**Escuela de Doctorado
y Estudios de Posgrado**

Universidad de La Laguna

Pragmatic competence in EFL secondary school context: An investigation on (dis)agreement strategies

TRABAJO DE FIN DE MÁSTER

Máster en Formación del Profesorado de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria y Bachillerato, Formación Profesional y Enseñanza de Idiomas

Autora:

Claudia Sosa Gutiérrez

Tutora:

Sonia López Serrano

Curso académico 2022/23

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take a moment to thank everyone that has supported me in the completion of this thesis. First, I want to express my gratitude to my family for always believing in me and encouraging me to do my best at school and at life. I also want to thank my friends Laura and Jesús for making this path a little easier and always helping one another. Finally, I would like to thank my TFM tutor, Sonia, for always answering my questions, giving me wise advice and encouraging me in every step of the way.

It could not have been possible without all of you.

ABSTRACT

This thesis analyzes the pragmatic input in EFL instructional materials in the Spanish context to determine the extent to which (dis)agreement strategies are presented to EFL students. The study focuses on a comprehensive examination of the 'New Action' 3 and 4 textbooks by Burlington Books, systematically analyzing each page for the presence of (dis)agreement strategies. The findings reveal a lack of explicit pragmatic instruction within these materials. Interestingly, contrary to previous research, the textbooks give more emphasis to disagreement strategies rather than agreement strategies. To address this gap and further enhance students' exposure to (dis)agreement strategies, a teaching intervention is proposed. The objective of this teaching proposal is to raise students' awareness of pragmatic elements through explicit explanations and questions, while also encouraging their production through output-based activities. This thesis aims to present a thorough analysis of EFL materials and propose a teaching approach that effectively addresses students' needs.

Keywords: pragmatic competence, EFL context, speech acts, EFL textbooks, audiovisual-materials, pragmatic instruction

RESUMEN

Esta tesis analiza la contribución pragmática en los materiales instruccionales de inglés como lengua extranjera (EFL) en el contexto español para determinar hasta qué punto se presentan estrategias de (des)acuerdo a los estudiantes de EFL. El estudio se centra en un examen exhaustivo de los libros de texto 'New Action' 3 y 4 de Burlington Books, analizando sistemáticamente cada página en busca de la presencia de estrategias de (des)acuerdo. Los resultados revelan una falta de instrucción pragmática explícita en estos materiales. Sin embargo, en contraste con investigaciones previas, los libros de texto analizados dan más énfasis a las estrategias de desacuerdo que a las de acuerdo. Para abordar esta brecha y mejorar aún más la exposición de los estudiantes a las estrategias de (des)acuerdo, se propone una intervención docente. El objetivo de esta propuesta de enseñanza es aumentar la conciencia de los estudiantes sobre los elementos pragmáticos a través de explicaciones y preguntas explícitas, al mismo tiempo que fomentar su producción a través de actividades basadas en la producción de lenguaje. Esta tesis tiene como objetivo presentar un análisis exhaustivo de los materiales de EFL y proponer una intervención educativa que aborde eficazmente las necesidades de los estudiantes.

Palabras clave: competencia pragmática, contextos EFL, speech acts, libros de texto EFL, materiales audiovisuales, enseñanza pragmática

Table of contents

1. INTRODUCTION

The attention paid to the role of pragmatic competence in EFL (English as a foreign language) contexts has increased greatly over the past decades. Many studies point out how high grammatical proficiency needs to be accompanied by an equally high degree of pragmatic awareness and skills. Therefore, many researchers have tried to study the best methods to teach pragmatic competence as well as the main limitations of pragmatic instruction in the classrooms.

Some studies draw attention to the quality of traditional EFL materials. Some researchers have tried to designate the relationship between pragmatic competence development and its connection to the materials used in the classrooms. While some remarkable investigations have been carried out in Vietnamese, Chinese, Malaysian and German contexts, little is known about the topic in Spanish contexts, which this thesis aims to palliate.

This thesis aims to carry out an in-depth analysis of the (dis)agreement strategies found in Spanish EFL textbooks "New Action" 3 and 4 by Burlington Books, in doing so it is hoped that more light is shed on the topic of pragmatic competence in traditional textbook materials. Afterwards, a teaching intervention attending to the main deficiencies of the analyzed textbooks is provided. The teaching proposal presented follows the methodology and pedagogical practices of teaching pragmatic competence through audiovisual materials. Teaching speech acts through audiovisual contents is one of the methods researchers have come up with in order strengthen students' pragmatic conscience and production, which has been proved to be an effective tool since it provides contextual and physical contexts which are often unavailable in traditional materials (Jernigan, 2012).

Thus, this essay will study the limitations of traditional EFL textbooks in the Spanish context and present a consequent teaching proposal based on previous research and literature aimed at facilitating students' pragmatic competence development.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The following section aims to guide and provide the reader with all the necessary information in order to further understand the following thesis. First, the state of affairs of pragmatics in current educational contexts will be provided by analyzing some extracts from the CEFR and LOMLOE curriculum, followed by a brief review of the importance and main limitations of pragmatic competence instruction in EFL contexts along with a revision on audiovisual materials teaching in order to frame the analysis of secondary school textbooks and consequent teaching proposal.

2.1. Pragmatic competence in the CEFR and LOMLOE curriculum

The Common Reference European Framework (2020) has in the past years established a groundbreaking and new vision of language and language learning that has influenced not only the actual Spanish educational curriculum which is ruled by Organic Law 3/2020, de 29th December, which modifies Organic Law 2/2006, de 3rd may, of Education. Official State Gazette 340, de 30th December 2020 https://www.boe.es/eli/es/lo/2020/12/29/3, and in the Canary Islands, the education system is, in the precise moment in which this research has been developed, regulated by Decree 30/2023, 16th March, regulating the organization and curriculum of the compulsory secondary education and baccalaureate in the Autonomous Community of the Canary Islands (2023), but many other foreign language teaching institutions. The CEFR presents the language learner as a "social agent" who uses language in the real world and for specific purposes. The language user lives in a social world and plays a fundamental role on the learning process. Although this is somewhat obvious, it has not been until quite recently that this proposal has been established by the CEFR, completely changing the vision scope that teachers, learners, course designers, examining institutions and educative administrators had of language teaching and learning. This new focus shift which is oriented towards action by the CEFR represents a change in the direction of language learning. Instead of programs based on a linear progression that are founded on linguistic structures or in a set of predetermined functions and notions, the need to redirect efforts to a renovated notion of programs substantiated in the analysis of needs is pressing, oriented to tasks of the real world and constructed around notions and functions deliberately selected. As the Council of Europe

(2020) states: "The CEFR takes an innovative stance in seeing learners as language users and social agents, and thus seeing language as a vehicle for communication rather than as a subject to study" (p. 29). The student is not supposed to learn and memorize strings of words without context anymore. Now, it is understood that language users have to use language in means of real communication and interaction with others to express themselves.

This new switch to the language user as a "social agent" set the bases for a long list of projects and conferences hosted by the Council of Europe under the principles of transparency and coherence in the description of European languages. With this relocation towards "action" and "language user centered teaching", the CEFR pays special attention to the role of interaction, as it is considered to be the very origin of language, since its interpersonal, collaborative and transactional functions are key to constructing and using discourse. Moreover, the CEFR distinguishes between oral and written interaction, admitting that the latter, although disregarded by the general public, has in the past 20 years regained a significant role.

Such is the impact of the CEFR in Spanish educational system, that according to the *Decreto 30/2023, de 16 de marzo, por el que se establece la ordenación y el currículo de la Educación Secundaria Obligatoria y del Bachillerato en la Comunidad Autónoma de Canarias 2023* establishes: "Para la elaboración del presente currículo se ha empleado como guía el Marco común europeo de referencia para las lenguas: aprendizaje, enseñanza, evaluación (MCER) y su enfoque comunicativo orientado a la acción" (p. 1). This interest in presenting the language user as a social user can be seen in the new shift taken by the LOMLOE curriculum. The LOMLOE (2023) evaluation criteria number 2.1 of 4º ESO (compulsory secondary education) says

> 2.1. Elaborar y expresar oralmente textos sencillos, estructurados, comprensibles, coherentes y adecuados a la situación comunicativa que versen sobre asuntos cotidianos y sean de relevancia personal o de interés público próximos a la experiencia del alumnado, empleando diferentes soportes, y haciéndolo de forma creativa y mostrando empatía y aprecio por las producciones ajenas, con el fin de responder a propósitos comunicativos concretos (p. 48)

The aspect of "simple oral texts that are structured, comprehensible, coherent and adequate to the communicative situation" should be highlighted. For an utterance to be adequate to the communicative situation, it must follow a series of rules or conventions that have been established by the users of the language. It is the pragmatic competence that allows language users to adapt and adjust a certain utterance in order for it to be adequate to the context and to the receiver and make communication a successful event. (Kwan & Dunworth, 2016).

Furthermore, the evaluation criterion 2.3 says in LOMLOE (2023) argues:

> 2.3. Seleccionar y aplicar de forma guiada conocimientos y estrategias elementales en la elaboración de textos comprensibles, coherentes y adecuados a las intenciones comunicativas, a las características contextuales y a la tipología textual, haciendo uso de su repertorio lingüístico individual, con ayuda de los recursos físicos o digitales más adecuados en función de la tarea y las necesidades de cada momento, teniendo en cuenta el contexto y la persona a quien va dirigido el texto, para planificar, producir, revisar y seguir progresando en el proceso de aprendizaje (p. 12)

Once again, "taking into account the context and to whom is the text directed" is a statement that seems to be heavily influenced by the idea that pragmatic awareness enables the language user to make better decisions. Moreover, "elaborating comprehensible, coherent and adequate texts to the communicative intention, contextual characteristics and textual typology" is a rather simple stance, but in order to be coherent and adequate to the communicative intention, the student needs to make use of a series of instruments and strategies that have to be taught and learnt.

Besides, the importance posed on the ability to participate in the personal, public and professional situations referred to in the competency block of specific competence 2 and in evaluation criterion 4.1 should not be overlooked. This concern on the ability of the language user to be able to maintain conversations on the public sphere refers specifically to the pragmatic competence needed not only to correctly interpret speech acts but also to perform them successfully. Similarly, the evaluation criterion 3.1 argues that:

3.1. Planificar, participar y colaborar activamente en situaciones interactivas, orales, escritas o multimodales, sobre temas cotidianos de relevancia personal o de interés público cercanos a su experiencia, haciendo uso de la cortesía lingüística y mostrando proactividad, empatía y respeto por las diferentes necesidades, ideas, inquietudes, iniciativas y motivaciones de los interlocutores y las interlocutoras, con el fin de responder a propósitos comunicativos concretos, fortalecer vínculos personales y participar en la vida social con cierta autonomía (p. 49)

This emphasis on using language in order to answer communicative purposes, to strengthen personal relationships and to participate in social situations with certain autonomy is directly related to seeing the EFL students as a social agent that uses the language to communicate with others. Therefore, the student is asked not only to correctly interpret relevant cultural and sociolinguistic aspects but also to properly introduce these elements in language production. In order to be able to maintain interpersonal relationships and pay attention to social conventions and sociolinguistic peculiarities, such as linguistic courtesy, the student needs a strong pragmatic competence.

It has now been established the importance posed on the development of students' pragmatic competence. This ability to understand and produce language that is appropriate for different situations, audiences, and purposes and to to engage in meaningful and culturally relevant interactions is of utmost importance for any EFL student. The LOMLOE curriculum (2023) even argues that linguistic competence (CCL) is the ability to pay attention to the different situations and contexts in which the language user participates in order to be coherent and adequate: "La materia de Lengua Extranjera contribuye a la adquisición de la Competencia en comunicación lingüística (CCL), puesto que el alumnado deberá desenvolverse de manera oral o escrita con coherencia y adecuación en diferentes ámbitos y contextos" (p.3). In order to be able to take into account the different communicative contexts, the student needs a strong pragmatic competence that enables smart and efficient communicative choices based not only in linguistic aspects but also in social aspects.

2.2. The importance of pragmatic competence in EFL teaching and learning contexts

In order to discern the importance of pragmatic competence, first a definition of pragmatics in its general sense should be provided. It is now well established from a variety of studies that pragmatics is a field that focuses on how context influences the interpretation and use of language. It deals with the study of language beyond its literal meaning, exploring how speakers convey meaning through implied or inferred information, social conventions and situational factors (Grice, 1975).

To provide a brief description of Pragmatics is a complicated task, the multiple definitions listed in Levinson's book *Pragmatics* (1983) exemplify the complexity of the field at hand. Levinson offers different definitions for Pragmatics, each one paying attention to a specific nuance of the matter, the first one being "pragmatics is the study of those principles that will account for why a certain set of sentences are anomalous, or not possible utterances" (p. 6), followed by "pragmatics is the study of language from a functional perspective, that is, that it attempts to explain facets of linguistic structure by reference to non-linguistic pressures and causes" (p. 7), and finally, "pragmatics is the study of just those aspects of the relationship between language and context that are relevant to the writing of grammars" (p. 9). It can be observed that each definition is unsatisfactory in one way or another because the scope of study of Pragmatics is sometimes too wide to fit in a few sentences.

However, interlanguage pragmatics narrows down to a better definition for the current purpose of this study. Interlanguage pragmatics is a branch of second language acquisition (SLA) that examines second language (L2) learners' knowledge, use, and development in performing sociocultural functions (Taguchi, 2017). More specifically, interactional competence in interlanguage pragmatics focuses on the dynamics and dialogic aspects of communication. According to Taguchi (2017) interactional competence includes: "knowledge of rhetorical scripts, lexis and syntax specific to the practice, the turn-taking system, topic management, repair and recognition and productions of boundaries between speech activities" (p. 5). All of these resources allow the students to bring together construction of discourse and meaning making. This concept of interactional competence lines up with contemporary definitions of pragmatics since both point to the primary object of study in pragmatics, which is speaker-hearer interaction in a socioculturally-bounded act.

There is no denying that teaching pragmatics in schools equips students with the necessary skills and awareness to communicate effectively, navigate cultural differences, and foster positive interpersonal relationships. It enhances their overall language proficiency, social competence, and prepares them for success in various academic, professional, and intercultural contexts. As Fraser (2010) points out, pragmatics is defined as: "the ability to communicate your intended message with all its nuances in any socio-cultural context and to interpret the message of your interlocutor as it was intended" (p. 15). From this argument, two main points are drawn: the relevance of context and contextual information in real-life speech and the highlight of aspects that deviate from semantic and linguistic data, which are key elements of Pragmatics. This definition draws attention to the argument, that conversations in a second language need the factor of spontaneity, Overall, there seems to be some evidence to indicate that students are missing the input of real-life conversations, where utterances get misinterpreted, where sometimes rephrasing your speech is necessary, where the real meaning of an utterance is not just what is being said. These features of the language are if not never, seldom shown in textbooks or in instructional materials. Instead, students are left with very simple and straight-to -the-point interactions that feel unnatural.

What is more, Ożańska-Ponikwia and Dewaele (2012) even argue that those students who are exposed to the use of language in real-life situation (i.e immigration situations) are more proficient in L2 because they engage in more authentic interactions and that curiosity in the L2 language and culture has a strong effect on language proficiency. It could be inferred that being competent in a language does not only mean to know how to speak it *per se,* this is, for instance, knowing how to construct grammatical patterns, such as the passive, to form an interrogative sentence, or knowing how to form sentences in present perfect tense. Knowing how to properly use grammar and vocabulary is helpful but, if only done in isolation, a huge part of language competence is being missed. As Bardovi-Harlig (1996) points out: "a learner of high grammatical proficiency will not necessarily show concomitant pragmatic competence" (p. 3). To be really competent in a language, students also need to be able to take into account a series of variables when talking with other language such as age, status, gender, social distance between the speakers, etc. that are going to modify how utterances are constructed. This is not a mere postulation or personal preference of some teachers, it is included in the official curriculum LOMLOE (2023) as part of the Bloque III "Interculturalidad" which argues that: "También incluye patrones culturales básicos propios de la lengua extranjera, aspectos socioculturales y sociolingüísticos básicos relativos a la vida cotidiana, las condiciones de vida

y las relaciones interpersonales; convenciones sociales básicas; lenguaje no verbal, cortesía lingüística y etiqueta digital" (p.7). Noticeably, the curriculum talks about aspects such as interpersonal relationships, social conventions, and non-verbal language which are all elements closely related to how language works in context.

This focus on pragmatic competence is not casual; very often a pragmatic error can obstruct communication more than a grammatical error. As noted by Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor (2003), when speakers are unaware of social or cultural norms, the interlocutor can misinterpret the speaker's intention and judge the speaker's moral not his knowledge of the language. That is because pragmatics touch on personal and abstract aspects of the language and of its speakers. For native speakers it is difficult to discern whether someone is purposefully being impolite or if they simply have not been taught to be polite in a second language.

For instance, if at a high school, a teacher asks their student if they have done the homework and the student replies: "No teacher, I don't did it"*, there is a grammatical error in regards to the use of tenses and auxiliary verbs, but the general meaning and intention is still comprehensible. However, if the student answered: "No bro, I didn't do it", there is not a grammatical error, but a pragmatic one in that the social distance between teacher and student obliges the student not to use slang terms such as "bro" to refer to older people. In this second case, the teacher is not going to judge his pragmatics knowledge but is probably going to make a moral judgment of the student (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003, as cited by Mariana, 2021) The conclusion drawn is that this second pragmatic error can lead to bigger problems in communication than the first grammatical error.

Most of the time students make these types of mistakes out of lack of pragmatic awareness. Since they have not been taught to be aware about all these aspects nor trained to answer correctly to them, it cannot be expected from them to use them properly. There are a series of strategies that help language users to be more polite, more resolutive and more competent when communicating with others that most of the time are ignored when teaching a foreign language. These strategies can be acquired through intuition in language users' mother tongue, more or less successfully. However, when learning a second language, intuition cannot be used and other tools are necessary in order to acquire this pragmatic knowledge. In spite of how relevant these strategies are in daily life, they are rarely seen being instructed nor learnt in educational contexts (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996). As it has been established, pragmatic competence is a key

element in language proficiency, however it has also been a neglected aspect of language teaching.

2.3. Limitations of input and practice in secondary school EFL classrooms

As it has been established, the development of the students' pragmatic competence boosts their overall language proficiency. However, in this section an overview of the main limitations regarding pragmatic input and practice in EFL contexts will be outlined. The main circumstances analyzed are monolingual and low-socioeconomic contexts, teachers' insecurity of their pragmatic competence and students' shyness and insecurity which result in rigid and planned interactions, among other factors.

Teachers and education professionals have to make sure that languages are instructed in context. The language learner must know how to use a language in real-life situations. For years, students have been told to learn by heart and repeat isolated and archaic grammatical patterns without any kind of context and have been forced to memorize decontextualized vocabulary that they do not use outside of the classroom. What is more, the LOMLOE (2023) recommends that teachers teach the basic knowledge content: "Partiendo del MCER y teniendo en cuenta las dimensiones del alumnado, es determinante que estén contextualizados en situaciones reales, de manera que puedan ser útiles y que el alumnado los pueda utilizar en situaciones comunicativas" (p. 6).

As teachers of a second language, the number of real-life situations that can be created for students are scarce. Most students live in monolingual households and do not need to learn a second language in order to live comfortably. Spain is a country where the English language is a foreign language (EFL), which means that students do not have many opportunities to use the language outside of the academic context. What is more, according to Lasagabaster (2009), "in formal contexts of language teaching (such as schools) the socioeconomic background may determine the children's FL experience, but the educational level of parents has a more significant influence on their FL learning success" (p. 6).

In the Canarian context this is especially concerning since according to Consejo Escolar de Canarias (2020) 38,7% of people between 18 and 64 years old have the ESO as their maximum level of education achieved, whereas in Spain the number is 6 points below that, with a 31,7%

(p.75). In all likelihood, most students only speak English in class with their teacher and their colleagues. Almost all of the interactions that students can practice in class are with other students, who, due to a lack of practice, tend to be shy or insecure of their speaking skills. This results in conversations that are extremely planned and rigid, without space for improvisation or non-prepared reactions.

A recent study by Wang and Marecki (2021) revealed student's negative and positive feelings about participating and interacting in class with their peers and teachers in an English classroom in China. Among many of the comments that students had, some argued that due to their overthinking, shyness, nervousness, fear of making grammatical mistakes and aim towards perfection affected negatively their interaction in class which made some students perceive their comments as a "failure" or to experience negative emotions. Both statements reflect how students feel like they need to prepare beforehand their participation in class in order not to make mistakes nor feel embarrassed in front of their classmates. However, later in the study, after the teacher's intervention, most students felt better about their contributions and expressed more positive feelings.

In a similar study done in Spain, Merino-Crespo (2019) tried to find out the effect the variable of anxiety had in students of EFL. The study found that students in Spanish contexts had a moderate level of anxiety. Specifically, highest levels of anxiety were related to having to use the foreign language outside of the educational context. These results seem to indicate that students do not feel ready to make use of the language with a purely social purpose. This anxiety can result in a lack of spontaneous interaction.

In order to improve students' experiences and encourage real participation and interaction in the EFL classrooms, teachers should try to discern the best way to teach and incite pragmatic competence. Many studies exist in the literature regarding pragmatics in EFL teaching contexts. Before specializing on specific speech acts, researchers tried to discern what were the best methods to implement pragmatic teaching in educational contexts. The existing body of research suggests that explicit pragmatic instruction provides better learning results than implicit instruction. In a study conducted by Alcón-Soler (2005), 132 students were randomly assigned to three different groups; one where the instruction was explicit by means of tasks aimed to raise their pragmatic awareness and by receiving meta pragmatic feedback, another group where the tasks were implemented in an implicit way, and a last control group. The conclusion was that learners benefited from both explicit and implicit instruction, but the

explicit instruction group showed a better performance over the implicit group. Existing research recognizes the critical role played by output in EFL learning. As Jernigan (2012) demonstrated in a classroom-based study, the students in the output-focused group outperformed the students in the comprehension-focused group. Although both groups had an identical amount of exposure to the pragmatic materials, which were in the form of video-vignettes, the output group had far better outcomes in the written pragmatic acceptability judgment task.

It should be noted that along with the limitations of formal contexts that have been examined in this section, there is another key aspect of EFL teaching, which is the materials used in instruction. As a means to draw a whole picture of the state of affairs of EFL pragmatic competence teaching, the role played by textbooks should also be examined. Its relevance and main drawbacks will be explored in the next section.

2.4. Limitations of input and practice in secondary school EFL textbooks

In contrast to the literature regarding pragmatic instruction in EFL contexts, there is a relatively small body of literature that explores how pragmatics is treated in secondary school EFL textbooks. An example of this body of research is Schauer's (2022) analysis of EFL textbooks in Germany. The quantitative and qualitative analysis focused on the amount and type of agreement and disagreement strategies that appeared in the textbooks in the *Lighthouse* series, by Cornelsen Publishing House. She also investigated the strategies secondary school students were able to use. Schauer (2022) found that the six textbooks by Cornelsen Publishing House, *Lighthouse* series analyzed in the study had a total of 135 agreement and 136 disagreement strategies, a very fair number. However, the study also concluded that the number of disagreement tokens was smaller than the number of agreement tokens, 79 and 114 respectively. Some interesting facts are that students were able to use more agreement strategies than those shown in the textbooks, which alludes to either learners transferring from their L1 into L2 or students acquiring this knowledge from other sources. Surprisingly enough, Schauer found out that a high number of attack-statement strategies were used in the textbooks. Although it could be expected not to find these kinds of impolite strategies in traditional textbooks, the use of these strategies exposes students to authentic language use, which could

be argued to have a positive effect in students cultural and social knowledge (it was also found that in higher years, these strategies were replaced by more formal ones).

Other two studies have also been carried out in Vietnamese and Chinese contexts by Nguyen (2011) and Ren and Han (2016). Whereas Nguyen found out that agreements and disagreements were included in all the textbooks, agreements were only included in the workbook for year 10 and disagreements were not included in any of the workbooks, Ren and Han found out that agreements and disagreements were only included in three of the ten textbooks they had analyzed. However, in this study, there is no further distinction between agreement and disagreement, therefore it cannot be discerned if one was given preference over the other. Both studies touch on how little importance is given to the (dis)agreement strategies. Another remarkable study is that by Seto (2009) who analyzed agreement strategies in five different secondary school English textbooks in Hong Kong, whose results indicated that the strategies found are rather scarce. Liew (2016) compared three textbooks from Oxford University Press, New Headway Series to their corresponding Malaysian textbooks in secondary school. She found out that the first books contained a larger number of agreement strategies than the latter and that both books had less disagreements strategies than agreement strategies, just like Schauer's (2022) findings. Interestingly enough, whereas the Malaysian textbook preferred the use of more formal strategies, the New Headway series included shorter and more informal expressions. In the same line as Seto, both authors agree that there appears to be no agreement between textbook writers or publishers with regards to which disagreement or agreement strategies students should be exposed to. Very little is currently known about how EFL materials deal with pragmatic content and what effect it has on EFL students. Therefore, looking at the current literature on agreement and disagreement strategies in EFL textbooks, this study aims to provide similar research to those mentioned before, but in the Spanish educational context, along with a teaching proposal in order to compensate for the lack or ineffectiveness of current textbooks.

Along with the lack pragmatic strategies present in textbooks as discussed by authors such as Seto (2009), Nguyen (2011), Ren and Han (2016), or Liew (2016), one of the biggest problems teachers face when wanting to teach pragmatics to students is the lack of authentic and quality didactic materials or the equal lack of guidance on how to proceed in said task. A lot of teachers resort to the textbook as the main tool to organize and structure their classes. Nevertheless,

current textbooks pay little attention to no attention at all in developing this pragmatic competence.

Most textbooks do not offer any explanation about pragmatic concepts or how to use these strategies in the first place, which is a problem since the majority of studies comparing implicit versus explicit instruction found out that explicit instruction provides better learning results than implicit instruction (Alcón-Soler, 2005). Some textbook materials also fail at providing exercises or activities that encourage the pragmatic production of the students, instead of just exercises that ask students to match phrases or to listen and copy. Therefore, there is no room for the students to actually use the language. As Kasper states (1997): "without a pragmatic focus, foreign language teaching raises students' metalinguistic awareness, but it does not contribute much to their metapragmatic consciousness in L2" (para. 14). Moreover, as some authors indicate the material presented is generally completely decontextualized, inaccurate, unnatural and based on archaic models of language (Martinez-Flor, 2007).

As it has been previously mentioned, in addition to the lack of authentic input that teachers or textbooks of EFL can offer, other problems add to the difficulties of teaching pragmatics that make this discipline a last priority for a lot of teachers of English and other foreign languages. As Taguchy and Sykes (2013) points out the absence of authentic didactic materials, the limitations of the classroom and of monolingual contexts, the difficulty to numerically evaluate this competence, the lack of real interaction, the lack of practice from the students and the lack of real contexts that can be provided to students all contribute to the detriment of this competence. On top of that, many non-native teachers feel that they lack the expertise to teach pragmatics, and this feeling is somehow corroborated by the fact that most textbooks and other written materials are based on native-speaker's intuition rather than on empirical research of pragmatic norms (Boxer, 2003). Students obviously lack in this matter because they simply do not have to face real-life situations where they could put to the test their pragmatic strategies. To be pragmatically competent, students of a second language need to know how to carry out "speech acts", produce non-literal meanings, understand implicatures, use politeness strategies, know how to make use of the different discursive functions and have a general cultural and social knowledge.

Another major problem that hinders the teaching of pragmatics is that pragmatics is not exclusively a linguistic matter. There are other factors that come into play such as intonation, body language, the speaker's aspect, their facial expressions, their tone of voice, the

relationship between speakers, etc. All of these aspects are completely ignored and impossible to take into account through written and listened exercises. Therefore, it is necessary to find different methods and ways to progressively introduce real interaction in the classrooms and encourage students to practice the language in a realistic and relevant way for them. Consequently, there has been an increasing interest in alleviating these gaps of knowledge, which is why some authors have recurred to working with pragmatics through audiovisual materials. This is supported by the LOMLOE curriculum (2023), which argues that the didactic materials chosen by the teacher have to be innovative, varied, flexible and adapted to the interests and necessities of the students; the materials should also adapt to the different learning styles (visual, auditory and kinesthetic) and special attention to the ICT offers immediate approximation to different languages and cultures and maximize language learning. (p. 9)

2.5. Teaching speech acts through audiovisual materials: Recent proposals

In the two previous sections a brief overview of the main difficulties that obstruct teaching pragmatic competence in EFL contexts was provided. Many problems hinder pragmatic competence instruction, such as the students lack of practice which result in anxiety to use the language, the sense of poor expertise by non-native teachers and the poor quality of traditional textbooks, among others. In this section, a review of pragmatic instruction in a general lens will be provided, along with a literary review on a particular teaching proposal, which is teaching speech acts through audiovisual materials.

Much of the studies done on pragmatic competence have revealed that most pragmatic features are indeed teachable and that instruction helps to improve students' pragmatic competence and conscience. On the same line, there has been a tendency to categorize speech act expressions across languages in order to reveal culturally specific features of speech acts and to be able to make comparisons among them as showed by the project the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realisation Project by Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989).

A speech act refers to an act performed by the speaker through the use of language. It focuses on the functional aspects of language, examining how utterances are not only used to convey information but also to perform actions and achieve specific communicative purposes. Austin (1962) argued that utterances are not just descriptive or informative but can also have performative functions. Some of the speech acts that have occupied researchers the most are

the speech acts of requests, suggestions, apologies, offers, refusals of offers, agreements and disagreements.

By studying speech acts in an explicit way, students of EFL develop their pragmatic competence better (Taguchi, 2017). However, many authors have tried to elucidate which may be the best way to teach said speech acts. In recent years, there has been a growing body of research that has highlighted the potential benefits of using movies and TV series as a tool for improving the pragmatic competence of second-language students. This is because movies and TV series can provide a wealth of contextual, corporal, and linguistic information that is often difficult to obtain through traditional language learning materials. This can be particularly beneficial for second-language learners, as it allows them to develop a more nuanced understanding of the language, including its cultural and contextual nuances. Moreover, because movies and TV series are often set in real-world contexts, they provide a more authentic and immersive learning experience, which can help to improve language retention and comprehension. By analyzing the communication strategies used in these media, students can develop a deeper understanding of the social and cultural norms that underpin the language, and learn how to use language more effectively in real-world settings (Martínez-Flor, 2007).

It is crucial to acknowledge that the authenticity of dialogues in movies and TV shows has sometimes been questioned. In fact, the assertion that TV series and movies employ unnatural language has been a common criticism of using such media for language learning purposes. Indeed, several researchers have argued that movie dialogues fail to reflect the real nature of ordinary speech. Especially in a recent study by Ryan and Granville (2020), which argued that phone calls in movies reflected inaccurate models of conversations because they lacked the natural "sequencing of talk". However, several studies have shown that dialogues in fact imitate real-life data, and above all, are more natural than materials presented in language textbooks.

One of the earliest studies is the one conducted by Rose (1997), where the occurrence of compliments in 46 American movies was compared with a corpus of compliments and found that movie data closely matched that of naturally-occurring speech data. In a follow-up study, Rose (2001) also found out that syntactic formulae, compliment topic and compliment strategy responses from movies data was similar to natural language speech. Along the same lines, Grant and Starks (2001) investigated the speech act of closings in movies, by comparing closing in 23 EFL textbooks and in 50 episodes of the soap opera *Shortland Street* and found out that conversations in TV imitated more accurately naturally-occuring speech than the textbooks,

and provided a wider variety of functional conversational English. In turn, in their study, Martinez-Flor and Fernandez-Guerra (2002) compared the appearance of three exhortative speech acts (requests, suggestions and advice acts) in coursebooks and movies. They found similar results to those of Tatsuki and Nishizawa (2005) who focused on the speech act of compliments. Both studies found that TV interviews and conversations served as reliable models for presenting pragma linguistic forms to students. Alcón-Soler (2005) investigated the speech act of requests, finding similar results as the previous researchers. Then, Martínez-Flor (2007) carried out a similar study on request modification devices, which revealed that all types of internal and external modifiers were found in the data from the movies and they were all completely contextualized.

Therefore, as Rose (2001, as cited in Usó-Juan & Martínez-Flor, 2021) suggests, although movies are not a perfect copy of real-life conversations, they are somehow very similar and they suppose a more accurate representation of spontaneous conversation and speech acts. Moreover, the language used in these media is often tailored to suit specific contexts and characters. In addition, it is worth noting that efficient language learning requires developing communicative competence, which is the ability to use language effectively in a range of social contexts and situations. TV series and movies can be highly effective tools for developing communicative competence, as they provide a wealth of contextual and cultural information that is often difficult to obtain through traditional language learning materials.

Examples of studies which have implemented instructional approaches using audiovisual materials are those conducted by Abrams (2014, 2016) in the German context. In order to decide whether or not the visualization of TV series developed students' pragmatic awareness, the author carried out an instructional study. Results showed that the movie exposure was beneficial for the students since it provided them with contextualized situations and language input. Abrams (2016) affirmed that, after having watched some fragments of the TV show 'Rosenheim-Cops', her students of German could express the level of politeness required for an interaction between a manager and guests at a hotel linguistically more successfully than before having watched the TV series fragments. The visualization of the scene conferred them with context and helped the students identify the speech participants, the scenery and the purpose of the interaction and to modify the language accordingly. There are other studies carried out in the Spanish context, such as those by Martínez-Flor (2007) who focused on the request modification devices of the speech act of requesting in ten different movies that were

analyzed, finding 113 request citations, which contained 134 request moves. The findings defended that movie scenes are a good source of pragmatic input since occurrences of all types of internal and external modification devices were found and that all devices took place in completely contextualized situations. These findings allude to the great pedagogical implications that movie-based input have on students' pragmatic competence.

However, simply seeing movies and TV shows without further discussion and introspection is unfruitful. EFL students need to deepen on the content they see, in aims to activate their pragmatic consciousness and to borrow from these movies and TV series' strategies and social context (Abrams, 2014). In order to do this in an orderly way, in the teaching proposal the *SPEAKING Framework* will be used as the main instrument for instruction. The framework was firstly created by Hymes in 1974 and used and refined later on by different researchers.

This framework highlights the principal components of any conversation. It takes into account linguistic as well as pragmatic and contextual information. It is called SPEAKING because it is the acronym of the 8 elements it helps to analyze. Those eight components are: Setting (S) (i.e., physical circumstances), Participants (P) (i.e., interactants), Ends (E) (i.e., goals of the conversation), Act sequence (A) (i.e., form and order of events), Key (K) (i.e., tone of conversation), Instrumentalities (I) (i.e., style of speech), Norm (N) (i.e., rules of interaction) and Genre (G) (i.e., kind of speech event). (Usó-Juan & Martínez-Flor, 2021, p. 61)

Apart from this framework, Usó-Juan and Martínez-Flor recommend adding awareness-raising questions related to these eight categories that will further guide the students. Hence, the studies conducted in the field of second-language acquisition have provided valuable insights into the use of audiovisual materials such as movies and TV series as an effective tool for improving and further developing pragmatic production skills and awareness among second-language learners. As Jernigan (2012) states: "the use of video-based pragmatic instruction is recommended not only in research settings, but in the EFL classroom and other second language learning settings in order to teach more successfully the complexities of pragmatics" (p. 8). These studies have shown that visualizing such materials can provide a contextual and physical context that is often unavailable in traditional language learning exercises, and can show body language and intonation, as well as many other features that are important for developing pragmatic competence.

In addition to the use of audiovisual materials, the researches by Hymes (1974) and Usó-Juan (2002) have highlighted the importance of the SPEAKING Framework as a powerful tool for organizing and structuring students' impressions in an orderly way. The framework provides a clear structure for students to organize their thoughts and impressions, and it includes further raising-awareness questions that aim to guide them and decodify pragmatic strategies and features. By using this framework, students can develop a deeper understanding of the language and its pragmatic nuances, and can become more effective communicators in real-world settings.

3. THE PRESENT STUDY

As it has been mentioned before, a search of the literature reveals that not many studies have focused their attention on EFL materials' pragmatic input in the Spanish educational context. Some researchers have analyzed pragmatic strategies in EFL textbooks and traditional materials in Vietnamese (Nguyen, 2011), Chinese (Ren and Han, 2016), Malaysian (Liew, 2016) and German (Schauer, 2022) contexts. The present study aims to bridge the gap in the Spanish context.

The purpose of this thesis is twofold: First, to conduct an analysis of the occurrence of (dis)agreement strategies in EFL traditional materials (more specifically, two textbooks from levels 3re and 4th of compulsory secondary education) in order to understand the nature of the pragmatic input and instruction that students receive through such materials. Second, to present a teaching proposal that uses audiovisual materials, and that is based on the findings from the textbook analysis and informed by previous research.

The speech act of (dis)agreement in particular has been chosen for many reasons. Firstly, because, unlike other speech acts such as requests or refusals of offers, (dis)agreements have not been studied as much and as in depth as said speech acts. Moreover, there seems to be a gap in the literature regarding (dis)agreement in EFL contexts in the Spanish educational system, which this study aims to palliate. Secondly, politeness theory, which is a fundamental pillar in pragmatics theory developed by the sociolinguists Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (1978) explores how politeness and social interaction are intertwined. The theory talks about the different strategies language users employ in order to maintain positive social relationships and manage potential threats to their own and others' "face". The "face" refers to

a person's social identity or self-image, this "face" can be positive or negative, and the strategies employed can be directed to protect either the positive or negative face or other people's faces. Regarding face, there are certain actions that intrinsically threaten the face. Levinson and Brown distinguish between two types of face threatening acts, those that threaten the addressee's negative-face want and those that threaten the positive-face want. In the last category, Brown and Levinson (1978) argue that positive-face threatening act are

> Those that show that S has a negative evaluation of some aspect of H's positive face: (a) expression of disapproval, criticism, contempt or ridicule, complaints and reprimands, accusation, insults (S indicates that de doesn't like/ want one or more of H's want, acts, personal characteristics, goods, beliefs, or values), (b) contradictions or disagreements, challenges (S indicates that he thinks H is wrong or misguided or unreasonable about some issue, such wrongness being associated with disapproval (p. 314).

Therefore, as Brown and Levinson explain, disagreement is a type of speech act that is very delicate since it can directly threaten the positive face of the listener. This means that disagreements are face-threatening acts by themselves. This is of special concern because in the LOMLOE (2023) curriculum, specific competence 6 argues:

> Además, favorece el desarrollo de una sensibilidad artística y cultural y la capacidad de identificar y emplear una gran variedad de estrategias que permitan establecer relaciones con personas de otras culturas. A medida que el alumnado avance por los distintos cursos de esta etapa, tendrá que aplicar, de modo progresivo, mayor autonomía en su repertorio de estrategias, así como incluir valoraciones y juicio crítico en situaciones interculturales cada vez más complejas y variadas. (p. 6)

 It can be argued that "more complex and different intercultural situations" can refer to face threatening acts which include disagreements. What is more, the CEFR (2020) adds as a descriptor of language proficiency in level A2 in the scale "Informal discussion" that the language user: "can agree and disagree with others" and "can express opinions in a limited

way" (p.75). Therefore, agreeing and disagreeing is a key ability needed to be developed by the students, and special attention should be paid to disagreeing for its "face-threatening" nature.

4. METHOD

4.1 Target level

The target level chosen has been the 4th year of ESO because it is the maximum level of compulsory education. The textbooks of the 3rd and 4th year have been analyzed in order to have a broad and complete picture of students' previous knowledge and students' exposure to (dis)agreement strategies.

4.2. Textbook Corpus

The textbooks analyzed in this study are "New Action", by the editorial Burlington Books, from the 3rd and 4th years of compulsory secondary school. The study also focuses on these two levels, because a progression on the third cycle can be observed. Moreover, as Schauer (2022) reminds us: "intermediate secondary school learners are very rarely focussed on in interlanguage pragmatic studies to date, as those tend to either focus on primary school learners (e.g., Rose, 2000; Schauer, 2019; Chapter 5, this volume), advanced secondary school learners (e.g., Warga, 2004) or university learners (e.g., Félix-Brasdeger, 2007; Glaser, 2014; Bardovi-Harlig; Mossman & Vellenga, 2015)" (p. 147). Therefore, it is considered of great interest to examine these same researches but in secondary and intermediate level audiences.

4.2.1. 3rd year textbook

The 3rd year Student's Book has 150 pages and is divided into 9 units, and each unit has exactly 10 pages. The units are: Unit 1-Fabolous Food (from pages 10 to 20), Unit 2-Look at That! (from pages 20 to 30), Unit 3-Win or Lose (from pages 30 to 40), Unit 4-On the Road (from pages 44 to 54), Unit 5-What a Story! (from pages 54 to 64), Unit 6-Changing Styles (from

pages 64 to 74), Unit 7-Blast Off! (from pages 78 to 88), Unit 8-Saving Our Cities (from pages 88 to 98) and Unit 9-What's New? (from pages 98 to 108). Added to these units, there are three "Reviews" at the end of every three units, which is a series of exercises aimed to review the materials of the units, an Introduction mini unit from pages 4 to 10 and six Appendices (Culture Magazine, Spelling Appendix, Pronunciation Appendix, Pair work Appendix, Irregular Verb List and Grammar Extension). The contents are further subdivided into six general categories: Vocabulary, Reading, Grammar, Listening, Speaking and Writing. Meaning that there is a space reserved for these six skills in each unit. Furthermore, the units are subdivided into the same sections as the textbook from 4th year. There is a Vocabulary and Listening sections at the beginning of the unit, then there are the sections Speaking and Reading, then two pages dedicated to Grammar exercises, then a Vocabulary section and a Reading accompanied by a text and finally, a section called "English in Action!" which is divided into Listening and Speaking exercises and a final a Writing section.

4.2.2. 4th year textbook

The 4th year Student's Book has 143 pages and is divided into 9 units, and each unit has around 10 pages. The units are: Unit 1-Curious Places (from pages 10 to 20), Unit 2-That's a Laugh! (from pages 20 to 30), Unit 3-Anything is Possible (from pages 30 to 40), Unit 4-Keep it Green (from pages 44 to 54), Unit 5-Family and Friends (from pages 54 to 64), Unit 6-What a Crime (from pages 64 to 74), Unit 7-Man Over Nature (from pages 78 to 88), Unit 8-Around the World (from pages 88 to 98) and Unit 9-People and Products (from pages 98 to 108). Added to these units, there are three "Reviews" at the end of every three units, which is a series of exercises aimed to review the materials of the units, an Introduction mini unit from pages 4 to 6 and six Appendices (Culture Magazine, Spelling Appendix, Pronunciation Appendix, Pairwork Appendix, Irregular Verb List and Grammar Extension). The contents are further subdivided into six general categories: Vocabulary, Reading, Grammar, Listening, Speaking and Writing. Meaning that there is a space reserved for these six skills in each unit.

Inside a unit, the distribution of sections and exercises is always the same. So, the content is further divided into little sections inside each unit and they all follow the same pattern. Firstly, at the beginning of the unit the Vocabulary and Listening sections can be found, then there are the sections Speaking and Reading, after that there are two pages dedicated to Grammar

exercises, then a Vocabulary section and a Reading accompanied by a text and finally as a closing of the unit there is a section called "English in Action!" which is divided into Listening and Speaking exercises and finally a Writing section.

As it can be seen, the division of the content and overall organization of the textbooks are identical in both years. The group of students in 4th year have used the Student's Book and Workbook in 3rd year in the same way they do now since they have had the same teacher and have had access to the same materials. Therefore, by looking at both textbooks a greater understanding not only of what students know but also of their progress will be found.

4.3. Procedure

The aim of the research is to count how many agreements and disagreements strategies are presented in the textbook "New Action", by Burlington in 3rd and 4th years. All units, plus extra appendices have been examined. Each page and each exercise is looked at individually, including those with audio content. Moreover, the agreement and disagreement strategies will be further divided into further categories depending on the type of agreement or disagreement they represent.

First the definition of agreement and disagreement that has been followed in the present study should be given. In this study agreements are utterances that indicate to the interlocutor(s) that the speaker agrees with their previous evaluation assertion and disagreements are utterances that indicate to the interlocutor(s) that the speaker does not agree with their previous evaluation/ assertion (Schauer, 2022). This part of the research is heavily inspired by the work of Schauer (2022) *Interlanguage Pragmatic Development in a German EFL Secondary School Context*, which is a profound and exhaustive research on EFL instructional materials. The following strategies with their respective examples presented are taken from the German EFL learners' data and they will serve as criteria in order further categorize the agreement and disagreement strategies seen in the textbooks by Burlington Books (pp.152-154):

Agreement strategies are the following ones:

- Agreement token: this strategy includes short words or formulaic expressions that show agreement, such as *yes*, *yeah I agree (that's)/ (you're) right*. For example: A) "Ooh…,

look who is there, the neighbour's new dog is soo cute, isn't he?", B) "Ooh yes, the dog is so cute".

- Same evaluation: the speaker produces an utterance that shows the interlocutor that they evaluate the issue similarly. For example: A) "Look the sun is shining! Isn't it a beautiful day today?", B: "Yes, it is wonderful"

- Downgraded evaluation: although the speaker shows agreement with the interlocutor, the force of agreement is weaker than the interlocutor's force (this strategy is on the end of the agreement scale close and can be close to disagreements). For example: A) "What an awful test! Physics is the most awful subject ever", B) "Yes, it is difficult".

- Upgraded evaluation: the speaker's assessment is more positive or negative than the original evaluation of their interlocutor. For example: A) "The neighbor's new dog is soo cute, isn't he?", B) "Yeah, it's maybe the cutest thing I ever saw"

- Topic expander: the speaker expands on their agreement by marking additional statements that are in-line with the agreed proposition. For example: A) "Look the sun is shining! Isn't it a beautiful day?", B) "Yes, it's a beautiful day today. I think I will wear a T-shirt".

- Perspective change: when the speaker is in agreement with the interlocutor, they highlight further aspects related to the topic that provide a difference on the issue. For example: A) "Mr.Atkins must be crazy!!! 5 pages about the Second World War in 3 days, this is absolutely impossible", B) "Yes, it is. But in Germany our teacher gave us bigger homework than Mr. Atkins gave".

- Rhetorical question: a rhetorical question is asked that is in-line with the agreed proposition. For example: A) "Mr.Atkins must be crazy!!! 5 pages about the Second World War in 3 days, this is absolutely impossible!, B) !How long does it take? 3 hours? I don't want to do this homework!

- Knowledge marker: the responder agrees by laying claim to the same knowledge or belief as the giver of the assessment, by saying *I know* or *I think so*. For example: A) "What an awful test! Physics is the most awful subject ever", B) "Yes, I think so".

Disagreement strategies are listed below:

- Disagreement token: this includes words or formulaic expressions that show a speaker or writer's disagreement, such as *no, that's wrong, I don't agree*. For example: A) "I think I have heard that German people don't like barbecues", B) "No, Germans love barbecues" or "That's wrong, I like barbecues"

- Hedged negation: the producer of the utterance conveys their disagreement more indirectly with the use of hedges, such as *I don't think so*. For example: A) "I think I have heard that German people don't like barbecues", B) "Oh, I don't think so. My friends and I like barbecues"

- Contradiction: the speaker or writer produces an utterance that clearly conveys to their interlocutor that they do not share the interlocutor's view. This can be done by (partially) repeating the preceding utterance and taking the opposite stance. For example: A) "That was fun, wasn't it? Teasing the toddlers is the best", B) "No! It is not funny"

- General statement: a general statement is made that shows disagreement with the interlocutor's previous utterance. For example: A) "Yuck! Can't they do that in private? This is so inappropriate!", B) "Oh no, love is something nice"

- Attack-rhetorical question: the interlocutor's view is attacked by asking a rhetorical question that attacks their face. For example: A) "That was fun, wasn't it? Teasing the toddlers is the best", B) "Are you dumb? That wasn't nice, the poor kid"

- Attack-statement: the interlocutor's utterance is attacked by the use of face-threatening statements or names. For example: A) "That was fun, wasn't it? Teasing the toddlers is the best", B) "You are a moron"

- Challenge: the interlocutor's view is challenged by a direct utterance that shows disagreement and may also convey aggression. For example: A) "I think I have heard that German people don't like barbecues", B) "That isn't right. Who said that? We often have a barbecue in summer and we have the *rost bratwurst* which is very delicious"

- Command: the speaker forcefully tells the interlocutor to do or not do something. For example: A) "Yuck! Can't they do that in private? This is so inappropriate!", B) "They are just in love. Leave them alone. You don't have to look at it"

- Question: the speaker indicates they either doubt the interlocutor's utterance and/ or that they would like more information. For example: A) "Yuck! Can't they do that in

private? This is so inappropriate!", B) "Why is it so problematic for you? If they want to do this here they can do it here"

- Sympathy: the producer of the utterance shows empathy towards a third person that has been negatively affected by the interlocutor's actions. For example: A) "That was fun, wasn't it? Teasing the toddlers is the best", B) "Are you dumb? That wasn't nice, the poor kid"

- Consequence: the producer of the utterance makes the interlocutor aware of the (potential) consequences of their actions. For example: A) "That was fun, wasn't it? Teasing the toddlers is the best", B) "No, that's wrong. It wasn't funny. He is dirty and hurt"

- Perspective change: the producer of the utterance makes the interlocutor aware of a different perspective by asking them to consider being in a different position or being the recipient of the interlocutor's actions. For example: A) "That was fun, wasn't it? Teasing the toddlers is the best", B) "It isn't funny to tease the toddlers. I think you also don't want other people teasing you"

- Grounder: the speaker provides an explanation for their disagreement. For example: A) "That was fun, wasn't it? Teasing the toddlers is the best", B) "No, I think it's very unfair because you are stronger than he is. We have to protect them"

In this analysis, instances where "No, I don't think so" are an answer to a yes-or-no question and not an answer that shows disagreement will not be taken into account. It can be argued that this is a hedged negation but is only a negative answer to a question and not necessarily a disagreement. However, contrary to Schauer, answers to suggestions ("Let's go to the cinema", "Great idea!") and offers ("I can help you with that", "Yes! That would be awesome") are investigated and taken into consideration in the study. It is worth noting that each instance in the textbook of any (dis)agreement is only counted once, this is, is only organized in one strategy, this was not done on purpose, but it is the natural way in which the strategies were used in the textbook

5. CORPUS ANALYSIS RESULTS

When embarking on the task of teaching "Agreements and Disagreements," it is essential to assess the existing knowledge of students and the type of input they have been exposed to. This project aims to conduct an objective study of the communicative needs and areas of weakness among the students, to then focus on innovative ways to enhance these skills. To accomplish this, we will begin by thoroughly analyzing the materials used by the 4th year group.

Our analysis will focus on the textbooks provided by Burlington, specifically the "New Action" Student's Book of years 3rd and 4th ESO. A meticulous search for any instances of speech acts related to "Agreement and Disagreement" within these materials will be done.

By thoroughly examining these materials, the aim is to gain insight into the pragmatic strategies that the students are familiar with, as well as those they may be unaware of. Their level of familiarity with specific strategies and determine the frequency with which students are exposed to them will also be assessed. For a comprehensive analysis, the focus is on the Student's Book of the third cycle (3rd ESO and 4th ESO), evaluating the pragmatic strategies presented to students using "New Action" by Burlington Books textbooks.

Through this detailed exploration of the provided materials, it is expected to acquire a solid understanding of the students' knowledge of pragmatic strategies, their familiarity with different approaches, and the extent to which these strategies are reinforced. This analysis will form the basis for further enhancing their understanding and application of "Agreements and Disagreements" in their communication skills.

5.1. Analysis of 3rd year textbook

The data show that the textbook contains only twelve examples of agreements and eighteen examples of disagreement. Table 1 below shows the occurrence of agreement strategies across the different units in the textbook, while Table 2 shows the instances of disagreement strategies. In order to facilitate the reading of the tables, the number 1 has been highlighted in gray, number 2 in green and number 3 in red.

Table 1

3rd year textbook agreement strategies

	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3	Unit 4	Unit 5	Unit 6	Unit 7	Unit 8	Unit 9	Grammar extension	Total number
Agreement token	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	6
Same evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Downgraded evaluation	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Upgraded evaluation	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Topic expander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Perspective change	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rhetorical question	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knowledge marker	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

With regards to the agreement strategies used, units 1, 6 and 9 are the units with more strategies with three strategies used in each unit. However, in units 2, 5, 7 and 8 there is not any agreement strategy used. Taking a closer look into the specific types of strategies used, regarding agreement strategies, the most used speech act is agreement token, being used 6 times in the whole textbook. This may be due to the fact that agreement token is the simplest way to agree with someone as sometimes it is made up of just one word like "Right", "That's true" or "Yes". Contrarily, the least used agreement strategies are knowledge marker and downgraded evaluation, both used just once.

Table 2

3rd year textbook disagreement strategies

	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3	Unit 4	Unit 5	Unit 6	Unit 7	Unit 8	Unit 9	Grammar extension	Total number
Disagreement token	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	5
Hedged negation	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Contradiction	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
General statement	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Attack-rhetorical question	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attack-statement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Challenge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Command	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Question	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Sympathy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consequence	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Perspective change	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grounder	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	3	0	7

Moving on to the disagreement strategies, units 6 and 9 are the units with the most disagreement strategies with six per unit. However, units 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7, plus the Grammar Extension section do not have any disagreement strategy. Concerning the kinds of strategies, the most used strategy is grounder, used seven times in total whereas the least used were hedged negation and questions used twice each strategy. This is noticeably different from other least used strategies, since it is a higher number of strategies and a higher number of times used.

In addition to this, there are some strategies that do not appear in the textbook. The agreement strategies that are not used in this textbook are rhetorical question, topic expander and perspective change. In regards to the disagreement strategies, those that could not be found are contradiction, attack-rhetorical question, attack-statement, challenge, command, sympathy,

consequence, and perspective change. In conclusion, out of eight existing agreement strategies, only five appear in the textbook and out of thirteen disagreement strategies only five appear in the textbook. Once again, this could be explained as a simple statistical matter, since there are more existing disagreement strategies, it is more difficult to use all of them and therefore less strategies are used in the textbook.

All of the disagreement and agreement strategies collected in the 3rd level textbook come from the "English in action", the Speaking and the Listening sections. None of the strategies were found on the Grammar or Writing sections. In the same way, most strategies used can be found on the same exercise. Meaning that they are not evenly distributed around the textbook.

5.2. Analysis of 4th year textbook

The data show that the textbook contains fourteen instances of agreements and twenty-two instances of disagreement. Table 1 below shows the occurrence of agreement strategies across the different units in the textbook, while Table 2 shows the instances of disagreement strategies. In order to facilitate the reading of the tables, the number 1 has been highlighted in gray and number 2 in green.

Table 3

4th year textbook agreement strategies

	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3	Unit 4	Unit 5	Unit 6	Unit 7	Unit 8	Unit 9	Grammar extension	Total number
Agreement token	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Same evaluation	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
Downgraded evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Upgraded evaluation	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	4
Topic expander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Perspective change	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Rhetorical question	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knowledge marker	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4

4th year textbook disagreement strategies

	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3	Unit 4	Unit 5	Unit 6	Unit 7	Unit 8	Unit 9	Grammar extension	Total number
Disagreement token	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Hedged negation	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	8
Contradiction	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
General statement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attack-rhetorical question	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attack-statement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Challenge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Command	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Question	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sympathy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consequence	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Perspective change	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grounder	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	7

Some interesting inferences that can be drawn from this data are how Unit 1 is equally lacking on agreement and disagreement strategies. An explanation for this may be because Unit 1 is a very basic and simple introduction to the English subject which does not leave space for more complex use of the language such as agreeing or disagreeing. Contrary to what could be first expected, there are more disagreement strategies than agreement strategies used. In the whole textbook, there are fourteen instances of agreement strategies used and twenty two instances of disagreement strategies used. Therefore,

 disagreement strategies are used almost twice as much as agreement strategies used. Moreover, disagreement strategies appear in almost every unit, except for Unit 1 and 6 whereas agreement strategies do not appear in three units which makes disagreement strategies more evenly distributed.

There are not any agreement strategies in Units 1, 3 and 6. Moreover, regarding agreement strategies, in Units 4 and 7 there is only one strategy used. Regarding disagreement strategies Units 3 and 6 only use one strategy. For both kinds of speech acts, Unit 9 is the unit with more strategies used, with five disagreement strategies and four disagreement strategies. Since it is the last unit and students are supposed to have a greater level of English because they have studied more, this may give space to use greater and more varied agreement and disagreement strategies.

In 4th year Student's Book from Burlington Editorial the most used agreement strategies are: upgraded evaluation and same evaluation, both of them being used four times in total and the least used was the perspective change strategy with only one use. Now, regarding disagreement strategies the most used strategy was hedged negation, being used eight times and the least used were perspective change and command, both being used only once in the whole textbook.

Although both textbooks show a fairly varied use of strategies, there are some strategies that are not used at all and do not appear in the materials. With respect to the agreement strategies, knowledge marker, rhetorical question and topic expander strategies do not appear in the Student's Book and with reference to the disagreement strategies there are also some strategies not used such as, general statement, attack rhetorical question, attack statement, challenge, question, sympathy, consequence.

The lack of these specific disagreement strategies can be more easily explained than the lack of the agreement strategies not used. Some of the disagreement strategies not used in the textbook are all very face-threatening. For instance, attack rhetorical question, attack statement and challenge, are speech acts not suitable for an academic textbook for students which may explain why the authors have decided not to use any. In the same way, the fact that there are more disagreement strategies not used than agreement strategies may be explained as a matter of probability. Since there are more disagreement strategies that can be used than agreement strategies, respectively thirteen and eight, it is only normal that fitting all disagreement strategies is more complicated.

As it happened with the 3rd year textbook, all of the disagreement and agreement strategies collected come from the "English in action", the Speaking and the Listening sections. None of the strategies were found on the Grammar or Writing sections. In the same way, most strategies used can be found on the same exercise. Meaning that they are not evenly distributed around the textbook. For example, in only one activity, the four strategies used in the whole unit could be found. What is more, since most strategies that are in the textbook come from audio materials, this means that students are only exposed to the language but they are not encouraged to produce pragmatic strategies. On the same line, these utterances were presented without any further pragmatic explanation, meaning that students only had the opportunity to listen to them in isolation. Hence, students were presented with the strategies in an isolated and decontextualized manner, without having the opportunity to produce language and being limited to just listening to the (dis)agreement strategies.

Summarizing, the total number of strategies (both agreement and disagreement strategies) used throughout the whole 3rd cycle (3rd ESO and 4th ESO) in the Burlington Books is 66 instances.

In the 3rd year textbook, there are 30 strategies further divided into twelve agreement strategies and eighteen disagreement strategies. In the 4th year textbook, there are 36 strategies used in

total which are further subdivided into fourteen agreement strategies and twenty-two disagreement strategies. Therefore, in the 4th year there is a 9,10%% increase of overall strategies, an increase of agreement strategies of 7,70% and a 10% increase of disagreement strategies.

Moreover, there are a total of twenty-six agreement strategies in both 3rd and 4th levels and forty disagreement strategies in both levels. Respectively there is a percentage of 60,61% disagreement strategies and a percentage 39,40% agreement strategies, this means that students see disagreement strategies 21,21% more than agreement strategies. This is in contrast to the study performed by Schauer (2022), who found that the overall number of (dis)agreement strategies was very similar however with more agreement than disagreement strategies, in the case of this study the number is very uneven, favoring the disagreement strategies.

Other relevant data found when comparing those strategies not used in both courses is that none of the agreement strategies rhetorical question and topic expander are used in the whole third cycle. However, whereas knowledge marker is used in 3rd level but not seen again in 4th level, perspective change is seen in 4th level which is one of the agreement strategies they had not seen in 3rd level. In conclusion, out of eight agreement strategies, only two are not taught to the students.

With regards to the disagreement strategies, students do not see in either textbook attack-statement, attack rhetorical question, challenge, sympathy and consequence. Nevertheless, whereas contradiction, command and perspective change are not seen in 3rd year, students are introduced to these strategies in 4th year. The only disagreement strategy that students see in 3rd level but not again in 4th level is general statement. Thus, out of thirteen disagreement strategies only three strategies (disagreement token, hedged negation and grounder) are seen in both years. This is very unexpected since there are twelve more instances of disagreement strategies than agreement strategies. However, whereas agreement strategies seen in the text are more diverse in kind, disagreement strategies variety is very insufficient.

5.3. Discussion of the analysis and implications for the teaching proposal

The main finding of the analysis is the lack of pragmatic explicit explanation in all the instances where a (dis)agreement strategy appeared. As it has been mentioned, most (dis)agreement strategies could only be found in audio materials. They also appeared in isolation and de-contextualized. There was not any explanation on how to soften a disagreement speech act or even what it is to disagree or agree with someone. The student is not encouraged to either reflect on the strategies used nor to produce his or her own strategies. This is really important because previous studies seem to agree that explicit instruction of the pragmatic competence provides much better results in EFL contexts than implicit instruction. According to Alcón-Soler (2005), "explicit metapragmatic instruction seems to be more effective than implicit teaching" (para. 4). Therefore, if EFL teachers want to activate students' pragmatic awareness and competence, a bigger effort should be made in providing explicit metapragmatic explanations and encouraging the students to produce their own pragmatic strategies. In order to bridge the gap of the lacking explicit instruction in textbooks "New Action" by Burlington Books, the teaching proposal is presented in section 6

Another finding was that, unlike Schauer's study (2022), there were more disagreement strategies used in both textbooks. Another opposite finding was that whereas Schauer (2022) found face threatening disagreement strategies in the instruction materials

> Another finding that needs to be addressed is the number of attack statements found in the teaching materials. While it may be somewhat unexpected to also encounter utterances that are likely to be considered impolite such as expressions that indicate doubt about an interlocutor's intelligence or belong to the taboo category, the inclusion of these items is in line with calls for teaching impoliteness in order to ensure L2 learners' safety and expose them to authentic language (p. 160).

In the textbooks analyzed in this study, not a single attack-rhetorical question, attack-statement or challenge strategy was found. However, the use of more indirect disagreement strategies is greater than the agreement strategies analyzed in the previous section. Although the most indirect strategies used are hedged negation and grounder (with a total of 24 instances), and the

rest of the strategies only sum up to 5 instances, this is a positive finding, because students are exposed to more indirect disagreement strategies than to direct agreement strategies. Moreover, the grounder strategy is used 7 times in both textbooks and hedged negation is seen twice in 3rd level and 8 times in 4th level, showing a progression adequate to the students' development.

It should be highlighted that most of the strategies found in the textbooks came from exercises with audio materials (listening exercises), which as Schauer (2022) points out

> While EFL learners working with the Lighthouse series will typically have access to their textbooks and would be allowed to take them home, access to accompanying audio CDs is likely to be more limited, since parents or guardians would need to purchase them (p. 156)

Whereas having access to the textbook and its written contents is taken for granted, the accessibility of audio materials is much more limited since students have to register on the official website or purchase the CD. This means that students do not have easy access to most of the (dis)agreement strategies they hear in the textbooks.

As a final remark, explicit pragmatic exercises were not found. As it has been discussed before, many authors back up the idea that explicit instruction is far more beneficial for the students' pragmatic conscience than implicit instruction (Alcón-Soler, 2005).

To conclude, the aim of this analysis was to outline the main deficiencies of traditional instructional materials in regards to pragmatic (dis)agreement strategies in order to form a teaching proposal aimed precisely at overcoming these shortcomings. In the subsequent section, a teaching intervention is proposed, focusing on the missing and most used pragmatic strategies in both textbooks and on providing explicit pragmatic instruction of the different strategies. The intervention also emphasizes the use of audiovisual materials to enhance the teaching and learning experience.

6. TEACHING PROPOSAL

The following teaching proposal is a carefully crafted intervention taking into account the deficiencies and advantages of the textbooks that the students use. The main aim of the teaching proposal is to serve as a complement to the Student's Book, to further develop those (dis)agreement strategies that students have already seen and to further expand and encourage pragmatic awareness through a series of exercises that are directed to provide pragmatic input and explicit explanations of pragmatic strategies. According to Li et al. (2015):

> The increase in the level of Chinese learners' pragmatic awareness can predict the enhancement of their ability to produce appropriate language. This result corroborates previous studies (Tada, 2005; Rafieyan et al., 2014; Bardovi-Harlig, 2014), and confirms Schmidt's proposal (1995) that L2 learner's conscious noticing or awareness of the target features is the essential condition for L2 pragmatic acquisition (p. 114)

While this study was carried out in the Chinese context, the same can be applied to any EFL context. By fostering the development of pragmatic consciousness pertaining to students' second language (L2), there is a consequent enhancement in their pragmatic output as well.

The aim of this proposal is to complement those (dis)agreement strategies that students already know or use, in order to expand their knowledge on what they already understand and to develop their pragmatic awareness and skills.

6.1. Teaching proposal justification

The following teaching proposal is created as a complementary material that teachers of EFL can use in their classrooms as means to pay special attention to pragmatic competence. The importance of developing pragmatic competence in a foreign language has already been established in section 2.2. In short, pragmatic competence development enables learners to go beyond mere grammatical accuracy and comprehend and produce language in a way that is contextually suitable and culturally sensitive. By developing pragmatic competence, EFL learners can navigate complex communicative situations, interpret and convey intended meanings accurately, and avoid misunderstandings or unintended offense. It enhances their

overall language proficiency, promotes intercultural competence, and facilitates successful interactions in multicultural settings.

However, this teaching proposal specifically addresses pragmatic competence in (dis)agreeing speech acts. The study carried out in sections 3, 4 and 5 further evinces the most and least (dis)agreement strategies used. The study findings allow for the creation of a thorough and rigorous teaching intervention which is based on students' previous knowledge.

The following analysis and learning situation is justified with the LOMLOE (2023). This decision has also been taken with the idea that future researchers in the Spanish educational context can put the teaching proposal into practice. The following teaching proposal is aimed at students in the 4th year of ESO.

Table 5

Curricular elements

SPECIFIC COMPETENCES	1. Comprender e interpretar el sentido general y los detalles más relevantes de textos expresados de forma clara y en la lengua estándar, buscando fuentes fiables y haciendo uso de estrategias como la inferencia de significados, para responder a necesidades comunicativas concretas.
	2. 2. Producir textos originales, de extensión media, sencillos y con una organización clara, usando estrategias tales como la planificación, la compensación o la auto reparación, para expresar de forma creativa, adecuada y coherente, mensajes relevantes y responder a propósitos comunicativos concretos.
EVALUATION CRITERIA	1.3. Aplicar los conocimientos y las estrategias más adecuadas en cada situación comunicativa para comprender el sentido general, la información esencial y los detalles más relevantes de los textos, inferir significados e interpretar elementos no verbales, así como realizar búsquedas para seleccionar y gestionar información veraz y enriquecer su repertorio lingüístico individual.
	2.3. Seleccionar, organizar y aplicar conocimientos y estrategias en la elaboración de textos coherentes, cohesionados y adecuados a las intenciones comunicativas, las características contextuales, los aspectos socioculturales y la tipología textual, haciendo uso de su repertorio lingüístico y usando los recursos físicos o digitales más adecuados en función de la tarea y de las necesidades de la audiencia o del lector o lectora potencial a quien se dirige el texto, para planificar, producir,

	revisar y seguir progresando en el proceso de aprendizaje.
KEY COMPETENCES: DESCRIPTORS	STEM1, CD1, CD2, CPSAA4, CP2, CPSAA5
BASIC KNOWLEDGE	Bloque I. Comunicación: 4. Identificación y uso de modelos contextuales y géneros discursivos de uso común en la comprensión, producción y coproducción de textos orales, escritos y multimodales, breves y sencillos, literarios y no literarios: características y reconocimiento del contexto (participantes y situación), expectativas generadas por el contexto; organización y estructuración según el género y la función textual. Bloque III. Interculturalidad: 1. Reconocimiento y respeto por aspectos socioculturales y sociolingüísticos de uso común relativos a la vida cotidiana y las condiciones de vida; convenciones sociales de uso común; lenguaje no verbal, cortesía lingüística y etiqueta digital; cultura, normas, actitudes, costumbres y valores propios de países donde se habla la lengua extranjera y de Canarias. Bloque IV. Dimensiones interpersonal e intrapersonal: 7.Visión creativa y emocional del aprendizaje. 9. Aprecio por la diversidad y patrimonio lingüístico, cultural y artístico en lo relativo a las relaciones interpersonales en países donde se habla la lengua extranjera, y diferencias y similitudes con aquel propio de Canarias.

6.2. Teaching proposal materials

The teaching proposal materials presented in order to carry out the teaching intervention are presented in the next section. Secondly, pre- and post-treatment questionnaires are provided in case a teacher-researcher wants to conduct an empirical study on students' pragmatic development in the sections 6.2.2. The initial questionnaire can also be used to conduct a needs analysis in order to inform instruction.

6.2.1. The scenes and SPEAKING Frameworks

The following teaching proposal has one fragment that is to be presented in class by the teacher in order to introduce the topic and to show students what is the procedure and what it is expected for them to do. Along with this first fragment presented by the teacher, another two scenes will be presented. The aim of this paper is to help and provide teachers with adequate materials to teach (dis)agreement strategies in the EFL classrooms. Therefore, the script of the scene is presented along with an answer sheet that can be freely modified by each teacher, adding or removing whatever elements it is deemed necessary. This teaching proposal has been created keeping in mind the specific deficiencies and strengths of the textbooks "New Action" 3º and 4º ESO by Burlington Books, therefore it is specially recommended to students using these books but it is also recommendable to use by any teacher who wants to encourage students' pragmatics skills and awareness.

The materials are divided into two parts, one aimed at developing their pragmatic conscience and another one aimed at developing their pragmatic production skills. They are also presented in this order since explicit instruction provides better results than implicit instruction and furthermore, students that are encouraged to produce language (output practice) show better learning outcomes than those that are only encouraged to comprehend (Jernigan, 2012). Therefore, it has been suggested that students are first introduced to pragmatic strategies and then encouraged to produce their own pragmatic strategies. Explicit instruction should always be provided by the teacher by explaining the (dis)agreements strategies, their use, how they intervene in the scenes, etc. All the scenes that have to be watched come along with a questionnaire which is the following:

Table 6

SPEAKING Framework sheet

<div style="border:1px solid">

Part 1

SETTING (Where does the scene happen?):

PARTICIPANTS (What is the relationship between the speakers?):

ENDS (What is the participants' goal for having this conversation?):

ACT SEQUENCE (What is the order of the conversation?):

KEY (What clues let us know the tone of the conversation? Angry? Happy?):

INSTRUMENTALITIES (Is the conversation polite, impolite, casual or in between?):

NORM (Can you see politeness norms in the conversation?):

GENRE (What type of conversation is this? Face to face? By phone?):

Follow-up questions:

-Can you identify the instances in which the people agree or disagree with each other?
-Why do they say the things they say?
-What does the body language and tone indicate in this scene?

Part 2

Now imagine yourself in this situation. How would you express agreement/disagreement in your own language? And in English?

</div>

As the readers can notice, the questions are adapted from the awareness-raising questions suggested by Usó-Juan (2021). The responses that are received from the students regarding the questionnaire are of utmost importance to the current research, as they can provide valuable insights and information. The data collected from these responses can help to address and potentially answer some of the most pressing and challenging research questions.

Therefore, great emphasis on ensuring that the questions included in the questionnaire are well-crafted and thought-provoking is posed in order to elicit meaningful and informative responses from the students. For instance, by asking the students what they would do in said situation in

their L1 language, two main objectives are achieved; activating their previous knowledge; allowing students to make use of strategies and abilities they already possess in L1; and to start activating students' pragmatic conscience in L2. According to Li et al. (2015):

> In the process of language learning, L2 learners have to deal with the challenges of resisting the application of their L1 knowledge to the second language when the L1 knowledge is a source of errors. Noticing the gap between what they have already known and what they should know is quite necessary to help L2 learners deal with the challenges. For foreign language learners who are not provided with adequate L2 input and opportunities to use the language, this awareness is more crucial in order to convert the limited input into intake (p. 114)

Whereas the influence of L1 in L2 pragmatic transfer is still a debate among researchers, some argue that it has a positive effect, others argue that it has a negative or not effect at all (Bu, 2012), what is clear is that by enhancing pragmatic awareness students can make more conscious choices and make efforts to understand the linguistic forms and sociopragmatic constraints of the target language (Li et al., 2015). What is more the LOMLOE curriculum (2023) evaluation criterion 6.1 argues that:

> 6.1. Valorar críticamente y de forma empática y respetuosa la diversidad lingüística, cultural y artística propia de Canarias y de países donde se habla la lengua extranjera, aplicando estrategias en situaciones comunicativas, interculturales, cotidianas, con resiliencia, proponiendo vías de solución a dificultades comunicativas socioculturales, construyendo vínculos entre el patrimonio canario y el de otras culturas y favoreciendo y justificando el desarrollo de una cultura compartida y una ciudadanía comprometida con la sostenibilidad y los valores democráticos, para afrontar las diferencias morales o culturales con actitud dialogante, argumentativa, respetuosa y opuesta a cualquier tipo de discriminación o violencia (p. 53)

It is recognized in the curriculum that being able to infer differences and similarities among languages and cultures is not only beneficial for the students but necessary for their adequate development as a multicultural and multilingual individual in this interconnected and democratic world.

Added to the SPEAKING Framework sheet, there are some specific questions aimed at clarifying what students have to answer in each part. After having watched the scene's fragment, students will have to reflect and answer the questions presented previously.

As it has been previously mentioned, this teaching proposal has been created as a complement to the Student's Book of the third cycle "New Action" by Burlington Editorial. Therefore, the teaching proposal pays great attention to the disagreement strategies of disagreement token, hedged negation and grounder, perspective change, command and questions and to the agreement strategies of agreement token, same evaluation, downgraded evaluation and upgraded evaluation. This is owing to the fact that these are the most seen strategies in the "New Action" textbooks, and the aim of the proposal is to further complement what students already know. The scenes have been chosen according to this criterion, that is why some strategies are preferred over others.

Below, the scenes' scripts along with the suggested answers will be presented. It is recommended that before watching each scene, the teacher asks a few questions about the movies or TV series to the students in order to know if students have already seen the fragment, what they think about it, whether they liked it or not. This will connect them to the scenes and they will start forming an opinion about them.

The order of the scenes takes into account the natural progression of students' pragmatic awareness. Therefore, the scenes go from more basic and easier strategies to more complex strategies.

Table 7

Scene nº 1: The Incredibles, 2004

Mr.Incredible: Is this on?

Interviewer: That's fine.

Mr.Inrcredible: I can break through walls, I just can't…

Interviewer: That's fine.

Mr. Incredible: I can't get this on.

Interviewer: So, Mr. Incredible… Do you have a secret identity?

Mr. Incredible: Every superhero has a secret identity. I don't know a single one who doesn't. Who wants the pressure of being super all the time?

Elastigirl: Of course, I have a secret identity. Can you see me in this at the supermarket? Come on. Who'd want to go shopping as Elastigirl, y'know what I mean?

Mr. Incredible: Sometimes l think I'd just like the simple life, you know? Relax a little and raise a family.

Elasticgirl: Settle down? Are you kidding? I'm at the top of my game! I'm right up there with the big dogs! Girls, come on. Leave the saving of the world to the men? I don't think so! I don't think so.

—--

SPEAKING Framework sheet

Part 1

SETTING (Where does the scene happen?): In a sort of interview place with cameras.

PARTICIPANTS (What is the relationship between the speakers?): Mr.Incredible and Elasticgirl are the interviewed and there is an interviewer who asks them questions.

ENDS (What is the participants' goal for having this conversation?): Superheroes want to appeal to the public so they have interviews where they can show their personal side and express themselves to seem closer and more intimate.

ACT SEQUENCE (What is the order of the conversation?): The interviewer asks a question which we cannot hear, but we can deduce that the same question is asked first to Mr.Incredible and then to Elasticgirl.

KEY (What clues let us know the tone of the conversation? Angry? Happy?): The tone is personal and intimate because they are talking about personal experiences. Whereas Mr.Incredible seems more touched, Elasticgirl is more energetic.

INSTRUMENTALITIES (Is the conversation polite, impolite, casual or in between?): Although they are being interviewed, the interaction has a casual tone, probably because they are talking about personal things.

NORM (Can you see politeness norms in the conversation?): While the conversation is polite, no specific politeness norms can be observed.

GENRE (What type of conversation is this? Face to face? By phone?): It is a face-to-face interview.

Follow-up questions:

-Can you identify the instances in which the people agree or disagree with each other?

  Elasticgirl says:

"Settle down? Are you kidding?" → rhetorical question
"I'm at the top of my game! I'm right up there with the big dogs!" → grounder
"Leave the saving of the world to the men?" → rhetorical question
"I don't think so! I don't think so" → hedged negation

-Why do they say the things they say?

Rhetorical questions don't expect an answer back, maybe we ask them to show our opinion without giving the opportunity to someone to contradict us.

The grounder offers a justification, an explanation of why she disagrees with the idea of settling down

The hedged negation makes the disagreement a little softer and more indirect. Instead of saying "No, I don't want to settle down" she uses a series of strategies that give foundation

and soften her disagreement

-What does the body language and tone indicate in this scene? In the case of Elasticgirl her body language indicates confidence but at the end, she seems to be unsure of what she is saying.

Part 2: Production practice

Now imagine yourself in this situation. How would you express agreement/disagreement in your own language? And in English? *(Imagine you are an elite athlete and at a press conference someone asks you if you're thinking about retiring? (The journalist can be asking this question for a number of reasons: because you are getting older, your game is getting worse, they think you want to form a family...) What would you answer?)*

In Spanish: No, no lo creo. La verdad es que nunca he pensado en retirarme y no creo que vaya a ser pronto tampoco.

In English: See, right now I'm not thinking about retiring. I feel young, I feel athletic. We have been doing some great training. So, I don't think I'm going anywhere. (hedged negation, grounder)

*To all Part 2 questions, a description specifying the circumstances of said situation can be provided in order to make it easier for the students to see themselves in said position.

Table 8

Scene nº 2: This is Us, Disney+, 2021, Season 2 Episode 6:

Randall: Right on schedule.

Rebecca: Yeah! That's great. Hey, hey, hey, but let's, uh, let's go to this house. That's the Larsens.

Randall: Nah, they talk too much and they make you do tricks, like hopscotch.

Rebecca: Yeah, but it's gonna be really quick because there's no one waiting in line over there, so let's go.

Randall: Mom, it's because they always have licorice and-and… Let's just stay on my map, okay?

Rebecca: Hey, hey, Randall. The plan is not set in stone. We can change it. We can... we can improvise. Do you know what that means?

Randall: No.

Rebecca: It means when you make something up in the moment and it can be a lot of fun. Can you try it for me? Just take one minute.

Randall: Fine!

-SPEAKING Framework sheet-

Part 1

SETTING (Where does the scene happen?): The scene takes place in the street, on Halloween day.

PARTICIPANTS (What is the relationship between the speakers?): Rebecca is Randall's mom.

ENDS (What is the participants' goal for having this conversation?): Randall is a little bit rigid and wants to follow his plan for the night thoroughly, while Rebecca wants him to be more flexible, that's why she suggests going to another house (which wasn't on Randall's plan).

ACT SEQUENCE (What is the order of the conversation?): Rebecca talks and Randall answers back.

KEY (What clues let us know the tone of the conversation? Angry? Happy?): Randall is definitely angry at the end because he is not used to doing spontaneous things, but Rebecca is calming and reassuring.

INSTRUMENTALITIES (Is the conversation polite, impolite, casual or in between?): The conversation is casual and intimate because they have a very close relationship. Randall is a bit impolite, for instance he answers "No" without any softening strategy.

NORM (Can you see politeness norms in the conversation?): No politeness strategies can be observed in the conversation.

GENRE (What type of conversation is this? Face to face? By phone?): It is a face-to-face conversation.

Follow-up questions:

-Can you identify the instances in which the people agree or disagree with each other?

Randall says "Nah, they talk too much and they make you do tricks, like hopscotch." →
disagreement token, grounder

"Mom, it's because they always have licorice and-and… Let's just stay on my map, okay?"
→ grounder, command

"No" → disagreement token

Rebecca says: "Yeah, but it's gonna be really quick because there's no one waiting in line
over there, so let's go." → grounder

"Hey, hey, Randall. The plan is not set in stone. We can change it. We can... we can
improvise. Do you know what that means?" → question

"It means when you make something up in the moment and it can be a lot of fun. Can you try
it for me? Just take one minute." → command

-Why do they say the things they say?

Metalinguistic information: Randall uses a lot of grounders, grounders are explanations for
one's disagreeing. Randall tries to explain to his mother why his plan is better and why he
doesn't want to go to the Larsen's house by saying: "they talk too much and they make you
do tricks, like hopscotch.", and "Mom, it's because they always have licorice and-and". He
also tries to command her mother to just follow his plan when he says: "Let's just stay on my
map, okay?".

Rebecca also explains why she disagrees by saying "Yeah, but it's gonna be really quick
because there's no one waiting in line over there, so let's go." and commands him to do how
she says "It means when you make something up in the moment and it can be a lot of fun.
Can you try it for me? Just take one minute". It makes sense that she uses commands because
she is the mother.

-What does the body language and tone indicate in this scene? While Randall is angry and
anxious, Rebecca is trying to calm him down and convince him by softening her voice and
ducking down to his eyes in order to be closer.

Part 2: Production practice

Now imagine yourself in this situation. How would you express agreement/disagreement in
your own language? And in English? *(Imagine you are on an excursion in nature with your
family, and everybody wants to go to the picnic tables to eat lunch but you want to go to the
lake and eat lunch there. How would you disagree with your family?)*

In Spanish: Pero yo no quiero ir a las mesas. Ya hemos estado en mesas antes, pero en este
lago no. ¿Podemos ir ya a ver el lago, por favor? Va a oscurecer pronto y no nos va a dar
tiempo.

In English: But we won't have time to see the lake if we stop to eat lunch there. How many of you have eaten lunch while looking at a beautiful lake? See, so let's go now before sunset. (grounder, command, question)

Table 9

Scene n° 3: Modern Family, Disney+, 2009, Season 1 Episode 7

Jay: Hey, champ! I got a little something for you.

Manny: And I have something for you. Here. I will not be needing it anymore.

Jay: But the finals?

Manny:I am retired.

Jay: Wait, wait, wait. You can't retire.

Manny: It's just not fun anymore.

Jay: Well, that's probably just butterflies. Come on. You're gonna be fine.

Gloria: Look, if he doesn't want to, it's his decision.

Jay: Ah, the hell it is.

Gloria: He shouldn't be doing anything that makes him nervous. Papi, I support you.

Manny: I'm not nervous. I just don't want to fight a girl

Gloria: What?

Manny: Defeating a woman will be a mark on my honor.

Gloria: Why? Because men are always so superior to woman?

Manny: Uh-

Gloria: Uh, uh. So superior that you cannot even finish your sentence?

Jay: Dude.

Gloria: Manny, you always call yourself the lover of women, but if you don't compete with this girl, you're showing me and all the woman that you don't respect us.

Manny: I'm sorry.

-SPEAKING Framework sheet-

Part 1

SETTING (Where does the scene happen?): The scene takes place at their house

PARTICIPANTS (What is the relationship between the speakers?): Jay and Gloria are married and Manny is Gloria's son and Jay's stepson

ENDS (What is the participants' goal for having this conversation?): Manny wants to quit fencing because he has to compete against a girl, and his parents are against this decision.

ACT SEQUENCE (What is the order of the conversation?): First, Manny is talking with Jay but then Manny is talking with Gloria.

KEY (What clues let us know the tone of the conversation? Angry? Happy?): His parents are confused and a little bit disappointed because they wanted him to compete. Jay is very direct, he says "You can't retire" and "Ah, the hell it is". Whereas at the beginning Gloria is supportive: "Look, if he doesn't want to, it's his decision.", when she finds out the reason, she gets very angry.

INSTRUMENTALITIES (Is the conversation polite, impolite, casual or in between?): The conversation is casual and a bit impolite because they are a family having a discussion.

NORM (Can you see politeness norms in the conversation?): No politeness norms can be observed. What is more, Gloria uses a few attack-statements which are very impolite.

GENRE (What type of conversation is this? Face to face? By phone?): It is a face-to-face conversation

Follow-up questions:

-Can you identify the instances in which the people agree or disagree with each other?

Jay says: "Wait, wait, wait. You can't retire." → command

Manny says: " It's just not fun anymore." → grounder

"I'm not nervous." → hedged negation
"I just don't want to fight a girl" → grounder
"Defeating a woman will be a mark on my honor." → grounder

Gloria says to Jay "He shouldn't be doing anything that makes him nervous. Papi, I support you". → grounder

"Why? Because men are always so superior to woman?" → attack rhetorical question

"Manny, you always call yourself the lover of women, but if you don't compete with this girl, you're showing me and all the woman that you don't respect us" → grounder/ perspective change

-Why do they say the things they say?

Metalinguistic information:

Jay's character is known for being very straight-forward which he shows here because he simply commands him to compete.

Manny tries to explain his decision by using many grounders in hopes to make his parents understand why he is leaving the competition.

Gloria uses grounders as well to explain her position. However, after Manny tells her that he doesn't want to compete against a girl, she gets angry and uses a rhetorical question, which is not expected to have an answer back, she just wants to get her point across. Then, Gloria tries to explain to Manny how fighting against a girl is not a bad thing, but quite the opposite it shows that he respects women, which is a perspective change because she is making a point that Manny hadn't thought about.

-What does the body language and tone indicate in this scene?

Manny is sad at the beginning, and his parents are confused and trying to understand his decision. At first, Jay is more rigid and Gloria is trying to calm both down, but then Gloria gets angrier in her tone and expression while Jay is more neutral.

Part 2: Production practice

Now imagine yourself in this situation. How would you express agreement/disagreement in your own language? And in English? *(Imagine you and your colleagues have prepared a presentation for the class, but one of your friends doesn't want to go out because he is very shy and he says he is going to do it wrong. How would you show disagreement with him?)*

In Spanish: ¿Cómo no vas a estar listo? Ayer estuvimos dos horas ensayando la presentación. Te va a salir genial, no tengas miedo. Piensa que nadie te está escuchando.

In English: You aren't going to do it wrong. Are you crazy? You can do this without any problem. Just go out there and do as we have practiced. It'll be alright! (rhetorical-question, command, general statement)

If the EFL teacher needs more materials for students with a higher level of English, or for high intellectual abilities students (ALCAIN), two more script scenes along with their SPEAKING

Framework sheet are presented in the Appendices section. In order to evaluate students' progress, an evaluation rubric should be used in each SPEAKING Framework presented by the students. This would provide a depiction of students' progress or lack of it throughout the activities. As a final summative mark, the average score can be obtained. However, doing a summative evaluation is also optional, thus it is presented in the Appendices section as well.

6.2.2. Materials to conduct an action-research project

As it has been explained before, in order to carry out the teaching intervention, just using the materials presented in section 6.2.1 is enough. There is no need to carry out an action-research investigation. However, if any teacher-researcher would like to do so, the different tools and resources suitable to do that task are provided in the next section.

6.2.2.1. Initial and end of instruction questionnaire

An initial questionnaire should be given to the students prior to the start of the teaching proposal in order to be able to assess progress or the lack of it. This initial questionnaire tries to assess students' pragmatic production and awareness. The initial questionnaire would evaluate students' abilities to produce speech acts, use of internal and external modifiers (if any), use of "Politeness theory" and their ability to reflect and deepen on all of these aspects, which is referred to as pragmatic awareness.

The intention of this questionnaire is to serve as an objective evaluation instrument from which results and data can be compared. The aim of this project is to create a series of activities that will improve students' pragmatic awareness and production. Therefore, some sort of previous and final evaluation in order to be able to observe progress or the lack of it should be carried out. Any teaching proposal which is based on the scientific method should be able to provide objective and analyzable data which allows for comparison and scrutiny to discern whether the teaching proposal fulfilled its intended purposes or not.

For the first question they have to watch a fragment of a TV series and then read the transcript. After that, they have to answer three questions that aim to activate their pragmatic awareness. The second question is a production one. Students have to write down what they would say in

a given situation. By proceeding this way, we can evaluate progress in a more accurate way. This questionnaire will help us to see student's overall level of pragmatic reflection and production, introduce them to the topic and assess progress objectively.

Table 11

Initial questionnaire

Part 1

We are going to watch a scene from the popular TV series "X". Here is the transcript as well.

(Transcript)

Now, reflect on what you have seen and answer the questions below:

-Can you identify the instances in which the people agree or disagree with each other?

-Why do you think they say the things they say?

-What does the body language and tone indicate in this scene?

Part 2:

Imagine you are in a similar situation. How would you show agreement/ disagreement in your own language? And in English?

Then, the teaching proposal activities should be used. After having finished the teaching proposal and gone through all the materials, students will answer an end of instruction questionnaire.

Table 12

End of instruction questionnaire

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:10px;">

Did you find the activities useful? Why or why not?
Have you learnt any new agreement/ disagreement strategies?
Have you learnt to identify and explain these strategies better?
What could be done better by the teacher?
Would you change anything about the activities?
Is there anything else you would like to say?

*The qualitative questionnaire can be in student's L1 in order to get the most information from students.

</div>

Once all the data has been collected, an action-research analysis can be done. In order to do a triangulation of data, the study will combine quantitative data, provided by the pre-watching results (initial questionnaire) and the data collected from the while-watching activities with qualitative data provided by the end of instruction questionnaire. In this way, a holistic result can be provided, measuring not only the objective results but also students' perceptions and opinions. With the findings at hand a number of research questions aimed at discerning whether or not the teaching intervention has been successful or not can be posed:

1) After having completed the teaching proposal, do students use more and more varied pragmatic strategies than before? Why? Why not?
2) After having completed the teaching proposal, are students able to decodify pragmatic strategies more effectively? Why? Why not?
3) Overall, can we say that students have improved their pragmatic skills and awareness?

6.3. Teaching proposal programming

Next, the activities' order will be presented, along with a justification for each part so that the EFL teacher can apply the proposal.

Table 13

Teaching proposal programming

	Timing	Procedure	Justification
Session 1	30 minutes	Pre-activity to introduce ourselves. The teacher can ask questions related to students' favorite movies or TV series in order to introduce the topic and to get to know their interests. Then, the teacher could prepare an activity where the first fragment of a TV series or movie is shown, the scene cuts to the climax of the plot, and students are asked to debate about what happens next.	Since it is the first day, we need to do some presentation activities so that the teacher can get to know the students and students can feel comfortable.
	25 minutes	The teacher informs the students about the project, and asks for their parents' consent to collect their data and share it. *(This section is optional, only if the teacher wants to carry out an action-research project)*	We have to carry out some necessary procedures in order to ensure students' privacy and consent
Session 2	30 minutes	The students do the initial questionnaire that aims to collect data about their pragmatic skills production and awareness. *(This is optional, only if the teacher wants to carry out an action-research project or if the teacher wants to conduct an initial needs analysis)*	The intention of this questionnaire is to serve as an objective evaluation instrument from which we can compare results and data.

	25 minutes	Discussion and debate about agreement and disagreement experiences. With questions such as: Do you guys know how to agree or disagree with someone in English? Why do you think disagreeing with someone is so complicated? Is it more difficult to do it in English than Spanish? Why? Why not? Have you ever had to disagree with someone strongly? Are you afraid of saying no? Some implicit instruction of disagreement strategies that are going to be seen can be done.	The aim of this introductory activity is to introduce them to the topic: Pragmatics and agreements and disagreements speech acts. In this way students start to activate their previous knowledge, and raise their pragmatic awareness.
Session 3	55 minutes	The teacher shows a scene from the movie The Incredibles. From this scene the teacher explains the SPEAKING framework, the raising-awareness questions as well as giving an example of what to say in a similar situation. We discuss and complete the activity together, with the help of the teacher. It is important that in this first session, the activity is mainly done by the teacher in order to illustrate the students how to do it and not to overwhelm them.	Introduction to the model SPEAKING Framework that the students will be working with. This first example is done with the help of the teacher and with the comments from the students. We present the main questions they will have to work with later (SPEAKING and production questions)
Session 4	55 minutes	The teacher shows a scene from the TV series This is Us. From this scene the students have to do their SPEAKING frameworks, the raising-awareness questions as well as the production question individually. The teacher can always answer any question and help the students.	Same as above
Session 7	55 minutes	The teacher shows a scene from the TV series Modern Family. From this scene the students have to do their SPEAKING frameworks, the raising-awareness questions as well as the production question individually. The teacher can always answer any question and help the students.	Same as above
Session 9	30 minutes	The students have to complete the qualitative questionnaire. *(This is*	From this questionnaire we can collect qualitative data

		optional, only if the teacher wants to carry out an action-research project)	about the students' personal opinion in order to do a triangulation of data
	25 minutes	The teacher can give feedback to the students as well as provide an opportunity for the students to give feedback to the teacher about the activities or discuss and comment on anything they would like to share.	This gives the students an opportunity to express themselves and make them feel heard. Any relevant feedback done by the students should be taken into account for future proposal

7. CONCLUSIONS

The present study was motivated by the importance of developing students' pragmatic competence in EFL instructed contexts. Numerous studies have been conducted on the effects of instruction on students' pragmatic development, showing that explicit pragmatic instruction and output-based learning is pedagogically better than implicit instruction and comprehension-based learning (Alcón-Soler, 2005; Jernigan, 2012), that contextual and real-life like learning situations helps the students to engage in real communicative situations and that role that EFL traditional materials play in students' development is crucial.

Nonetheless, very few studies have been carried out in order to explore the input secondary school students receive from their classroom materials between pragmatic input in traditional materials and students' pragmatic competence. The literature was especially lacking in the Spanish context, which this master's thesis aimed to palliate by analyzing the "New Action" textbooks by Burlington Books. This study has identified that, unlike Schauer (2022), disagreement strategies were used twice as much as agreement strategies, but most importantly that no explicit pragmatic explanation was given in the textbooks. As it has been argued, explicit instruction is effective and beneficial for students' pragmatic development, therefore a teaching intervention aimed at providing explicit pragmatic instruction was provided. The teaching proposal was crafted after the main drawbacks and strengths of the "New Action" textbooks, aiming at developing students' pragmatic awareness and production skills.

However, the most important limitation of this study lies in the fact that the teaching intervention could not be put into practice. Therefore, it was not possible to assess the progression or lack of progression of the students; therefore, it is unknown if the teaching proposal improved students' pragmatic competence. The study should be repeated with the implementation of the teaching intervention in a group of students.

Pragmatic competence development in EFL contexts is of utmost importance for students' proficiency since it gives them the tools to live in a hyper-connected society and to communicate effectively with others. Future research needs to examine more closely the links between the materials that students study with and students' pragmatic abilities in order to outline its main limitations and provide students with different resources that enable them to become socially competent individuals.

8. REFERENCES

Abrams, Z. (2016). Creating Social Context Through Film: Teaching L2 Pragmatics as a Locally Situated Process. *L2 Journal*, *8*(3), 23–45.

Abrams, Z. I. (2014). Using film to provide a context for teaching L2 pragmatics. *System*, *46*, 55–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.06.005

Alcón-Soler, E. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System*, *33*(3), 417–435. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.06.005

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and Language Teaching: Bringing Pragmatics and Pedagogy Together. Bouton, Lawrence F., Ed. Pragmatics and Language Learning.

Blum-Kulka, S., Kasper, G., & House, J. (1989). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. essay, Cambridge University Press.

Boxer, D. (2003). Critical issues in developmental pragmatics. In *Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching* (pp. 45–69). essay, Publicaciones de la Universitat Jaume I.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). *Universals in language usage: Politness phenomena*.

Bu, J. (2012). A study of relationships between L1 pragmatic transfer and L2 proficiency. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(1), 32–43. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n1p32

Consejo Escolar de Canarias. (2020). Informe sobre la realidad educativa de Canarias. Gobierno de Canarias.

Gcrant, L., & Starks, D. (2001). Screening appropriate teaching materials closings from textbooks and television soap operas. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *39*(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.39.1.39

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics; an ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jernigan, J. (2012). Output and English as a second language pragmatic development: The effectiveness of output-focused video-based instruction. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(4), 2–14. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n4p2

Kaltenböck, G., Mihatsch, W., Schneider, S., & Fraser, B. (2010). Pragmatic competence: The case of hedging. In *New approaches to hedging* (pp. 15–34). essay, Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Kasper, G. (1997). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?*. http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/

Kwan, N., & Dunworth, K. (2016). English as a lingua franca communication between domestic helpers and employers in Hong Kong: A study of pragmatic strategies. *English for Specific Purposes*, *43*, 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.02.001

Lasagabaster, D. (2009, December). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL classes. Universidad del País Vasco.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

Li, R., Raja Suleiman, R. R., & Sazalie, A. (2015). An investigation into Chinese efl learners' pragmatic competence. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *15*(2), 101–118. https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2015-1502-07

Liew, T. S. (2016). Comparison of Agreement and Disagreement Expressions between Malaysian and New Headway Course Books . *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, *12*(1), 20–36.

Mariana, I. (2021, June 6). An empirical study on the pragmatic competence of Spanish EFL learners in performing a speech act of request. Universitat Rovira I Virgili.

Martínez-Flor, A. (2007). Analysing request modification devices in films: Implications for pragmatic learning in instructed foreign language contexts. *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*, 245–280. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-5639-0_13

Merino-Crespo, C. (2019, July). Ansiedad en el aprendizaje del inglés como segunda lengua extranjera en dos contextos: aprendizaje integrado de contenidos y lengua extranjera (AICLE) y enseñanza formal del inglés (EFI). Universidad de Extremadura.

Nguyen, M. T. T. (2011). Learning to communicate in a globalized world: To what extent do school textbooks facilitate the development of intercultural pragmatic competence? *RELC Journal*, *42*(1), 17–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688210390265

Ożańska-Ponikwia , K., & Dewaele, J.-M. (2012). Personality and L2 use: The advantage of being openminded and self-confident in an immigration context. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, *12*(1), 112–134. https://doi.org/10.1075/eurosla

Ren, W., & Han, Z. (2016). The representation of pragmatic knowledge in recent ELT textbooks. *ELT Journal*, *70*(4), 424–434. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw010

Rose, K. R. (1997). Pragmatics in the classroom: Theoretical concerns and practical possibilities. *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, *8*, 267–295.

Rose, K. R. (2001). Compliments and compliment responses in film: Implications for pragmatics research and language teaching. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *39*, 309–326.

Ryan, J., & Granville, S. (2020). The suitability of film for modelling the pragmatics of interaction: Exploring authenticity. *System*, *89*, 102186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102186

Schauer, G. A. (2022). *6 - Interlanguage Pragmatic Development in a German EFL Secondary School Context Investigating Input and Output Focussing on the Speech Acts of Agreement and Disagreement*. Cambridge University Press.

Seto, A. (2009). 'I Agree With You' – A Corpus-based Study Of Agreement. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, *15*, 41–67.

Taguchi, N., & Sykes, J. M. (2013). Technology in Interlanguage Pragmatics Research and Teaching. In *Technology in interlanguage pragmatics research and teaching* (pp. 1–19). essay, John Benjamins Publishing.

Usó-Juan, E., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2022). Using audiovisual material to teach refusals from a discursive perspective: A research-based proposal. *Complutense Journal of English Studies*, *30*, 53–66. https://doi.org/10.5209/cjes.81875

Usó-Juan, E., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2021). Fostering learners' (Meta)pragmatic awareness through film analysis. *Language Value*, *14*(1), 85–111. https://doi.org/10.6035/languagev.5821

Wang, Y., & Marecki, M. (2021). Positive psychology 2.0 in a foreign language classroom: Students' emotional experience in English classroom interaction in China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.789579

9. APPENDICES

9.1. Additional scenes and SPEAKING Frameworks

Scene nº 1: Civil War, Disney +, 2016

Tony Stark: There's no decision-making process here. We need to be put in check! Whatever form that takes, I'm game. If we can't accept limitations, if we're boundary-less, we're no better than the bad guys.

Steve Rogers: Tony, someone dies on your watch, you don't give up.

Tony Stark: Who said we're giving up?

Steve Rogers: We are if we're not taking responsibility for our actions. This document just shifts the blames.

James Rhodes: I'm sorry. Steve. That - that is dangerously arrogant. This is the United Nations we're talking about. It's not the World Security Council, it's not SHIELD, it's not HYDRA.

Steve Rogers: No, but it's run by people with agendas, and agendas change.

Tony Stark: That's good. That's why I'm here. When I realized what my weapons were capable of in the wrong hands, I shut it down and stopped manufacturing.

Steve Rogers: Tony, you chose to do that. If we sign this, we surrender our right to choose. What if this panel sends us somewhere we don't think we should go? What if there is somewhere we need to go, and they don't let us? We may not be perfect, but the safest hands are still our own.

Tony Stark: If we don't do this now, it's gonna be done to us later. That's the fact. That won't be pretty.

Wanda Maximoff: You're saying they'll come for me.
Vision: We would protect you.

Natasha Romanoff: Maybe Tony's right.

[Tony looks at her, surprised.]

Natasha Romanoff: If we have one hand on the wheel, we can still steer. If we take it off -

Sam Wilson: Aren't you the same woman who told the government to kiss her ass a few years ago?

Natasha Romanoff: I'm just . . . I'm reading the terrain. We have made . . . some very public mistakes. We need to win their trust back.

Tony Stark: Focus up. I'm sorry, did I just mishear you or did you agree with me?

Natasha Romanoff: Oh, I want to take it back now.

Tony Stark: No, no, no. You can't retract it. Thank you. Unprecedented. Okay, case closed-- I win.

-SPEAKING Framework sheet-

Part 1

SETTING (Where does the scene happen?): In a kitchen

PARTICIPANTS (What is the relationship between the speakers?): All of them are superheroes with powers from the Avengers group.

ENDS (What is the participants' goal for having this conversation?): The government is trying to ban superheroes. While some in the group want to sign a contract which will give them some limitations, others from the group don't want to sign the contract. They are discussing whether to sign the contract or not to come up with the same answer.

ACT SEQUENCE (What is the order of the conversation?): It is obvious that Tony Stark and Steve Rogers are the ones talking the most, which makes them the leader of the two sub-groups in the Avengers (those who want to sign the contract with Tony Stark and those who don't want to sign the contract with Steve Rogers). Tony says something and Steve answers, while sometimes other people intervene in the conversation.

KEY (What clues let us know the tone of the conversation? Angry? Happy?): The tone isn't very aggressive but it's definitely not happy or friendly either. They are discussing a very important issue, so they are serious.

INSTRUMENTALITIES (Is the conversation polite, impolite, casual or in between?): The conversation is polite, although at the end it turns very casual because Tony Stark, Sam Wilson and Natsha Romanoff make some jokes.

NORM (Can you see politeness norms in the conversation?): James says "I'm sorry" to be polite and everyone tries to give their opinion respectfully.

GENRE (What type of conversation is this? Face to face? By phone?): It is a face-to-face conversation.

Follow-up questions:

-Can you identify the instances in which the people agree or disagree with each other?

Tony Stark says: "If we can't accept limitations, if we're boundary-less, we're no better than the bad guys." → consequence

"Who said we're giving up?" → contradiction

James Rhodes says: "I'm sorry. Steve. That - that is dangerously arrogant." → general statement

Steve Rogers says: "What if this panel sends us somewhere we don't think we should go? What if there is somewhere we need to go, and they don't let us?" → perspective change

Sam Wilson says: "Aren't you the same woman who told the government to kiss her ass a few years ago?" → attack-rhetorical question

-Why do they say the things they say?

"If we can't accept limitations, if we're boundary-less, we're no better than the bad guys." tries to show the consequences of choosing not to sign the contract, Tony wants the rest of the team to see his point of view.

"Who said we're giving up?" Here, Tony is repeating what Steve just said in order to show disagreement because he said something and Tony is saying just the opposite.

General statements occur when someone has a point to make, some conviction about how life works and that is disagreeing with what another person is saying.

When Steven Rogers says: "What if this panel sends us somewhere we don't think we should go? What if there is somewhere we need to go, and they don't let us?" he is trying to change the perspective of the matter; Steve is telling them one side of the issue they haven't taken into account.

When someone uses an attack-rhetorical question like Sam Wilson does: "Aren't you the same woman who told the government to kiss her ass a few years ago?" he tries to discredit Natasha by showing her that in the past she used to agree with them, by asking her a rhetorical-questions about her past behavior, which expects no answer from her.

-What does the body language and tone indicate in this scene?

They are having a calm but tense conversation, none of them raises their voice or does big body gestures but the topic is very important to all of them.

Part 2: Production practice

Now imagine yourself in this situation. How would you express agreement/disagreement in your own language? And in English? *(Imagine there is a new rule which obliges students to wear uniforms in your high-school. Some people in class like the idea whereas others don't want to wear uniforms at all but you have to make a common decision to decide whether you will start using uniforms or not. How would you defend your position?)*

In Spanish: Pues yo creo que llevar uniforme no es tan mala idea. Si lo piensas bien, así nadie se sentirá peor por no poder comprar ropa de marca, porque todos vestiremos igual.

In English: I don't think that uniforms are that bad. Guys, wearing uniforms will save us a lot of time in the morning because we just have to grab the same clothes every day. Plus, we will save a lot of money since we only have to buy two uniforms. (hedged negation, grounder)

Scene nº 2: Dead to me, Netflix, 2019, Season 2 Episode 5

Judy: There's also that documentary about the Saudi Arabian women who get to drive. Is it "Sowdi" or "Sawdi"? Anyway, I don't know if they get to drive, or because they already know, or if they learn to drive, but it's supposed to be really good.

Tyler: $263.42.

Judy: There's also the one about misogyny and revenge. Ooh, take a penny, leave a penny! I love that.

Tyler: (beeps) Oh, sorry, your card didn't go through.

Jen: Oh, just run it again, please.

Tyler: Uh, I already did. Twice.

Jen: Well, then something must be wrong with your runner thingy.

Tyler: Or your card's maxed out.

Jen: Maybe your card's maxed out.

Tyler: That doesn't even make sense. Just take some items out. Do you really need eight bottles of wine?

Jen: Oh, I'm sorry, are you the wine sheriff? Because I am the dick police and you have the right to remain fuck¡ng silent.

Tyler: What is your problem, lady?

Jen: You're my fuck¡ng problem, Tyler!

Tyler: Eww.

Jen: Eww. (Jen mocks)

(The wine drops) (Jen and Judy gasp)

Jen: I'm not paying for that.

Tyler: I'm not cleaning that up. (mocks)

Judy: I will. No worries.

-SPEAKING Framework sheet-

Part 1

SETTING (Where does the scene happen?): In a supermarket.

PARTICIPANTS (What is the relationship between the speakers?): Judy and Jen are friends shopping together and Tyler is the supermarket's cashier.

ENDS (What is the participants' goal for having this conversation?): Jen's goal is for Tyler to solve the problem of her card not getting detected and Tyler's goal is to explain to Jen that he can't do anything about it.

ACT SEQUENCE (What is the order of the conversation?): Firstly, Tyler tells Jen about her card getting declined, then Jen tells him to run it again but he has done it twice. After Tyler advises her to get some things out, Jen and Tyler start discussing about whose problem is this, Jen gets too aggressive and Tyler just tries to defend himself until Jen drops the wine bottle to which only Judy goes to clean.

KEY (What clues let us know the tone of the conversation? Angry? Happy?): Jen is very rude and uses a lot of direct speech and unpleasant expressions. Jen even swears at Tyler. Tyler is not very cooperative at the beginning but at the end he is surprised at Jen's behavior.

INSTRUMENTALITIES (Is the conversation polite, impolite, casual or in between?): At the beginning of the scene the language is casual but later on it turns impolite and very threatening.

NORM (Can you see politeness norms in the conversation?): No. Quite the contrary, Jen is very impolite.

GENRE (What type of conversation is this? Face to face? By phone?): It is a face-to-face

conversation

Follow-up questions:

-Can you identify the instances in which the people agree or disagree with each other?

Tyler says: "Do you really need eight bottles of wine?" → question
"What is your problem, lady?" → question

Jen says: "Oh, I'm sorry, are you the wine sheriff?" → attack-rhetorical question
"Because I am the dick police and you have the right to remain fuc***g silent. → attack statement

-Why do they say the things they say?

Metalinguistic information: Tyler mainly uses questions in order to show disagreement. When you ask something to show disagreement you are calling into question the other person's actions or words. On the other side, Jen is much more direct, she uses attack-rhetorical questions and attack-statements. With rhetorical questions you don't expect an answer, you just want to show disagreement and be disrespectful and with attack-statements you just want to be disrespectful in order to show how much you disagree with the previous statement.

-What does the body language and tone indicate in this scene?

The body language and intonation of Jen is very aggressive. She doesn't want to find a solution; she just wants to fight. The cashier at the beginning is a little bit unhelpful but later on he is just confused. Meanwhile Judy maintains a calm attitude and tone which makes sense because she is the one that is trying to peace down things and even offers to clean up.

Part 2: Production practice

Now imagine yourself in this situation. How would you express agreement/disagreement in your own language? And in English? *(Imagine you are at a supermarket and you have a discount coupon. You try to use it but the cashier tells you she can't pass it though. There is nothing wrong with the coupon, so you don't know why she isn't able to pass it. How would you express disagreement with the cashier?)*

In Spanish: No entiendo por qué no puedes pasar el cupón. Está en perfecto estado y es válido hasta la semana que viene así que vuelve a pasarlo por la máquina.

In English: Listen, I'm not sure what you are trying to do. The coupon works, you just don't want to pass it through. Are you really doing this right now? I want to speak with your manager. (grounder, rhetorical-question, command)

9.2 Evaluation rubric of the teaching proposal

EVALUATION CRITERION	4	3	2	1
1.3. Aplicar los conocimientos y las estrategias más adecuadas en cada situación comunicativa para comprender el sentido general, la información esencial y los detalles más relevantes de los textos, inferir significados e interpretar elementos no verbales, así como realizar búsquedas para seleccionar y gestionar información veraz y enriquecer su repertorio lingüístico individual.	The student is able to correctly spot the general meaning and the main ideas, as well as the discursive and principal communicative function of each scene. The student can also apply the knowledge and strategies to understand all of the different nuances each scene has, infer meaning and detect non-verbal elements (such as body language and tone)	The student can spot the general meaning and the main ideas, with some difficulties in spotting the discursive and principal communicative function of each scene. The student can apply the knowledge and strategies to understand most of the different nuances each scene has, infer meaning and detect non-verbal elements (such as body language and tone)	The student has some difficulties spotting the general meaning and the main ideas, as well as the discursive and principal communicative function of each scene. The student can apply the knowledge and strategies to understand some of the different nuances each scene has, infer meaning and detect non-verbal elements (such as body language and tone)	The student cannot spot the general meaning and the main ideas, nor the discursive and principal communicative function of each scene. The student cannot apply, or applies with great difficulty the knowledge and strategies to understand the different nuances each scene has, infer meaning and detect non-verbal elements (such as body language and tone)

2.3. Seleccionar, organizar y aplicar conocimientos y estrategias en la elaboración de textos coherentes, cohesionados y adecuados a las intenciones comunicativas, las características contextuales, los aspectos socioculturales y la tipología textual, haciendo uso de su repertorio lingüístico y usando los recursos físicos o digitales más adecuados en función de la tarea y de las necesidades de la audiencia o del lector o lectora potencial a quien se dirige el texto, para planificar, producir, revisar y seguir progresando en el proceso de aprendizaje.	The student is able to correctly apply the knowledge and strategies in order to create short texts that answer the communicative intention, the contextual characteristics and sociocultural aspects specific to each situation provided. The written texts are legible, accurate, grammatically correct and make use of different (dis)agreement strategies.	The student is able to apply the knowledge and strategies in order to create short texts that answer the communicative intention, the contextual characteristics and sociocultural aspects specific to each situation provided. The written texts are legible, accurate, grammatically correct and make use of one (dis)agreement strategy.	The student applies with some difficulty the knowledge and strategies in order to create short texts that answer the communicative intention, the contextual characteristics and sociocultural aspects specific to each situation provided. The written texts are not completely legible and accurate, they have some grammatical errors and make use of one (dis)agreement strategy.	The student cannot apply the knowledge and strategies in order to create short texts that answer the communicative intention, the contextual characteristics and sociocultural aspects specific to each situation provided. The written texts are not legible and accurate, they have some grammatical errors and do not make use of any (dis)agreement strategy.