously get situated in Nagoya and we share an interest in English for Specific Purposes (ESP), the topic of my dissertation (in-progress). Mark has created ESP courses for students in Meijo University's Faculty of Pharmacy. In his presentation he shared several effective methodologies utilized in his custom-made ESP course. Mark's self-described pedagogy ethos, PHARM, assist ESP students unlock what Corrizzato & Goracci (2013) describe as communicative competences in the secret rules of English- pragmatics.

Practical
Homed-in
Authentic (materials)
Relevant
Motivational

Each time Mark teaches about diseases such as diabetes and cancer- used as examples in this presentation- his PHARM approach exposes the effects of these severe ailments on patients and their loved ones by several platforms: video, testimonials and dialogue between patient and family in cloze exercises. Consequently, students gain empathy for future patients vis a vis' ESP after realizing the human side of pharmacy.

"In everyday English and ESP students have to adjust register. I do try to show them the human side, for example, my daughter who has a disability," explained Rebuck. "Pharmacists are sensitive to pragmatic conventions." Moreover, without learning empathy, problems may occur for those in the medical field such as misinterpretations between healthcare professionals and patients and confusion between healthcare professionals and their patients' and relatives' (Corrizzato & Goracci, 2013; McCabe & Timmins, 2006).

The next presentation attended, *Developing Students' Vocabulary and Pragmatic Sense For Effective Email Writing* by Jennifer Kreisz, offered research on Korean student's pragmatic conventions in emails with pedagogy to remedy such pragmatic quagmires. The presentation offered findings that facilitate additional discussion on a *Pragmatics Matters* paper, which deals with what Greer (2013) describes what one might consider (im)politeness found in Japanese student emails; Kreisz' presentation opens up cross-cultural analysis between Korean and Japanese students' email pragmatics; both cultures' languages share a sociocultural feature- honorifics- which Kreisz revealed in discourse analysis of Korean student emails. Her email translations show that conceived impoliteness only surfaced in English (a non-honorific language) but not Korean. Honorifics have words such as "please" already built in. Kreisz went on to introduce how she teaches Korean students to construct polite email requests at her university in Seoul, which entails identifying preferred sentence constructions for L1s and pinpointing linguistic differences between Korean and English requests. I felt Kreisz' unique research has the propensity to have a few less offended native English speaking professors.

From a venue, which hosted the 2010 G-20 summit, KOTESOL International 2015 certainly kept me engaged. KOTESOL International had an abundance of intriguing

presentations and we all know the difficulties of cramming in as much as possible into the few days at conferences where we look for new ideas and research that will add to our pedagogical palette.

References

Corrizzato, S., & Goracci, G. (2013). English for nursing: the importance of developing communicative competences. Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes, 1(2), 177-184.

Greer, T. (2013). I stuck a file. Please check my drafts: (Im)politeness in student email messages. *Pragmatics Matters*, (43), 8-10. Retrieved September 25, 2015, from www.Pragsig.org

McCabe, Catherine, and Fiona Timmins. Communication Skills for Nursing Practice. Palgrave: Macmillan, 2006.

Pragmatics at JALT 2015: At a Glance

The JALT National Conference is upon us again, and as usual, pragmatics is well represented at the conference. Below are the details of the pragmatics themed presentations. For more details of the individual presentations, please visit the conference website at:
http://jalt.org/2015/schedule.php
If you attend any of these presentations, why not write a review for the newsletter? Or if you are the presenter, why not do a quick summary for those who were not able to attend the conference, or were spoilt for choice and couldn't make it. I know from experience that oftentimes at conferences there are presentations that I would dearly love to attend, but timings, schedule clashes, catch-ups with old friends and the like conspire to keep me away. No matter how big or small your audience on the day, there are always others who wanted to be there. So, consider a quick write up for the newsletter to showcase your work and perhaps attract people to your next talk. Contact the editor at the address below.

Saturday 21st November

Date	Time	Room No.	Presenter	Title	Format
Nov 21 (Saturday)	11:00 AM - 12:30 PM	901	Trent, Nobuko - Aoyama Gakuin University; Burdelski, Matthew - Osaka University; Okada, Hanako - Sophia University	Narrative Struggles: Disability, War, Learning	Forum
Nov 21 (Saturday)	11:00 AM - 12:15 PM	Koryu Hall (6F)	Ishii, Yosuke - Tokai University	How Japanese ELLs Speak Differently Than NSs	Roundtable Exchange
Nov 21 (Saturday)	11:00 AM - 12:15 PM	Koryu Hall (6F)	Wakui, Rie - Nichibei Kaiwa Gakuin	Exploring Learners' Subjectivity Through Video	Roundtable Exchange
Nov 21 (Saturday)	11:00 AM - 12:15 PM	Koryu Hall (6F)	Ogawa, Yosuke - Kansai University	Repairable Marking in Native and Learner Talk	Roundtable Exchange
Nov 21 (Saturday)	12:45 PM - 1:45 PM	903	Fielko, Martin - Cornelsen	Teach and Learn (Business) English Effectively	Practice-Oriented Long Workshop
Nov 21 (Saturday)	12:45 PM - 2:15 PM	Tenji Gallery (6F)	Wilson, Timothy - Hiroshima Jogakuin University	The Concept of Self and the Use of Apology	Poster Session
Nov 21 (Saturday)	4:40 PM - 5:05 PM	Hikae 2 (2F)	Greer, Tim - Kobe University	Turn Design and Emergent Familiarity in L2 Japanese	Research-Oriented Short Presentation
Nov 21 (Saturday)	5:15 PM - 5:40 PM	Hikae 2 (2F)	Hauser, Eric - University of Electro-Communications and University of Hawai'i at Mānoa	Curtailing or Sustaining Off-Task Interaction	Research-Oriented Short Presentation

Sunday November 22nd

Nov 22 (Sunday)	9:15 AM - 9:40 AM	902	Kindt, Duane - Nagoya University of Foreign Studies	Ongoing Alignment in Learner-Learner Interaction	Research-Oriented Short Presentation
Nov 22 (Sunday)	9:15 AM - 9:40 AM	906	Butterfield, Jeffrie - Kanagawa University; Bhatta, Baikuntha - Kanagawa University	IRF Sequences in EFL Team-Teaching Classrooms	Research-Oriented Short Presentation
Nov 22 (Sunday)	9:50 AM - 10:50 AM	906	Song, Katherine - Hiroshima University	Benefits of Institutional Email Writing Lessons	Practice-Oriented Long Workshop
Nov 22 (Sunday)	10:25 AM - 10:50 AM	Practice Room 1 (B1F)	Gardner, Scott - Okayama University	Learning From Humor in Textbooks? "Don't Even Ask"	Research-Oriented Short Presentation
Nov 22 (Sunday)	2:55 PM - 3:55 PM	904	Shimizu, Paul - Intercom Press; Snipp, Kirsten; Sakashita, Madeleine	Oxymoronic? Teaching Communication With a Textbook	Practice-Oriented Long Workshop
Nov 22 (Sunday)	2:55 PM - 4:25 PM	Tenji Gallery (6F)	Kawashima, Chie - Macquarie University / Tochigi Prefectural Sano Shou-ou High School	Pragmatic Features in Textbook Exercises	Poster Session
Nov 22 (Sunday)	6:25 PM - 6:50 PM	1003	Broadbridge, James - J. F. Oberlin University; Siegel, Joseph - Meiji Gakuin University	Rating SA Progress: Teacher vs. Non-teacher	Research-Oriented Short Presentation

Monday November 23rd

Nov 23 (Monday)	10:25 AM - 10:50 AM	903	Tateyama, Yumiko - University of Hawaii at Manoa	Interactional Practices of L2 Japanese Teacher	Research-Oriented Short Presentation
Nov 23 (Monday)	11:00 AM - 11:25 AM	903	Cruz, Selwyn - De La Salle University; Pariña, Jose Cristina - De La Salle University	The Universality of Neo-Gricean Anaphoric Repairs	Research-Oriented Short Presentation
Nov 23 (Monday)	11:35 AM - 12:00 PM	903	Oda-Sheehan, Sanae - Ochanomizu University	Making Pragmatics and Grammar Work Hand in Hand	Research-Oriented Short Presentation
Nov 23 (Monday)	12:10 PM - 12:35 PM	906	Nakamura, Ian - Okayama University	Working for Meaningful Communication in Interviews	Research-Oriented Short Presentation

Your Prag-SIG committee team

Following the Pragmatics SIG annual general meeting held at the JALT national conference in Tsukuba the following membership roles were approved by a vote of those present.

Treasurer: Kimiko Koseki
Membership Chairs: Nobuko Trent
                              Yosuke Ishii
Newsletter Editor: John Campbell-Larsen
Japanese Newsletter: Yukie Saito
                              Naoko Osuka
Web manager: Duane Kindt
Publications: Donna Tatsuki
Member-at-large: Jack Barrow

For submissions to the Pragmatics SIG newsletter please contact the editor at: joncamlar@hotmail.com

For more information about the JALT Pragmatics SIG please visit our website at: http://www.pragsig.org/