

УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ „ГОЦЕ ДЕЛЧЕВ“ - ШТИП
ФИЛОЛОШКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ

UDC 81
UDC 82
UDC 008



ISSN 2545-3998

ПАЛИМПСЕСТ

МЕЃУНАРОДНО СПИСАНИЕ ЗА ЛИНГВИСТИЧКИ, КНИЖЕВНИ
И КУЛТУРОЛОШКИ ИСТРАЖУВАЊА

PALIMPSEST

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LINGUISTIC, LITERARY
AND CULTURAL RESEARCH

PALMK, VOL 2, NO 4, STIP, MACEDONIA, 2017

ГОД. II, БР. 4
ШТИП, 2017

VOL. II, NO 4
STIP, 2017

ПАЛИМПСЕСТ

**Меѓународно списание за лингвистички, книжевни
и културолошки истражувања**

PALIMPSEST

**International Journal for Linguistic, Literary
and Cultural Research**

**Год. II, Бр. 4
Штип, 2017**

**Vol. II, No 4
Stip, 2017**

PALMK, VOL 2, NO 4, STIP, MACEDONIA, 2017

ПАЛИМПСЕСТ

Меѓународно списание за лингвистички, книжевни
и културолошки истражувања

ИЗДАВА

Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“, Филолошки факултет, Штип,
Република Македонија

ГЛАВЕН И ОДГОВОРЕН УРЕДНИК

Ранко Младеноски

УРЕДУВАЧКИ ОДБОР

Виктор Фридман, Универзитет во Чикаго, САД
Толе Белчев, Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“, Република Македонија
Нина Даскаловска, Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“, Република Македонија
Ала Шешкен, Универзитет Ломоносов, Руска Федерација
Олга Панкина, НВО Македонски културен центар, Руска Федерација
Георгета Раца, Универзитет Банат, Романија
Астрид Симоне Грослер, Универзитет Банат, Романија
Горан Калоѓера, Универзитет во Риека, Хрватска
Дејан Дуриќ, Универзитет во Риека, Хрватска
Шандор Чегледи, Универзитет во Панонија, Унгарија
Ева Бус, Универзитет во Панонија, Унгарија
Хусејин Озбај, Универзитет Гази, Република Турција
Зеки Ѓурел, Универзитет Гази, Република Турција
Елена Дараданова, Универзитет „Св. Климент Охридски“, Република Бугарија
Ина Христова, Универзитет „Св. Климент Охридски“, Република Бугарија
Џозеф Пониах, Национален институт за технологија, Индија
Сатхарај Венкатесан, Национален институт за технологија, Индија
Петар Пенда, Универзитет во Бања Лука, Босна и Херцеговина
Данило Капасо, Универзитет во Бања Лука, Босна и Херцеговина
Мета Лах, Универзитет во Љубљана, Република Словенија
Намита Субиото, Универзитет во Љубљана, Република Словенија
Ана Пеличер-Санчез, Универзитет во Нотингам, Велика Британија
Мајкл Грини, Универзитет во Нотингам, Велика Британија
Татјана Гурин, Универзитет во Нови Сад, Република Србија
Диана Поповиќ, Универзитет во Нови Сад, Република Србија
Жан Пол Мејер, Универзитет во Стразбур, Република Франција
Жан Марк Веркруз, Универзитет во Артуа, Република Франција
Регула Бусин, Швајцарија
Натале Фиорето, Универзитет во Перуца, Италија
Оливер Хербст, Универзитет во Вурцбург, Германија

PALIMPSEST

International Journal for Linguistic, Literary
and Cultural Research

PUBLISHED BY

Goce Delcev University, Faculty of Philology, Stip,
Republic of Macedonia

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Ranko Mladenoski

EDITORIAL BOARD

Victor Friedman, University of Chicago, United States of America
Tole Belcev, Goce Delcev University, Republic of Macedonia
Nina Daskalovska, Goce Delcev University, Republic of Macedonia
Alla Sheshken, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russian Federation
Olga Pankina, NGO Macedonian Cultural Centre, Russian Federation
Georgeta Rata, Banat University, Romania
Astrid Simone Grosler, Banat University, Romania
Goran Kalogjera, University of Rijeka, Croatia
Dejan Duric, University of Rijeka, Croatia
Sándor Czeglédi, University of Pannonia, Hungary
Éva Bús, University of Pannonia, Hungary
Husejin Ozbaj, GAZI University, Republic of Turkey
Zeki Gurel, GAZI University, Republic of Turkey
Elena Daradanova, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, Republic of Bulgaria
Ina Hristova, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, Republic of Bulgaria
Joseph Ponniah, National Institute of Technology, India
Sathyaraj Venkatesan, National Institute of Technology, India
Petar Penda, University of Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina
Danilo Capasso, University of Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina
Meta Lah, University of Ljubljana, Republic of Slovenia
Namita Subiotto, University of Ljubljana, Republic of Slovenia
Ana Pellicer Sanchez, The University of Nottingham, United Kingdom
Michael Greaney, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Tatjana Durin, University of Novi Sad, Republic of Serbia
Diana Popovic, University of Novi Sad, Republic of Serbia
Jean-Paul Meyer, University of Strasbourg, French Republic
Jean-Marc Vercrusse, Artois University, French Republic
Regula Busin, Switzerland
Natale Fioretto, University of Perugia, Italy
Oliver Herbst, University of Wurzburg, Germany

РЕДАКЦИСКИ СОВЕТ

Драгана Кузмановска
Толе Белчев
Нина Даскаловска
Билјана Ивановска
Светлана Јакимовска
Марија Леонтиќ
Јована Караникиќ Јосимовска

ЈАЗИЧНО УРЕДУВАЊЕ

Даница Гавриловска–Атанасовска (македонски јазик)
Весна Продановска (англиски јазик)
Толе Белчев (руски јазик)
Билјана Ивановска (германски јазик)
Марија Леонтиќ (турски јазик)
Светлана Јакимовска (француски јазик)
Јована Караникиќ Јосимовска (италијански јазик)

ТЕХНИЧКИ УРЕДНИК

Славе Димитров

АДРЕСА

ПАЛИМПСЕСТ
РЕДАКЦИСКИ СОВЕТ
Филолошки факултет
ул. „Крсте Мисирков“ бр. 10-А
п. фах 201
МК-2000 Штип, Македонија

Меѓународното научно списание „Палимпсест“ излегува двапати годишно во печатена и во електронска форма на посебна веб-страница на веб-порталот на Универзитетот „Гоце Делчев“ во Штип:

<http://js.ugd.edu.mk/index.php/PAL>

Трудовите во списанието се објавуваат на следните јазици: македонски јазик, англиски јазик, германски јазик, француски јазик, руски јазик, турски јазик и италијански јазик.

Трудовите се рецензираат.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Dragana Kuzmanovska
Tole Belcev
Nina Daskalovska
Biljana Ivanovska
Svetlana Jakimovska
Marija Leontik
Jovana Karanikik Josimovska

LANGUAGE EDITORS

Danica Gavrilovska-Atanasovska (Macedonian language)
Vesna Prodanovska (English language)
Tole Belcev (Russian language)
Biljana Ivanovska (German language)
Marija Leontik (Turkish language)
Svetlana Jakimovska (French language)
Jovana Karanikik Josimovska (Italian language)

TECHNICAL EDITOR

Slave Dimitrov

ADDRESS

PALIMPSEST
EDITORIAL COUNCIL
Faculty of Philology
Krste Misirkov 10-A
P.O. Box 201
MK-2000, Stip, Macedonia

The International Scientific Journal “Palimpsest” is issued twice a year in printed form and online at the following website of the web portal of Goce Delcev University in Stip:
<http://js.ugd.edu.mk/index.php/PAL>

Papers can be submitted and published in the following languages: Macedonian, English, German, French, Russian, Turkish and Italian language.

All papers are peer-reviewed.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Journal Name	PALIMPSEST International Journal for Linguistic, Literary and Cultural Research
Abbreviation	PALMK
ISSN (print)	2545-398X
ISSN (online)	2545-3998
Knowledge field:	UDC 81
UDC code	UDC 82 UDC 008
Article Format	HTML/ PDF; PRINT/ B5
Article Language	Macedonian, English, German, French, Russian, Turkish, Italian
Type of Access	Open Access e-journal
Type of Review	Double-blind peer review
Type of Publication	Electronic version and print version
First Published	2016
Publisher	Goce Delcev University, Faculty of Philology, Stip, Republic of Macedonia
Frequency of Publication	Twice a year
Subject Category	Language and Linguistics, Literature and Literary Theory, Education, Cultural Studies
Chief Editor	Ranko Mladenoski
Country of Origin	Republic of Macedonia
Online Address	http://js.ugd.edu.mk/index.php/PAL
E-mail	palimpsest@ugd.edu.mk Academia edu https://www.ugd.academia.edu/ PALIMPSESTПАЛИМПСЕСТ
	Research Gate https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Palimpsest_Palimpsest2
Profiles	Facebook Palimpsest / Палимпсест
	Twitter https://twitter.com/palimpsest22
	SCRIBD https://www.scribd.com/user/359191573/Palimpsest-Палимпсест

СОДРЖИНА / TABLE OF CONTENTS

11 ПРЕДГОВОР

Нина Даскаловска, уредник на „Палимпсест“

FOREWORD

Nina Daskalovska, editor of Palimpsest

ЈАЗИК / LANGUAGE

15 Svetlana Jakimovska

ANALYSE COMPARATIVE DE L'ÉTYMOLOGIE DES TERMES
ORTHODOXES MACÉDONIENS ET FRANÇAIS

Svetlana Jakimovska

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FRENCH AND MACEDONIAN ORTHODOX
TERMS ETYMOLOGY

25 Семина Бекир

ТУРЦИЗМИТЕ ВО ПОЕЗИЈАТА НА РИСТО ЛАЗАРОВ ОД 1972 ДО 1990
ГОДИНА

Semina Bekir

TURCISMS IN THE POETRY OF RISTO LAZAROV FROM 1972 TO 1990

35 Marco Mazzoleni

“ORMAI CADEVA” = ‘STAVA (QUASI) PER CADERE’

Marco Mazzoleni

“ORMAI CADEVA” = ‘HE NEARLY / ALMOST FELL (OVER)’

КНИЖЕВНОСТ / LITERATURE

47 Konan Koffi Syntor

UN REGARD SUR LE CONTRAT DE LECTURE DE *EL AMANTE BILINGÜE*
DE JUAN MARSÉ

Konan Koffi Syntor

A LOOK AT THE READING CONTRACT IN *EL AMANTE BILINGÜE* BY
JUAN MARSÉ

57 Марија Леонтиќ

ОРИГИНАЛНАТА И ПРЕПЕАНАТА ПОЕЗИЈА ЗА ДЕЦА КАКО
УМЕТНИЧКИ ДИЈАЛОГ МЕЃУ КУЛТУРИТЕ

Marija Leontik

ORIGINAL AND VERSIFIED POETRY FOR CHILDREN AS AN ARTISTIC
DIALOGUE BETWEEN CULTURES

65 Славчо Ковилоски

КОРЕСПОНДЕНЦИЈАТА (ЕПИСТОЛАРИЈАТА) НА МАКЕДОНСКИТЕ
ЖЕНИ ВО XIX ВЕК

Slavcho Koviloski

CORRESPONDENCE OF MACEDONIAN WOMEN IN THE XIX CENTURY

- 75 Ранко Младеноски, Данче Стефановска**
 МУЛТИПЛИКАЦИЈА НА ЛИКОВИ-ДУБЛЕТИ ВО РОМАНОТ „ТУНЕЛ“
 ОД ПЕТРЕ М. АНДРЕЕВСКИ
Ranko Mladenoski, Danche Stefanovska
 MULTIPLICATION OF CHARACTERS–DUPLETS IN PETRE M.
 ANDREEVSKI’S NOVEL “TUNNEL”
- Ѓвона Стојановска**
85 BAHRI DİVANI ÖZELLİKLERİ
Ѓвона Стојановска
 BAHRI AND HIS DIVAN
- Gabriele Ottaviani**
93 HORCYNUS ORCA: IL NUTRIMENTO DEL VIAGGIO, LA SEDUZIONE
 DELLA MORTE, L’INVENZIONE DEL LINGUAGGIO PER ESPRIMERE IL
 SENSO PIÙ VERO DELLE COSE
Gabriele Ottaviani
 HORCYNUS ORCA: THE NOURISHMENT OF TRAVEL, THE ALLUREMENT
 OF DEATH, THE INVENTION OF LANGUAGE TO EXPRESS THE MOST
 AUTHENTIC FEELING OF THINGS
- Lorena Lazarić**
101 PROFILO CRITICO DI MAIER SU SVEVO
Lorena Lazarić
 MAIER’S CRITICAL PROFILE OF SVEVO
- Ana Stefanovska**
111 LO SPAZIO DELLA TRASGRESSIONE IN “L’AGNESE VA A MORIRE”
Ana Stefanovska
 SPACES OF TRANSGRESSION IN “L’AGNESE VA A MORIRE”
- КУЛТУРА / CULTURE**
- Agnieszka Jóźwiak**
125 „SCHLESISCHE VOLKSBLÄTTER“. ZUR GESCHICHTE DER ZEITSCHRIFT
Agnieszka Jóźwiak
 „SCHLESISCHE VOLKSBLÄTTER“. TO THE HISTORY OF THE JOURNAL
- Стојанче Костов**
137 ТИПОВИ НА ОРА ВО ИСТОЧНОТО ИГРООРНО ПОДРАЧЈЕ НА
 МАКЕДОНИЈА
Stojanche Kostov
 TYPES OF DANCES IN THE EASTERN DANCING AREA OF MACEDONIA

143 Oliver Herbst
KEIN LEBEN OHNE KLAVIER. DER PIANIST, KOMPONIST UND
KLAVIERPÄDAGOGE PETER FEUCHTWANGER UND DIE STADT SEINER
VORFAHREN
Oliver Herbst
NO LIFE WITHOUT PIANO. THE PIANIST, COMPOSER AND PIANO
PEDAGOGUE PETER FEUCHTWANGER AND THE TOWN OF HIS
ANCESTORS

151 Петар Намичев, Екатерина Намичева
ПРОСТОРНО ОБЛИКУВАЊЕ НА ОДАЈАТА ОД ТРАДИЦИОНАЛНАТА
ГРАДСКА КУЌА ВО ШТИП ОД 19 ВЕК
Petar Namicev, Ekaterina Namiceva
SHAPING OF THE CHAMBER IN THE TRADITIONAL HOUSE OF SH TIP
19TH CENTURY

167 Giovanni Gualdani, Nicoletta Lepri
NEL NOME DI MICHELANGELO: VITE E OPERE DI MICHELANGELO
BUONARROTI E MICHELANGELO MERISI
Giovanni Gualdani, Nicoletta Lepri
IN THE NAME OF MICHELANGELO: LIVES AND WORKS OF
MICHELANGELO BUONAROTTI AND MICHELANGELO MERISI

МЕТОДИКА НА НАСТАВАТА / TEACHING METHODOLOGY

181 Виолета Димова, Лилјана Јовановска
РЕЦЕПЦИЈАТА И ЕСТЕТИКАТА НА КОМУНИКАЦИЈА ВО НАСТАВАТА
ПО МАКЕДОНСКИ ЈАЗИК И ЛИТЕРАТУРА
Violeta Dimova, Liljana Jovanovska
RECEPTION AND AESTHETICS OF COMMUNICATION IN TEACHING
MACEDONIAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

189 Marija Kusevska
THE ROLE OF EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION IN INTERLANGUAGE
PRAGMATIC DEVELOPMENT

199 Виолета Јанушева
ИЗБОР И ФОРМУЛАЦИЈА НА ТЕМАТА ВО ПЕТПАРАГРАФСКИОТ ЕСЕЈ
И КВАЛИТЕТОТ НА ПИСМЕНОТО ИЗРАЗУВАЊЕ НА СТУДЕНТИТЕ ВО
РМ
Violeta Janusheva
CHOICE AND FORMULATION OF THE TOPIC IN THE FIVE-PARAGRAPH
ESSAY AND QUALITY OF THE STUDENTS' WRITTEN EXPRESSION IN
RM

ПРИКАЗИ / BOOK REVIEWS

- 213** **Кристина Е. Крамер**
„ЗБОРУВАТЕ ЛИ МАКЕДОНСКИ?“ ОД АВТОРИТЕ МАРИЈА КУСЕВСКА
И ЛИЛЈАНА МИТКОВСКА
Christina E. Kramer
„ЗБОРУВАТЕ ЛИ МАКЕДОНСКИ? DO YOU SPEAK MACEDONIAN?“ BY
MARIJA KUSEVSKA AND LILJANA MITKOVSKA
- 217** **Марија Гркова**
ПРВИОТ РЕЧНИК НА СИНОНИМИ ВО МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ЈАЗИК
Marija Grkova
FIRST DICTIONARY OF SYNONYMS IN MACEDONIAN LANGUAGE

ДОДАТОК / APPENDIX

- 223** ПОВИК ЗА ОБЈАВУВАЊЕ ТРУДОВИ
ВО МЕЃУНАРОДНОТО НАУЧНО СПИСАНИЕ „ПАЛИМПСЕСТ“

CALL FOR PAPERS
FOR THE INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL “PALIMPSEST”

ПРЕДГОВОР

Почитувани колешки и колеги,

Големо задоволство ми е да го претставам четвртиот број на меѓународното списание за лингвистички, книжевни и културолошки истражувања „Палимпсест“ кое беше креирано за да обезбеди место за колегите од Универзитетот „Гоце Делчев“, Штип, и други универзитети во Македонија и пошироко да ги публикуваат резултатите од својата научна работа во областа на лингвистиката, книжевноста, методиката и културологијата. Иако ова е само втора година од постоењето на списанието, тоа успеа да го привлече вниманието на многу автори и читатели од целиот свет.

„Палимпсест“ е вистинско меѓународно списание од најмалку три причини. Прво, се прифаќаат трудови на седум јазици: македонски, англиски, италијански, француски, германски, руски и турски. Второ, Уредувачкиот одбор е составен од 30 уредници, сите универзитетски професори, од 17 земји не само од Европа туку и од други делови на светот. Трето, трите претходни броеви на „Палимпсест“ содржат трудови од автори од многу различни земји кои придонесуваат за разноликоста на истражувањата, теоретските перспективи и гледиштата. Овој број го следи истиот тренд, бидејќи содржи 21 труд од автори од Македонија (Светлана Јакимовска, Семина Бекир, Марија Леонтиќ, Славчо Ковилоски, Ранко Младеноски, Данче Стефановска, Ивона Стојановска, Стојанче Костов, Петар Намичев, Екатерина Намичева, Виолета Димова, Лилјана Јовановска, Марија Кусевска, Виолета Јанушева, Марија Гркова), Италија (Марко Мазолени, Габриеле Отовиани, Ана Стефановска, Џовани Гвалдани, Николета Лепри), Хрватска (Лорена Лазариќ), Полска (Агнешка Јужвјак), Германија (Оливер Хербст), Канада (Кристина Е. Крамер) и Брегот на Слоновата Коска (Конан Кофи Синтор). Ова богатство од научни трудови секако придонесува за развивање и проширување на емпириското и теоретското знаење во четирите области – лингвистика, литература, културологија и методика.

Би сакала да ја изразам мојата искрена благодарност за придонесот од авторите на трудовите вклучени во овој број на „Палимпсест“. Четвртиот број, како и претходните три броја, не оставаат сомнеж дека „Палимпсест“ ќе продолжи да им нуди на своите читатели интересни и привлечни трудови и дека ќе привлекува сè повеќе и повеќе истакнати автори кои ќе придонесуваат за квалитетот на ова списание.

Нина Даскаловска, уредник на „Палимпсест“

FOREWORD

Dear colleagues,

It is my great pleasure to present the fourth issue of the international journal for linguistic, literary and cultural research *Palimpsest* which was created with the aim of providing a venue for our colleagues from Goce Delcev University and other universities in Macedonia and abroad to publish their work in the area of linguistics, literary science, teaching methodology and culturology. Although the journal is only in the second year of its existence, it has already attracted the attention of many authors and readers from all over the world.

Palimpsest is a truly international journal for at least three reasons. First, it accepts papers in seven languages: Macedonian, English, Italian, French, German, Russian and Turkish. Second, the Editorial Board is composed of 30 editors who are all university professors from 17 countries not only from Europe, but also from other regions of the world. Third, the three previous issues of *Palimpsest* contain papers from authors from many different countries which contribute to the diversity of research studies, theoretical perspectives and viewpoints. The present issue follows the same fashion as it contains 21 papers from authors from Macedonia (Svetlana Jakimovska, Semina Bekir, Marija Leontik, Slavcho Koviloski, Ranko Mladenovski, Danche Stefanovska, Ivona Stoyanovska, Stojanche Kostov, Petar Namicev, Ekaterina Namiceva, Violeta Dimova, Liljana Jovanovska, Marija Kusevska, Violeta Janusheva, Marija Grkova), Italy (Marco Mazzoleni, Gabriele Ottoviani, Ana Stefanovska, Giovanni Gualdani, Nicoletta Lepri), Croatia (Lorena Lazarić), Poland (Agnieszka Józwiak), Germany (Oliver Herbst), Canada (Christina E. Kramer) and the Ivory Coast (Konan Koffi Syntor). This wealth of scientific papers certainly contributes to developing and broadening the empirical and theoretical knowledge in the four areas - linguistics, literature, culturology and teaching methodology.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation of the contributions made by the authors of the papers included in this issue of *Palimpsest*. The fourth issue, like the previous three issues, leaves little doubt that *Palimpsest* will continue to offer its readers interesting and engaging papers and that it will attract more and more prominent authors that will contribute to the quality of the journal.

Nina Daskalovska, editor of Palimpsest

THE ROLE OF EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION IN INTERLANGUAGE PRAGMATIC DEVELOPMENT

Marija Kusevska

Goce Delchev University, Republic of Macedonia
marija.kusevska@ugd.edu.mk

Abstract: The aim of this article is twofold: 1. to review some literature focusing on instruction in interlanguage pragmatics; and 2. to provide an example of how interlanguage pragmatics research and instruction can be linked. In particular it focuses on explicit and implicit instruction, noticing, awareness raising, and metapragmatic instructions. The following areas of instructional research are discussed: subject of study, research questions, research design and findings. We also refer to how instruction can benefit from interlanguage pragmatics research on the example of the second stage of the project “The role of explicit instruction in developing pragmatic competence in learning English and German as foreign languages” carried out at Goce Delchev University, Stip, Republic of Macedonia.

Keywords: *explicit, implicit, interlanguage pragmatics, noticing, awareness, matapragmatic, syllabus design.*

Introduction

This paper was motivated by two critical issues in foreign language teaching and learning: 1. the neglected role of pragmatic issues in instruction and 2. the much-debated role of explicit instruction. Research in pragmatics has piled up in recent years but it has rarely found its way to the classroom. Until recently most of the studies of interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) were cross-sectional, descriptive, concerned with what is happening with the interlanguage at the moment of study. Little attention has been paid to ILP development. In 1993 Schmidt noted that “the study of interlanguage pragmatics has produced important empirical findings” but that “there has been little discussion of how pragmatic abilities are acquired in a second language.” (p. 21)

This has changed now and the number of developmental studies is on the rise. There is a growing body of studies concerned with how learners acquire pragmatics both in second language learning through enhanced input and in foreign language learning through instruction (Rose, 2000; 2009). The number of researchers recognizing the importance of instruction is also greater today than a couple of years ago. Many have claimed that even in enhanced input, learners benefit from instruction. The rules by which societies abide are not straightforward, and often they are not obvious even for native speakers. “Simple exposure to sociolinguistically appropriate input is unlikely to be sufficient for second language acquisition of pragmatic and discorsal knowledge because the linguistic

realizations of pragmatic functions are sometimes opaque to language learners and because the relevant contextual factors to be noticed are likely to be defined differently or may be nonsalient for the learner” (Schmidt, 1993, p. 36). Instruction is particularly important in the EFL context where opportunities to hear and use English outside the classroom are rare.

In different periods of foreign language teaching development, different approaches have prevailed. One of the always important questions is which is more effective: implicit or explicit instruction. The main feature distinguishing one group from another was the provision of metapragmatic information designed to make the target features more salient. Schmidt (1993) defines *implicit learning* as nonconscious generalization from examples. *Explicit learning*, on the other hand, is conscious and the learners are given clear, unambiguous explanations about the target of learning. No matter which approach teachers prefer, learners need to notice language forms and functions. Schmidt (1993) notes that,

pragmatic knowledge seems to be partly conscious and partly accessible to consciousness, although it cannot be the case that all pragmatic knowledge is accessible to consciousness. Events may remain unnoticed for several reasons – because attention is directed elsewhere, because the information is too complex to be processed, or because it is presented too quickly or too softly to be consciously seen or heard. (p. 23)

So it is useful for learners to direct their attention to the thing that they are trying to learn. Attention to input is a necessary condition for learning to take place. In fact, “attention and awareness are inseparable, like two sides of the same coin” (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). For the learning of pragmatics in a second language, attention to linguistic forms, functional meanings, and the relevant contextual features is required. Schmidt (1993) claims that,

second language learners may fail to experience the crucial noticing for years. The fact that this does not seem to happen in first language learning is attributable not to any sort of pragmatics acquisition device, but to the efforts that parents and other caregivers make in order to teach communicative competence to children, using a variety of strategies. (p. 36)

There have been periods of teaching philosophy when the mother tongue was almost banned from the classroom and when explicit instruction was completely pushed out of the mainstream processes of teaching. Foreign language teachers, however, have always been doubtful about this. Explicit teacher-provided information about the pragmatics of the second language can also play a role in learning, provided that it is accurate and not based only on native speaker intuitions. Explicit teaching is often more efficient for identifying the pragmalinguistic forms of the target language (Norris & Ortega, 2000; Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; House, 1996; Tateyama, Kasper, Mui, Tay, & Thananart, 1997). In fact, in his review of the studies on the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics, Rose (2005) notes that “[w]ithout exception, learners receiving instruction in pragmatics outperformed those who did not” (p. 392) Explicit instruction is connected with

raising learners' awareness about the language, including metalinguistic awareness. Mora (2001) defines metalinguistic awareness as the ability to reflect on the use of language and engage in discussions about language.

Questions related to ILP development and how it is influenced by instruction are addressed in a number of publications (Kasper and Rose, 2001; Hinkell, 2011; Gesuato, Bianchi, & Cheng, 2015; Greer, Tatsuki, & Roever, 2013; Taguchi & Sykes, 2013; Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). In this paper we review the literature on the effectiveness of explicit instruction in interlanguage pragmatics research by referring to the subject of study, the research questions that are usually posed, organization of research and findings. We also refer to how explicit instruction can benefit from ILP research on the example of the second stage of the project "The role of explicit instruction in developing pragmatic competence in learning English and German as foreign languages" carried out at Goce Delchev University, Stip, Republic of Macedonia.

Organization of instructional research

Subject of study

Subject of study in ILP research are often speech acts (requests, apologies, compliment responses, suggestions, complaints, reaction to criticism), discourse markers, pragmatic routines, discourse characteristics, and pragmatic comprehension. As for speech acts, effectiveness of instruction is studied with respect to speech act strategies, level of directness, appropriateness, mitigating devices, and external modification.

Research questions

The following research questions are usually investigated:

1. Is second language acquisition better promoted through language exposure or through instruction? (Rose, 2005; Schmidt, 1993);
2. Does instruction in general make a difference in learners' pragmatic awareness and production? (Billmyer, 1990; Alcón, 2005);
3. What are the roles of explicit and implicit instruction on the acquisition of speech acts and which is more beneficial for the learners? (Nguyen, Pham, & Pham, 2012; Nguyen, Pham, & Cao, 2013; Alcón, 2005; Martínez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005; Salemi, Rabiee, & Ketabi, 2012);
4. How metapragmatic information considering speech acts can be incorporated into instruction and what are its effects on raising learners' awareness and improving their production? (Billmyer, 1990; Koike & Pearson, 2005; Nguyen, Pham, & Cao; Mirzaei and Esmaeili, 2013);
5. What is the role of feedback in the development of pragmatic competence? (Mirzaei and Esmaeili, 2013; Tolfi & Schmidt, 2008);
6. Do awareness raising activities facilitate noticing of pragmatic forms and functions and what is the effect of the learners' noticing on their learning outcomes? (Takahashi, 2005; Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005);
7. Does explicit instruction facilitate sustainability of positive effects over a longer period of time? (Nguyen, Pham, & Pham, 2012; Nguyen, Pham, & Cao, 2013; Koike & Pearson, 2005; Salemi, Rabiee, & Ketabi, 2012);

8. Are pragmatic forms and functions teachable? (Rose, 2005; Mirzaei & Esmaeili, 2013).

Research design

Most of the studies are designed as quasi-experiments with two (explicit instruction group and control group) or three groups (explicit instruction group, implicit instruction group and control group). The explicit treatment in such investigations offers metapragmatic information by describing, explaining and discussing a target linguistic form. The instruction usually includes a series of awareness raising activities (listening and reading tasks, providing explicit feedback, corrections) and production activities (dialogue improvement, role-plays). Recently, we have noticed a tendency to provide authentic audio-visual input (plays, video, films, TV) and application of modern technological development (internet, chat sessions, computer-mediated communication, and synthetic immersive environment).

Groups are tested before and after the treatment. Sometimes immediate tests are conducted during the treatment to investigate the effects of different tasks. To investigate sustainability of effects, delayed posttests are administered several weeks or months after the instruction. Research data is most often collected by means of a discourse completion task, multiple-choice tests, role plays, peer feedback, self-reports. However, there are also attempts to collect data by creating situations resembling real life that would enable collecting spontaneous data (Billmyer, 1990, who organized actual encounters between native and non-native speakers of English; Nguyen, Pham, & Pham, 2012, and Nguyen, Pham, & Cao, 2013, who recorded oral peer feedback)

Findings of instructional research

The results of the empirical studies of the role of instruction in general, and of explicit instruction in particular, show that the groups that receive instruction outperform the implicit and the control group. Billmyer (1990) who investigated the **efficacy of instruction** concludes that formal instruction concerning the social rules of language use can assist learners in communicating more appropriately with native speakers of the target language outside of the classroom. The results of her research showed that learners in the instructed group produced a greater number of spontaneous norm-appropriate compliments than learners in the uninstructed group and that those compliments were produced independently of the compliment-elicitation tasks. Learners in the instructed group also used a wider repertoire of positive adjectives. And on five out of seven measures of performance, subjects in the instructed group resembled more closely native speaker norms in complimenting than did subjects in the uninstructed group.

Bardovi-Harlig and Griffin (2005) studied the **results of repair activities**. Their study suggests that at the high intermediate level, learners in a second-language environment develop a certain degree of **pragmatic awareness** about the second language even without specific instruction. Building on this awareness through instruction would likely help learners increase their productive abilities in L2 pragmatics. Classroom activities which raise L2 pragmatic awareness provide

learners with necessary information and choices to help them become competent users of the target language.

Takahashi (2005) studied the instructional effects on learners' **noticing** of target English request forms and the effect of the learners' noticing on their learning outcomes. Noticing was studied through form-comparison and form-search activities. The results indicated that during the treatment, when the learners were required to compare their usage with the corresponding NS usage noticed the target request forms to a greater extent than those in the form-search condition. The learners' higher awareness of the target forms tended to ensure the emergence of these forms during their posttest performance.

In the majority of the studies comparing **explicit and implicit instruction**, explicit instruction has proven more useful than implicit instruction. A typical study of this type was conducted by Nguyen, Pham, & Pham (2012) who conclude that their "results seemed to suggest that although both types of instruction proved effective in developing learners' pragmatic performance, explicit instruction tended to produce a larger magnitude of effects." (p. 427) This view is shared by other researchers as well (Alcón, 2005; Martínez-Flor and Fukuya, 2005; Mirzaei & Esmaeili, 2013).

A similar study was conducted by Nguyen, Pham, & Cao (2013) as a part of the same project. While they agree that the instructed students significantly outperformed the students from the controlled group in comparison with the pre-test results, they go on to say that their study also showed that "the learners' post-instructional improvement was more evident in sociopragmatic appropriateness than in pragmalinguistic accuracy" and that "their gains in pragmalinguistic accuracy were significant only in the DCT post-test, where they were not under pressure to produce online speech and thus could plan their production more carefully." (p. 235)

Koike and Pearson's study (2005) indicates that learners develop their pragmatic competence more effectively when they experience instruction on the speech act before doing the exercises. According to their study, explicit instruction helped students to read, interpret, and select the most appropriate pragmatic choices in the multiple choice sections of the tests. Implicit instruction, on the other hand, led to an effect in these learners' open-ended responses in a dialogic context. Thus, the explicit/implicit instruction and feedback may have varying effects on different areas of learner competence. The delayed posttest, however, revealed that it is not clear if such gains are retained in the longer term.

Despite the findings of the positive contribution of explicit instruction for interlanguage pragmatic development, the question as to what is the most effective method is still lingering. In contrast to the above mentioned studies, Martínez-Flor and Fukuya (2005) do not advocate one particular approach. The results of their study revealed that both explicit and implicit groups had post-instructional improvements in their production of pragmatically appropriate and linguistically accurate suggestions. They, therefore, conclude that **coupled instruction** of these two techniques is a sound option to teach suggestions to foreign language learners.

We would also like to mention here Salemi, Rabiee and Ketabi's study (2012) because they looked at explicit and implicit instruction and feedback from

the point of the effect they have on **sustainability and acquisition** of speech act (in their case, suggestions). The results of their study showed that the explicit teaching group outperformed the other two groups, the implicit group and the control group. However, the results also demonstrated that students tend to forget the instructed materials after four weeks and there is no evidence that the effects of the instruction will be sustained. Namely, the learners of both the experimental groups and the control group performed almost the same on the delayed test, which means the effect of instruction almost faded away after a four-week no-instruction period.

Establishing links between interlanguage pragmatics research and instruction

In this part of the paper, we demonstrate how instruction can benefit from interlanguage pragmatics research. We refer here to the second stage of the ongoing project “The role of explicit instruction in developing pragmatic competence in learning English and German as foreign languages” carried out at Goce Delchev University, Stip, Republic of Macedonia. In the first stage of the project students’ pragmatic competence was investigated on the basis of their realization of the speech acts of requesting, apologizing and complaining in the language they were learning (English or German). In this paper we focus on English complaints.

In the first stage of our project, we investigated the pragmatic competence of Macedonian learners of English (MLE) and compared it to native speaker (NS) performance with respect to complaint strategies, complaint frames and modification of the speech act. The aim was to pinpoint the differences and to address those aspects of the speech act of complaining in our instruction that could potentially cause problems in communication with native speakers. The following target forms were chosen for treatment:

- Complaint frames and their relatedness to politeness
- Length of utterances - complaints are not to be long and verbose because in that case they become argumentative and spur animosity
- Complaint perspective: avoidance of you-perspective - *You made a mistake; There was a mistake; Can we go over my test one more time?*
- Mitigation of complaints: *can/could/may* - *Can I see an answer sheet?; Could you tell me why I got this grade?; I think there may have been a mistake on my grade;* embedding requests (past tense; questions): *I just wanted to ask if; I was wondering if; do you think; is there any way; would you mind.*
- Strengthening complaints in a polite way: negation - *I don't think you graded me fairly; I'm not sure why I got this grade;* *want/need* statements - *I'd like to discuss my grade; I just wanted to ask if you could be less noisy; You need to pay for damages; I think* (past tense, with modal verbs, negative and interrogative form) - *I thought you were coming at 8.30; I think there may have been a mistake on my grade; I think there might be a mistake; I don't think there was a bump in the fender when you took it. Do you guys think you could keep it down a bit?*

The information obtained through the research in the first phase of our project was further used for designing e-learning modules for addressing the deficiencies described in the first stage of the project. The instruction was in a form of an e-course posted on the e-learning platform of Goce Delcev University, Stip,

Republic of Macedonia. It consisted of self-study lessons created for the purpose of improving learners' awareness and production of the speech act of complaining. In this part of the project, we are set to answer the following set of questions:

1. Does explicit instruction raise students' awareness of the form and function of English complaints?
2. Are the students able to apply what they have become aware of?
3. Are the students able to retain information for remote application?

The modules consisted of two types of activities: activities for raising learners' awareness of the pragmatic meanings conveyed by specific linguistic means which native speakers use, and hands-on activities that enable learners to apply the acquired knowledge. Thus, the instruction comprised the following components:

- Awareness-raising through note taking, model dialogues, video analysis, summary writing, discussions of concepts and situations, speech act analysis, metapragmatic judgement tasks;
- Metapragmatic explanations and quizzes on sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic aspects of making complaints; metapragmatic judgment tasks to evaluate appropriateness of the utterances;
- Practice exercises including substitutions, reformulations, fill-in exercises;
- Production activities such as responding in situations with different social parameters;

The following norms were mentioned:

1. each speech act, including the act of complaining, is realized in a situation that is specific for the culture of the target language; it depends how the society views the offence: in the USA, for example, cutting the line is very offensive; in Macedonia it happens on daily basis and people do not find it as offensive;

2. complaints vary according to the age, sex and social status of the hearer and speaker as well as their relationship; they also vary depending on how severe the offence is (if someone damaged your old computer that you were trying to get rid of anyway, or your new camera that you were very proud of); if not appropriate they can damage a relationship;

3. complaints need to be specific and effective; speakers are usually relatively straightforward, not vague;

4. the dominating negative politeness in English often requires complainers to mitigate their complaints by framing them as questions or requests and by modifying them externally and internally; it also requires avoidance of the you-perspective which openly places the guilt on the hearer; however, if speakers find it necessary they can also make their complaints stronger;

5. complaints should not be over verbose: the goal needs to be achieved with the right amount of speech, not more and not less than it is necessary; complaints shouldn't be formulated as long streams of words that can be trapped into criticism or evaluation of someone's behavior; verbose explicitness can be interpreted as domineering behaviour.

Students were also encouraged to keep a Reflection journal and make notes of their learning experiences while doing the activities.

The assignments that the students produced during their self-study will be used to investigate the immediate effects of the instructions. At the end of the semester, the students who finished all the assignments did the End-of-project questionnaire. It was in a form of a DCT and consisted of six complaint tasks similar to the tasks included in the DCT administered at the beginning of the project. Their responses to these tasks will be used to investigate if the effects from the pragmatic instruction can be sustained for a longer period of time.

Conclusion

The findings of the empirical studies reviewed in this paper make a strong case in favour of instructional pragmatics and demonstrate that explicit instruction, and instruction in general, have positive effect on learners' interlanguage pragmatic development. This is especially true in FL learning, when learners have poor exposure to the target language, which makes it our duty, as teachers of foreign languages, to teach our students the "secret rules" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001) of the target language and culture. In support of this, Rose (2005) points out that,

there is considerable evidence indicating that a range of features of second language pragmatics are teachable. These include a variety of discoursal, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic targets of instruction, such as discourse markers and strategies, pragmatic routines, speech acts, overall discourse characteristics, and pragmatic comprehension. Second, it appears that learners who receive instruction are better than those who do not. The fact that instructed learners outpaced their uninstructed counterparts indicates that pedagogical intervention has at least an important facilitative role, which is especially good news for learners in foreign language contexts. (p. 396-397).

In our last part we referred to how ILP research can be informative for instructional pragmatics and can serve as needs analysis for syllabus design. What results it will yield, still remains to be seen.

References

- Alcón, E. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System* 33, 417–435.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. R. Rose, & G. Kasper, *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Griffin, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from the ESL classroom. *System* 33, 401–415.
- Billmyer, K. (1990). "I really like your lifestyle": ESL learners learning how to compliment. (pp. 31-48). University of Pennsylvania.
- Gesuato, S., Bianchi, F., & Cheng, W. (2015). *Teaching, Learning and Investigating Pragmatics: Principles, Methods and Practices*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Greer, T., Tatsuki, D., & Roever, C. (2013). *Pragmatics and language learning*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

- Hinkel, E. (2011). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18, 225-252.
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. London: Longman.
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K. R. Rose, & G. Kasper, *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 1-10). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koike, D. A., & Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in the development of pragmatic competence. *System* 33, 481-501.
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Fukuya, Y. J. (2005). The effects of instruction on learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *System* 33, 463-480.
- Mirzaei, A., & Esmaeili, M. (2013). The effects of planned instruction on Iranian L2 learners' interlanguage pragmatic development. *Iranian Journal of Society, Culture & Language (IJSCL)*, 89-100.
- Mora, J. K. (2001). *Metalinguistic awareness as defined through research*. San Diego: San Diego State University.
- Nguyen, M. T., Pham, M. T., & Cao, T. H. (2013). The effects of explicit metapragmatic instruction on EFL learners' performance of constructive criticism in an academic setting. In T. Greer, D. Tatsuki, & C. Roever, *Pragmatics and language learning, Vol. 13* (pp. 213-244). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Nguyen, M. T., Pham, T. H., & Pham, M. T. (2012). The relative effects of explicit and implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44, 416-434.
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 50 (3), 417-528.
- Rose, K. R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *SSLA* 22, 27-67.
- Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System* 33, 385-399.
- Rose, K. R. (2009). Interlanguage pragmatic development in Hong Kong, phase 2. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 2345-2364.
- Rose, K. R., & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Salemi, A., Rabiee, M., & Ketabi, S. (2012). The Effects of Explicit/Implicit Instruction and Feedback on the Development of Persian EFL Learners' Pragmatic Competence in Suggestion Structures. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 3 (1), 188-199.
- Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper, & S. Blum-Kulka, *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, R. W. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson, *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taguchi, N., & Sykes, J. M. (2013). *Technology in interlanguage pragmatics research and teaching*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Takahashi, S. (2005). Noticing in task performance and learning outcomes: A qualitative analysis of instructional effects in interlanguage pragmatics. *System* 33, 437-461.

- Tateyama, Y., Kasper, G., Mui, L., Tay, H., & Thananart, O. (1997). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatics routines. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Tolli, A. P. & Schmidt, A. M. (2008). The role of feedback, causal attributions, and self-efficacy in goal revision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 692-701.

ГОД. II
БР. 4

ПАЛІМПСЕСТ

PALIMPSEST

VOL. II
NO 4

