Development of Pragmatic Routines Recognition by Algerian EFL Learners

Hamida Massoud Bouzekria[*]
Dr. Bassil Mohammad Mashaqba [**]

Abstract:

This study examines the development of pragmatic routines' recognition by Algerian EFL learners throughout the investigation of the efficiency of corpus-based instruction in boosting pragmatic routines recognition. 60 Algerian EFL learners participated in this study. The participants enrolled at the University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia in Jijel city in the eastern north of Algeria. The participants were divided into two groups with 30 participants in each. The experimental group received instructional intervention on the meaning and function of pragmatic routines, whereas the control group did not. Both groups responded to pre-test and post-test. A modified version of the multilevel Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) is adopted to examine learners' recognition of routines. The results of the study revealed that the corpus-based instruction plays a critical role in developing the Algerian EFL learners' recognition of pragmatic routines.

Keywords: EFL learners; pragmatic routines; recognition; second language acquisition.

Algeria\ HMY9160633@ju.edu.jo [*]
Hashemite University\ Jordan\b_mashaqba@hu.edu.jo [**]

تطور إدراك متعلمي الانجليزية في الجزائر للتعبيرات العملية الرتيبة

حميدة مسعود بوزكرية *
د. باسل محمد المشاقبة **

ملخص:

تهدف هذه الدراسة الى تقصي مدى تطور التعبيرات العملية الرتيبة لدى متعلمي الإنجليزية كلغة اجنبية في الجزائر. كما تتناول الدراسة دور التعليم القائم على المتن في تطوير إدراك متعلمي الانجليزية للتعبيرات العملية الرتيبة. شارك في هذه الدراسة 60 متعلم لغة انجليزية بجامعة محمد الصديق بن يحيى بمدينة جيجل بالشمال الشرقي للجزائر. تم تقسيم المشاركين إلى مجموعتين تضم 30 مشاركًا لكل منهما. تلقت المجموعة التجريبية تدخلاً تعليميًا حول معنى التعبيرات العملية الرتيبة ووظيفتها، بينما لم تتلق المجموعة الضابطة ذلك. استجابت كلتا المجموعتين للإختبارين القبلي والبعدي. تم اعتماد نسخة معدلة من مقياس معرفة المفردات متعدد المستويات (VKS) لتقصي مدى إدراك متعلمي الإنجليزية للتعبيرات العملية الرتيبة. كشفت نتائج الدراسة ان التعليم القائم على المتن يؤدي دورا حاسما في تطور إدراك متعلمي الإنجليزية كلغة اجنبية في الجزائر للتعبيرات العملية الرتيبة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التعبيرات العملية الرتيبة، إدراك، اكتساب اللغة الثانية، تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية.

---
* الجزائر / HMY9160633@ju.edu.jo
** الجامعة الهاشمية/ الأردن/b_mashaqba@hu.edu.jo

1. Introduction

Pragmatics received a momentum consideration as the pivotal and the most defying aspect of language and became a legitimate focus of inquiry in the field of second language acquisition SLA. Developing pragmatic knowledge is substantial for efficient interaction in the target language since pragmatics sheds lights on how L2 learners comprehend and construct meanings as well as reinforce their pragmatic competence repertoire to understand and perform actions in that language (Kasper & Rose, 2002). Promoting L2 learners' ability to identify the intended meanings of their interlocutors and to convey meanings that are appropriate for the social context in which communication occurs is indispensable for efficient interaction in the target language.

Pragmatic routines have recently received a resurgence of attention in SLA research due to their importance in the reinforcement of L2 pragmatic competence and speech act realization. The significance of learning pragmatic routines lies in the fact that they represent the sociocultural knowledge that must be acquired to develop interactional skills and achieve a native like proficiency in the target language (House, 1996, pp. 226-227). They enable speakers to construct meanings and convey the intended illocutionary force of their utterances as well as to interpret their interlocutors' intentions by identifying the speech act (Bardovi-Harlig, 2012). L2 learners are therefore required to develop their formulaic expressions repertoire and their ability to retrieve them successfully in the appropriate context.

Recently, researchers sought to investigate pragmatic routines development by L2 learners in educational settings highlighting the role of instruction for the ease of acquisition. Even though studies investigating the impact of instruction on pragmatic routines development are limited, instruction is proved to play a critical role in enhancing the recognition of pragmatic routines. The results obtained by Wildner-Bassett (1994) revealed that beginning learners of German improved considerably in their ability to use routine formulas after having received instruction. Instructional intervention is therefore a substantial requirement in teaching pragmatics, because having an advanced level in L2 does not ensure for L2 learners' construction of meaning and communicating appropriately in a given sociocultural context without extensive instruction in pragmatics. (Kasper, 1997: 2).

The current study employs a corpus-based instruction to examine the

development of pragmatic routines since corpus materials, despite their considerable neglection from pragmatic research, can significantly extend resources for pragmatic instruction. Applying corpora opens for teachers a space to base their teaching of pragmatics on authentic language (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). Corpus materials may familiarize L2 learners with vague language usages found in different sociocultural contexts by investigating how those usages are utilized in natural settings and applying them in both spoken and written communication (Tan, 2002: 5–6).

Many studies have tackled the development of pragmatic routines and the role of instruction in boosting acquisition (Kecskes, 2000; Roever, 2005; Bardovi-Harlig, 2009; Tagushi, 2009; Barovi-Harlig & Mossman, 2016; Bardovi-Harlig and Vellenga, 2012; Furniss,2016; Tajeddin et al, 2017). However, to the researcher's best knowledge, no previous studies have been conducted in the Arab world in general and the Algerian context in particular. Hence, the present study attempts to fill this gap investigating the development of pragmatic routines by Algerian EFL learners and the potential impact of corpus-based instruction in promoting their development.

Pragmatic routines, like many other aspects of pragmatic competence, are teachable. As such, more attention must be given to implementing instructional activities that supports the use of routines in daily life. Applying corpora did not receive recognition in academic contexts, even though choosing corpus-based instruction would provide great opportunities in introducing EFL learners with authentic language that is required to develop their pragmatic competence. The significance of the current study lies in the fact that, even though it is not the only study that uses corpus-based approach to teach pragmatic routines for Algerian EFL learners, it is one of the few studies in Algeria that uses a corpus-based approach to teach pragmatic features in general. This study is therefore valuable for Algerian EFL teachers, syllabus designers, and textbook authors to consider their implementation in the Algerian universities' curriculum. The results of the study will be of great importance for teachers to focus more on pragmatic routines and the sociocultural norms that govern their use. Consequently, Algerian EFL learners' pragmatic knowledge would be more developed that they can debilitate fossilization and avoiding communication breakdowns. To this end, the study seeks answers to the following questions:

1. To what extent do Algerian EFL learners recognize pragmatic routines?
2. To what extent do instructions promote the development of pragmatic routines recognition?

2. Review of literature

Pragmatic routines are specific sequences of words or semi-fixed expressions with conventionalized meanings that are recurrently used in certain social contexts representing particular social purposes (Taguchi, 2011). Many researchers have probed the role of pragmatic routines in prompting the process of SLA by beginning L2 learners in the last decades (Hakuta, 1974; Wong-Fillmore, 1976; Hanania and Gradman, 1977; Krashen and Scarcella, 1978; Schmidt and Frota, 1986; Rescorla and Okuda,1987).

Coulmas (1979) argued that the most important function of pragmatic routines is to facilitate social interaction. Learning pragmatic routines of the target language may considerably enhance L2 learners' production of that language, help them acquire the native-like proficiency, develop their interactional skills and fit into the target language community (Weinert, 1995, cited in Hernandez & Sole, 2019:55)

Pragmatic routines, however, have been generally classified in terms of both their form and their function. Regarding form, pragmatic routines have two main categories: "chunks" and "patterns" (Wray 1999). On one hand, chunks involve routines with a flexible and prefabricated form (e.g., *For here or to go* when you order food from a restaurant). On the other hand, patterns refer to routines with a more flexible form that may involve one or more missing gaps (e.g., *Would you mind…? Can ..? Do you .....?*).

Regarding function, pragmatic routines are classified according to the extent to which their meaning is associated with specific situations. Pragmatic routines were therefore categorized into two main categories: situational and functional routines (Roever (2005). Situational routines refer to pragmatic routines with a fixed form and a specific contextualized use such as *help yourself* which means serve yourself when offering food to someone and *What brings you here?* asked by a doctor to a patient at the beginning of a medical interview. Therefore, situational routine may be difficult to discern, and inferential reasoning is required (Roever, 2005 cited in Soler and Hernandez, 2017:194). Functional routines, however, represent pragmatic routines with more flexible structure and multiple uses, such as *would you mind*). Since functional routines have fixed forms and used in different settings, they are less difficult to be interpreted.

2.1 Pragmatic Routines Recognition

The recognition of pragmatic routines has received a resurgence of interest among researchers throughout the years. One of the studies that

sheds lights on the recognition and production of routines in L2 pragmatics is the one by Bardovi-Harlig (2009). One hundred twenty-two ESL students in a US university participated in her study completing two oral tasks. In the oral recognition task, the participants listened to sixty conventional expressions and identified the expressions they knew. In the production task, the ESL students read thirty-two situational descriptions and responded orally by providing the utterance that best fit the situation. The findings showed that recognition of conventional expressions does not necessarily ensure production because learners' performance in the recognition task was much better than in the production task. The lack of familiarity is the main source of lower use of conventional expressions by learners; since even advanced-level learners in the study tend to use expressions with which they were most familiar more than other unfamiliar formulas.

Rodríguez (2001) examined the perception of requests in Spanish by instructed learners of Spanish in the second- and foreign language FL contexts shedding light on the recognition of pragmatic routines. Knowledge of pragmatic routines was measured by means of a judgment task and recall of request formulas. The participants in the study were divided into two groups: a group of L2 learners in a semester-long study abroad SA program in Spain, and a control group that stayed in the FL setting. Rodrigues has found that SA learners do not outperform students in the FL context in terms of their knowledge of pragmatic routines implying that SA context does not have a significant effect on the recognition of pragmatic routines and instruction in the SA context is required.

Many researchers claim that staying abroad plays an indispensable role in promoting both recognition and production of pragmatic routines. According to them, the classroom cannot provide an appropriate setting for pragmatic routines development. Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011) investigate the role of proficiency, length of stay, and intensity of interaction on the recognition and production of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics by administering both an aural recognition task and an oral production task targeting conventional expressions to 122 learners and 49 native speakers of American English via two computer-delivered tasks. The results obtained support Roever's claimed (2012) that both proficiency and interaction had a significant effect on pragmatic routines development, particularly when it comes to their recognition. The findings of the study are consistent with Bardovi-Harlig analysis (2009) showing that recognition does not necessarily ensure production. However, the study also reveals that students who had stayed abroad for a long period did not outperform those

with a short exposure or with no experience abroad. Learners who reported spending long hours speaking or listening to the L2 obtained better results in pragmatic recognition and production of routines. The study demonstrates no significant impact of length of stay on either recognition or production of pragmatic routines implying that length of stay abroad was unrelated to knowledge of routines. The study supports the claim that the development of pragmatic routines recognition and production requires extensive exposure to the target language even in the classroom through instruction.

2.2 Impact of Instruction on Pragmatic Routines Development

The significance of instructional pragmatics has inspired researchers to focus their attention on examining the development of several pragmatic features particularly when most of these pragmatic features are teachable. Many studies adopt different approaches to probe the instructional effects on pragmatic routines development. Researchers generally adopt a pre-test/post-test design to investigate the potential effects of instruction on the acquisition or development of many aspects of pragmatics.

Bardovi-Harlig and Vellenga (2012) examined the effect of instruction and mere exposure on the acquisition of pragmatic routines in academic settings using online fan-transcriptions of Friends corpus. Only Twenty-six learners who have completed both the pre-test and post-test and attended at least three out of four hours of instruction were included in the study. The participants were divided into an experimental (instructed) group and a control group to examine the effectiveness of instruction on routines acquisition.   The participants in the experiment group were provided with instruction on thirty conventional expressions, including 10 agreement, 10 disagreement, and 10 clarification scenarios. Instruction involves both noticing and production activities to test oral production for the expressions in context. The findings of this study report that, unlike the control group, the experimental group shows significant development, which emphasizes the crucial role of instruction and exposure in routines development.

2.3 Effects of Corpus-Based Instruction on Pragmatic Routines Development

Because pragmatics deals with language use, pragmatic researchers interested in instruction argued that the teaching of pragmatics should draw on authentic language materials. For teachers to supplement textbooks by collecting their own authentic language samples requires such an investment of time. The advent of free online corpora enables teachers to base their teaching on authentic language.

Bardovi-Harlig (2014) investigated ESL learners' knowledge of conventional expressions used in academic discussions shedding lights on the effect of instruction on their acquisition. 30 expressions, which include 10 for agreement, 10 for disagreement, and 10 for clarification were tested using a modified Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS). Instruction included both noticing and production activities. The samples of the study were 37 learners from different proficiency levels, including an experimental group of 26 students and a control group of 11 students. 5 classes received instruction across four 50-minute lessons. The study used authentic language samples extracted from the MICASE corpus. In order to examine the efficiency of instruction on the development of pragmatic routines, both a pretest-intervention-posttest design was assigned with experimental and control groups and four 50-minute instructed lessons were developed. The results obtained showed that learners at all levels reported recognizing the expressions with a plausible meaning. The number of appropriate speech acts and the number of targeted expressions remarkably increased from pre-test to post-test in the experimental group. However, no significant gains were recoded with the control group. The results indicate that instructional intervention has a significant positive effect on the development of pragmatic routines.

Using corpus-based materials, Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman, and Su (2017) examined the effect of implementing direct corpus searches by learners and studying teacher-developed corpus-based materials on the recognition and production of pragmatic routines used for agreement, disagreement, and clarification in academic English discussion. The participants of the study were 54 students divided into three main groups: a corpus- materials group (26) receiving corpus excerpts, a corpus search group (17) conducting equivalent searches, and a control group (11) which receives no instruction on routines. Input came from MICASE with noticing and production activities. All the participants did both the pre-test and post-test which were delivered in individual computers. The results obtained reveal that the use of MICASE, both in searches by learners and in teacher-developed materials, led to a remarkable development in the use of pragmatic routines. The study therefore highlights the crucial effect of incorporating corpus-based instruction in the development of pragmatic routines. This study also shows that pragmatic routines development can take place in the classroom stating that instruction can be integrated into language classrooms, taught by classroom teachers, and designed for an established curriculum. Teachers can combine two instructional approaches:

teacher-developed corpus-materials and corpus searches by students in order to promote interlanguage pragmatic competence and boost the acquisition process.

3. Method

To examine pragmatic routines recognition by Algerian EFL learners, both a pre-test and a post-test were developed. The pre-test and post-test were chosen because of their use and effectiveness in many studies that have investigated the acquisition of pragmatic routines (Roever, 2005; Bardovi-Harlig, 2008, 2009; Soler & Hernandez, 2017). The pre-test was developed using a modified version of the multilevel Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) (Wesche and Paribakht, 1996), which was adopted in several studies to identify both self-perceived and demonstrated knowledge of some pragmatic routines. This study presents 16 pragmatic routines which were selected from previous studies on routines recognition (Roever, 2005; Bardovi-Harlig, 2008, 2009, Soler & Hernandez, 2017).

Sixty first-year MA EFL learners from the university of Mohammed el-Saddik ben Yahia in Jijel, Algeria participated in the study after getting their consent. Since the participants did not attend the course of Pragmatics before, they are all assumed to have a very limited knowledge of pragmatic routines and pragmatic competence in general. Hence, they represent the appropriate sample for investigating the development of pragmatic routines and the role of instruction in boosting acquisition. The participants were divided into two groups to investigate the effects of corpus-based instruction on pragmatic routines development. Each group consists of 30 Algerian EFL learners.

The impact of using corpus-based instruction on the acquisition of pragmatic routines has been reiterated in several studies (e.g. Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2015a, 2015b; Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2017; Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012; Flowerdew, 2015; Furniss, 2016; Gilmore, 2011; Simpson, Briggs, Ovens, & Swales, 2002). The study investigates the role of instruction on pragmatic routines development. Therefore, an input-based group and a control group were designed. The input-based group was exposed to corpus-based materials represented in interactive texts that illustrate the use of the targeted pragmatic routines (Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012; Bardivi-Harlig, et al, 2017). Each pragmatic routine is presented in one session in at least two dialogues. The Algerian EFL learners are asked to read the dialogues, identify the pragmatic routine presented, and provide its meaning. The professor even ask them to give

examples of their own to show their understanding of the pragmatic routines presented. The professor, then provides the feedback explaining the use of each pragmatic routine. The corpus-based materials are extracted from the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICAS) because its content is highly consistent with the English for academic purposes curriculum. Unfortunately, not all pragmatic routines were available in MICASE; therefore, the researcher presented the missed pragmatic routines providing his own. The texts are validated by one professor from the university of Mohammed el-Saddik ben Yahia. The control group receives no instruction or extensive practices on routines. Both groups took the pre and post-tests. The post-test was taken a month after the pre-test. The participants in the input-based group were sufficiently exposed to pragmatic routines. The results obtained from both groups show us the potential development of pragmatic routines and the efficiency of instruction and applying corpora in boosting the learning process.

The data of the current study were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The quantitative analysis resulted in frequencies and percentages of pragmatic routines recognition. Learners' recognition of pragmatic routines is evaluated in terms of familiarity with the expressions. Each response in the VKS test is categorized as "no recognition; partial recognition; recognition with no plausible meaning; recognition with plausible meaning". No recognition is assigned to the choice "I don't remember seeing or hearing this expression before" and "I have seen or heard this expression before, but I don't know what it means". However, partial recognition, recognition with no plausible meaning and recognition with plausible meaning were given to the response "I know this expression, it means..." The qualitative analysis resulted from the researcher's deep analysis of each answer classifying them as correct answers (recognition with plausible meaning), close answers (partial recognition), or wrong answers (recognition with no plausible answers). For the validity of the results obtained, one professor from the University of Mohammed El-Saddik Ben-Yahia in Jijel examines all the participants' answers and the researcher classification. The following table represents the numeric code assigned to the four categories.

Table 1: Numeric code schema for Recognition

Numeric Code	Recognition Level	Production Ability
1	Recognition with plausible meaning	Yes
2	Recognition with no plausible meaning	No
3	Partial recognition	-
4	No recognition	-

The post-test was presented one month later. To avoid familiarity with the instruments in the post-test, a version of the VKS was designed by modifying the order of the items presented.

4. Results and Discussion

The Algerian EFL learners in both control and experimental groups were introduced with 16 pragmatic routines to investigate their knowledge and recognition of pragmatic routines.

4.1 Control and Experimental Pre-test Results

The participants in both groups attended a pre-test designed based on the Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS). The results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Control and Experimental Pre-test Results

Recognition of pragmatic routines	Recognition Code	Control		Experimental	
		N	N %	N	N %
I gotta go	1	29	97%	26	87%
	2	0	0%	2	7%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	1	3%	2	7%
I was wondering	1	5	17%	9	30%
	2	11	37%	12	40%
	3	6	20%	5	17%
	4	8	27%	4	13%
That works for me	1	16	53%	19	63%
	2	6	20%	5	17%
	3	3	10%	0	0%
	4	5	17%	6	20%
Help yourself	1	7	23%	7	23%
	2	9	30%	6	20%
	3	0	0%	5	17%
	4	14	47%	12	40%
For here or to go	1	8	27%	6	20%
	2	2	7%	5	17%
	3	7	23%	3	10%
	4	13	43%	16	53%
Do you have the time?	1	0	0%	1	3%
	2	0	0%	0	0%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	30	100%	29	97%
Thanks for coming	1	24	80%	26	87%
	2	3	10%	1	3%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	3	10%	3	10%
Would you mind	1	14	47%	13	43%

Recognition of pragmatic routines	Recognition Code	Control		Experimental	
		N	N %	N	N %
	2	6	20%	8	27%
	3	2	7%	3	10%
	4	8	27%	6	20%
Thanks for your time	1	21	70%	23	77%
	2	6	20%	3	10%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	3	10%	4	13%
I beg your pardon	1	9	30%	11	37%
	2	7	23%	6	20%
	3	5	17%	3	10%
	4	9	30%	10	33%
No problem	1	28	93%	26	87%
	2	2	7%	3	10%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	0	0%	1	3%
Can I get you something else?	1	19	63%	19	63%
	2	7	23%	6	20%
	3	0	0%	3	10%
	4	4	13%	2	7%
My bad	1	27	90%	26	87%
	2	2	7%	3	10%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	1	3%	1	3%
Can I get a ride?	1	15	50%	14	47%
	2	9	30%	3	10%
	3	0	0%	2	7%
	4	6	20%	11	37%
Do you want to come to my place?	1	13	43%	11	37%
	2	1	3%	4	13%
	3	0	0%	2	7%
	4	16	53%	13	43%
Do you think you could make it?	1	7	23%	13	43%
	2	5	17%	3	10%
	3	3	10%	1	3%
	4	15	50%	13	43%

The most noticeable result in table 2 is that the Algerian EFL learners in both control and experimental groups show a high level of recognition with the pragmatic routines *I gotta go, no problem, my bad, and thanks for coming. I gotta go* recorded the highest score with 97% and 87% in the control group and experimental group respectively, implying that *I gotta go* is a common pragmatic routine that is frequently used by Algerian EFL learners. All the participants gave answers such as *I have to go/ I have to go*

right no/ I must go or even giving translation to Arabic by simply saying ʕalaij a δ-δahaːb al-ʔaːn علي الذهاب الان with giving examples of the situation where this expression occurs, which show their understanding of the appropriate use of that expression. Similarly, the pragmatic routines *no problem*, *my bad* and *thanks for coming* recorded the next highest scores emphasizing their familiarity to the Algerian EFL learners.

Although Algerian EFL learners demonstrate a high level of recognition with *I gotta go, No problem, My bad, and Thanks for coming*, they show a lower recognition competency in both the control group and the experimental group in the case of *I was wondering* (17%-30%), *help yourself* (23% -23%), and *for here or to go* (27% -20%) implying that these expressions are not frequently used by the Algerian EFL learners. For example, in the case of *help yourself*, most of the participants either provide no answer or give the literal translation of that expression providing answers such as *assist yourself, don't expect others to help you, you should stand for yourself*. Such reliance on the literal translation to identify the intended meaning of these pragmatic routines indicates the learner's unfamiliarity with these expressions.

Another finding displayed in table 2 is that *do you have the time?* Recorded the lowest score. All the participants in both groups fail to provide the appropriate answer for this pragmatic routine. They gave answers suassisst ach as *are you free/ are you available,* which implies that they have never been introduced with this expression that is used to ask about time. This lack of awareness indicates the limited exposure to such formulaic sequence in classroom as Howarth (1998) revealed that non-native English speakers NNSs use a limited range of formulaic sequences. All other pragmatic routines were in a mild level, which indicates the need for conducting an instructional program to improve their recognition of pragmatic routines.

4.2 Control and Experimental Post-test Results

The participants in both groups did a post-test designed based on the Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS). The control group received no instruction, while the experimental group received an instructional course on how to recognize pragmatic routines.   Table 3 shows the results of the control group members in the post test.

Table 3 Control Group Pre and Post-test Results

Recognition of pragmatic routines	Recognition Code	Pre-test		Post_test	
		N	N %	N	N %
I gotta go	1	29	97%	29	97%

Recognition of pragmatic routines	Recognition Code	Pre-test		Post_test	
		N	N %	N	N %
	2	0	0%	0	0%
	3	0	0%	1	3%
	4	1	3%	0	0%
I was wondering	1	5	17%	15	50%
	2	11	37%	5	17%
	3	6	20%	2	7%
	4	8	27%	8	27%
That works for me	1	16	53%	14	47%
	2	6	20%	8	27%
	3	3	10%	2	7%
	4	5	17%	6	20%
Help yourself	1	7	23%	12	40%
	2	9	30%	7	23%
	3	0	0%	2	7%
	4	14	47%	9	30%
For here or to go	1	8	27%	12	40%
	2	2	7%	6	20%
	3	7	23%	2	7%
	4	13	43%	10	33%
Do you have the time?	1	0	0%	0	0%
	2	0	0%	0	0%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	30	100%	30	100%
Thanks for coming	1	24	80%	26	87%
	2	3	10%	1	3%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	3	10%	3	10%
Would you mind	1	14	47%	18	60%
	2	6	20%	2	7%
	3	2	7%	2	7%
	4	8	27%	8	27%
Thanks for your time	1	21	70%	22	73%
	2	6	20%	5	17%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	3	10%	3	10%
I beg your pardon	1	9	30%	16	53%
	2	7	23%	6	20%
	3	5	17%	1	3%
	4	9	30%	7	23%
No problem	1	28	93%	28	93%
	2	2	7%	2	7%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	0	0%	0	0%

Recognition of pragmatic routines	Recognition Code	Pre-test		Post_test	
		N	N %	N	N %
Can I get you something else?	1	19	63%	19	63%
	2	7	23%	1	3%
	3	0	0%	1	3%
	4	4	13%	9	30%
My bad	1	27	90%	26	87%
	2	2	7%	3	10%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	1	3%	1	3%
Can I get a ride?	1	15	50%	17	57%
	2	9	30%	5	17%
	3	0	0%	1	3%
	4	6	20%	7	23%
Do you want to come to my place?	1	13	43%	14	47%
	2	1	3%	6	20%
	3	0	0%	1	3%
	4	16	53%	9	30%
Do you think you could make it?	1	7	23%	7	23%
	2	5	17%	5	17%
	3	3	10%	4	13%
	4	15	50%	14	47%

The most distinctive finding in table 3 is that there is no notable difference between the pre-test and post-test results related to control group. They still maintain the same levels when comparing their individual scores for each pragmatic routine. *I gotta go, no problem*, *thanks for coming,* and *my bad* still recorded the highest score in the post-test, implying that Algerian EFL learners are unfamiliar with these expressions. No development was identified with the other pragmatic routines.

Table 4 Experimental group Pre and Post-test Results

Recognition of pragmatic routines	Recognition Code	Pre-test		Post_test	
		N	N %	N	N %
I gotta go	1	26	87%	30	100%
	2	2	7%	0	0%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	2	7%	0	0%
I was wondering	1	9	30%	21	70%
	2	12	40%	4	13%
	3	5	17%	2	7%
	4	4	13%	3	10%
That works for me	1	19	63%	26	87%
	2	5	17%	3	10%
	3	0	0%	0	0%

Recognition of pragmatic routines	Recognition Code	Pre-test		Post_test	
		N	N %	N	N %
	4	6	20%	1	3%
Help yourself	1	7	23%	20	67%
	2	6	20%	5	17%
	3	5	17%	2	7%
	4	12	40%	3	10%
For here or to go	1	6	20%	21	70%
	2	5	17%	6	20%
	3	3	10%	0	0%
	4	16	53%	3	10%
Do you have the time?	1	1	3%	26	87%
	2	0	0%	0	0%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	29	97%	4	13%
Thanks for coming	1	26	87%	28	93%
	2	1	3%	2	7%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	3	10%	0	0%
Would you mind	1	13	43%	21	70%
	2	8	27%	3	10%
	3	3	10%	2	7%
	4	6	20%	4	13%
Thanks for your time	1	23	77%	27	90%
	2	3	10%	1	3%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	4	13%	2	7%
I beg your pardon	1	11	37%	22	73%
	2	6	20%	5	17%
	3	3	10%	0	0%
	4	10	33%	3	10%
No problem	1	26	87%	30	100%
	2	3	10%	0	0%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	1	3%	0	0%
Can I get you something else?	1	19	63%	28	93%
	2	6	20%	2	7%
	3	3	10%	0	0%
	4	2	7%	0	0%
My bad	1	26	87%	26	87%
	2	3	10%	3	10%
	3	0	0%	0	0%
	4	1	3%	1	3%
Can I get a ride?	1	14	47%	24	80%
	2	3	10%	3	10%

Recognition of pragmatic routines	Recognition Code	Pre-test		Post_test	
		N	N %	N	N %
	3	2	7%	0	0%
	4	11	37%	3	10%
Do you want to come to my place?	1	11	37%	16	53%
	2	4	13%	2	7%
	3	2	7%	0	0%
	4	13	43%	12	40%
Do you think you could make it?	1	13	43%	18	60%
	2	3	10%	0	0%
	3	1	3%	1	3%
	4	13	43%	11	37%

The most salient finding in table 4 is that it shows a notable difference between the pre-test and post-test results related to the experimental group members. The Algerian EFL learners remarkably improved their pragmatic routines recognition level when comparing their individual scores in the pre-test and post-test for each pragmatic routine. Concerning the pragmatic routines, *I gotta go* and *no problem*, all the participants (100%) provided the appropriate interpretations, as *I have to go and it's ok/ it's fin,* respectively. indicating the effectiveness of applying corpus-based instruction in the development of pragmatic routines recognition.

Another interesting finding in table 4 is that the pragmatic routine *do you have the time,* which received the lowest score in the pre-test with only 3% recording a high score in the post-test after receiving extensive instructional intervention with a score of 87%. The instructional courses enable the Algerian EFL learners to identify the appropriate meaning of that expression. Therefore, instead of interpreting it literally as *are you free? Or are you available?*, they now understand that it is another way of asking about time (what time is it?). Literal translation was also assigned to the pragmatic routine *help yourself* in the pre-test where most of the participants gave answers such as assist yourself recording a score of mainly 23% as recognition with plausible meaning. However, in the post-test 67% of the participants were able to identify the adequate meaning of this expression as *serve yourself* that is used in restaurants or parties, when you have to bring your own food, implying that instruction positively affects he recognition of pragmatic routines by Algerian EFL learners.

Similarly, the participants make a notable progress in their recognition of the pragmatic routine *for here or to go*. The pre-test results show that the participants are not familiar with such expression. However, due to the instructional courses the participants have received, they became

familiarized with such expression and manage to recognize its meaning and explain when it is used (used generally in restaurants to ask the costumer whether he is going to have his meal or order at the restaurant or take it away).

Progress in pragmatic routines recognition was identified with the other pragmatic routines as demonstrated in the table above. However, the table shows an insignificant development in the recognition of the two pragmatic routines *do you want to come to my place,* and *do you think you could make it?* Even though the participants receive instructional courses on the meaning and the use of such expression, some of the Algerian EFL learners kept providing the literal interpretation of these pragmatic routines. *Do you want to come to my place*? was inappropriately interpreted as offering a seat for someone old or sick in the bus, whereas *do you think you could make it?* was interpreted literally as related to the physical ability to do something.

To sum up, the results of the pre-test reveal that Algerian EFL learners use a limited range of pragmatic routines. They recognized and produced pragmatic routines that they are familiar with such as *I gotta go, no problem, my bad, thanks for coming.* However, the lack of knowledge of certain routines hinders their recognition abilities. For example, they found difficulties in recognizing pragmatic routines such as *for here or to go, help yourself,* and *I was wondering* Similarly, no Algerian EFL learner managed to figure out the meaning of the pragmatic routine *Do you have the time,* which reflect their unfamiliarity with these routines. These results are consistent with the findings of Bardovi-Harlig (2009) and Nanaho Oki (2018), who maintain that learners' recognition of pragmatic routines is linked to pragma-linguistic complexity where some routines are used more frequently than others.

The findings of the post-test highlight the significance of instruction in general and corpus-based instruction in particular in the improvement of routines recognition. Algerian EFL learners, due to instruction, accomplished remarkable gains in recognizing routines. These results are consistent with the findings of House, 1996, Bardovi-Harlig and Vellenga, 2012, Bardovi-Harlig, 2014, Furniss, 2016, and Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman, and Su, 2017 that instruction and applying corpora in teaching pragmatic routines can have a profound effect on pragmatic routines development. The current study applied explicit instruction instead of implicit instruction assuming that explicit instruction would enable L2 learners to accomplish greater gains in their recognition of routines. The findings of the study comply with the results obtained by House (1996) and Teteyama (1998) that

highlight the significance of explicit instruction in the development of pragmatic routines by showing that L2 learners who receive explicit instruction outperform those who were exposed to implicit instruction in their recognition and production of routines.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The results obtained from the current study demonstrated that Algerian EFL learners have a limited knowledge of pragmatic routines. They use a limited range of these formulaic sequences indicating their unfamiliarity with routines. However, being exposed to extensive instructional materials on the functions and meanings of pragmatic routines enable them to appropriately develop their recognition. Algerian EFL learners would also develop their pragmatic routines repertoire and efficiently use them in daily life to acquire native like proficiency. Corpora provide great opportunities in introducing Algerian EFL leaners with authentic language that would effectively familiarize them with pragmatic routines. Therefore, based on these findings, more attention must be given to implementing instructional activities that support the use of routines in daily life. Moreover, Algerian EFL teachers, syllabus designers, and textbook authors should consider implementation of corpus-based instruction in the Algerian universities' curriculum.

Future research may address the recognition of routines investigating both short terms and long terms gains to examine the efficiency of corpus-based instruction on pragmatic routines development. Recognition does not ensure production. Therefore, other studies may consider investigating both recognition and production of routines. In addition, other variables such as level of proficiency and gender may also be scrutinized.

References

Bardovi-Harlig. Kathleen. (2009). Conventional expressions as a pragma-linguistic resource: Recognition and production of conventional expressions in L2 Pragmatics. *Language Learning*, 59, 755-795.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Bastos, M. T. (2011). Proficiency, length of stay, and intensity of interaction and the acquisition of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 8(3), 347–384.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Vellenga, H. E. (2012). The effect of instruction on conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *System*, 40 (1), 1-13.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Vellenga, H. E. (2014). The effect of instruction on pragmatic routines in academic discussion. *Language Teaching Research*, 19, 324 350.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Su, Y (2017). The effect of corpus-based instruction on pragmatic routines. *Language Learning & Technology*, 21 (3), 76-103.

Coulmas, F. (1979). On the sociolinguistic relevance of routine formulae. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 3, 239–266.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2010). Data collection methods in speech act performance: DCTS, role plays, and verbal reports. In A. Martínez-Flor & E. Usó-Juan (Eds. Speech act performance: *Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues* (pp. 41- 56). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Flowerdew, L. (2015). Data-driven learning and language learning theories: Whither the twain shall meet. In A. Leńko-Szymańska & A. Boulton (Eds.), *multiple affordances of language corpora for datadriven learning* (pp. 15–36). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Furniss, E.A. (2016). Teaching the pragmatics of Russian conversation using a corpus referred website. *Language Learning & Technology*, 20(2), 38-60.

Hakuta, K. (1974). Prefabricated patterns and the emergence of structure in second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 24, 287-298.

Hanania, E., & Gradman, H. (1977). Acquisition of English structures: A case study of an adult native speaker of Arabic in an English-speaking environment. *Language Learning*, 27(1), 75–91.CrossRefGoogle Scholar

House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routine and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18 (2), 225-252.

Howarth, P., 1998. Phraseology and second language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics* 19, 24-44.

Hymes, D. (1972). *On communicative competence*. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.). Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Ishihara, N. & Cohen, A. D. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.

Gilmore, A. (2011). "I prefer not text": Developing Japanese learners' communicative competence with authentic materials. *Language Learning*, 61, 786–819.

Kasper, G. (1997b). The role of pragmatics in language teacher education. In Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (Eds.) Beyond methods: components of second language teacher education. (pp.113-136). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (Eds.). *Pragmatics and language teaching*, (pp.33-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kecskes, Istvan. (2000). Conceptual fluency and the use of situation-bound utterances in L2. *Links & Letters* 7: 145-161.

Kecskes, I. (2010). Situation-bound utterances as pragmatics acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(11), 2889-2897.

Rescorla, L., & Okuda, S. (1987). Modular patterns in second language acquisition. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 8, 282–308.CrossRefGoogle Scholar.

Roever, Carsten. 2005. *Testing ESL pragmatics: Development and validation of a web based assessment battery*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Roever, C. (2012). What learners get for free: Learning of routine formulae in ESL and EFL environments? *ELT Journal*, 66(1), 10–21.

Rodriguez, S. (2001). *The perception of requests in Spanish by instructed learners of Spanish in the second- and foreign-language contexts: A longitudinal study of acquisition pattern*s. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Bloomington IN: Indiana University.

Schmidt, R., Frota, S., 1986. Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuese. In: Day, R.R. (Ed.), Talking to Learn: Conversation in second language acquisition. Newbury House, Rowley, MA, pp. 237-326.

Simpson, R. C., Briggs, S. L., Ovens, J., & Swales, J. M. (2002). The Michigan corpus of academic spoken English. Ann Arbor, MI: The Regents of the University of Michigan. Retrieved from http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/micase/.

Soler, E. A & Hernandez, A.S. (2017). Learning pragmatic routines during study abroad: A focus on proficiency and type of routine. *Atlantis*, 39(2), 191-210.

Soler, E. A & Hernandez, A.S. (2019). Pragmatic gains in the study abroad context:Learners' experiences and recognition of pragmatic routines. Journal of pragmatics,146, 54-71

Taguchi, Naoko. 2011. "The effect of L2 Proficiency and study-abroad experience on pragmatic comprehension." *Language Learning* 61 (3): 904-939.

Tan, Melinda (ed) (2002): *Corpus studies in language education*. Bangkok: IELE Press.

Weinert, R. (1995). The role of formulaic language in second language

acquisition: a review". *Applied Linguistics*, 16.

Wesche, M., & Paribakht, T. M. (1996). Assessing vocabulary knowledge: Depth vs. breadth. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 53, 13–40.

Wildner-Bassett, M.E. (1994). Intercultural pragmatics and proficiency: 'Polite' noises for cultural appropriateness. *IRAL*, 32, 3–17.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1976). *The second time around: Cognitive and social strategies in second language acquisition*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University.27 (1).

Tajeddin, Z., Alemi, M., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2017). Acquisition of pragmatic routines by learners of L2 English: Investigating common errors and sources of pragmatic fossilization. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 21(2). 1-21.,