



*JALT Pragmatics SIG
Newsletter*

Pragmatics Matters

Issue 64, Fall 2024

Letter from the Editor

Greetings! I hope you're all having a good fall season and that you're looking forward to the upcoming JALT conference.

In this issue, we have two articles. The first is from Eli Walgrave, who looks at the concept of Communication Pragmatics, its relationship with Linguistic Pragmatics, and how it can be useful in language teaching. The second is from Nobuko Trent, who gives us a preview of her presentation at JALT with an article about her use of AI in classes and her students' reactions.

Jim Ronald also has our third Pragmatic Incidents column, with an incident illustrated by Rob Olson and other incidents. This issue's column emphasizes pragmatic incidents that involve misunderstandings. We hope that members of the Pragmatics SIG will contribute incidents that we might be able to use in the column. If you have incidents to share, please email them to Jim at jmronald@gmail.com, with your affiliation, if you wish, and with or without a brief explanation.

Donna Fujimoto presents this issue's Member Focus. She had an interesting interview with Yosuke Ishii, who is the SIG Co-Membership Chair and a materials writer.

Finally, we have a list of the pragmatics-related presentations for the upcoming JALT Conference. We hope you'll take a look at the list and attend as many of the presentations as you can.

For the next issue of the newsletter, we are accepting contributions related to ideas for teaching elements of pragmatics, aspects of pragmatics, a pragmatics-related presentation you'd be interested in reporting on, etc. If you would like to contribute, please email me at kkitao217@yahoo.com.

Kathleen Kitao
Editor

Table of Contents

Pragmatics in Conversation, Pragmatics in System-- <i>Eli Walgrave</i>	4
Pre JALT Conference 2024	9
Navigating the Role of Generative AI in College Classrooms-- <i>Nobuko Trent</i>	
Pragmatic Incidents.....	11
Pragmatic Incidents in Cartoon (with video): The Meeting	13
Member Focus: Yosuke Ishii.....	15
JALT 2024 Presentations on Pragmatics.....	17

Note: The following is by Eli Walgrave, who would like to hear comments from readers about his article. His main area in communication is a theory called Coordinated Management, which he says is “a kind of an advancement of communication pragmatics.” Please send your comments to the Editor.

Pragmatics in Conversation, Pragmatics in System:

Pragmatics and the Communication Perspective

Eli Walgrave

Miyagi Gakuin Women’s University

Introduction

During my time as an undergraduate, I initially had no interest in or knowledge of linguistics. My background was, instead, in the field of Communication Studies, particularly interpersonal communication. Despite this, I was working with the school’s international programs as an English tutor for exchange students. Through chance and a series of events at my work, I had come to the conclusion that language teaching might be something that I wanted to pursue. I did not, however, want to go in blind and totally ignorant of language acquisition and teaching methodology. I received permission from the head of the department to join the TESOL graduate classes despite being only an undergraduate. The condition, though, was that I also had to take undergraduate linguistics at the same time. Pragmatics was the area of this class that I found the most interesting, as it was quite similar to many of the theories I had been studying in my communication courses. One major difference, though, was the level of application. Pragmatics and other areas of linguistics focus primarily on the individual level, looking at either the use of language within a particular communicative context or how the language is used within the context of the language itself. While many of the theories from the field of communication studies look at the moment-to-moment micro scale, there are just as many taking a systemic perspective and looking at how what happens in conversation influences events going forward.

Over the course of my career as a language educator in Japan, I started drawing connections between the pragmatics that I had learned in my linguistics class as well as the pragmatics that I had learned in my communication classes. As I continued to apply both areas in my practice, my ability to connect the ground-level pragmatic choices I was making in my classes with the dynamic system-level impact that my choices in communication were making. This, I believe, is important to understand as a language educator.

My goal with this discussion is to introduce the concept of communication pragmatics into the pragmatics community and to illustrate how the concepts can be used in the design and implementation of language classes. I will cover some of the history and theoretical background of communication pragmatics and the Communication Perspective. I will also discuss the Coordinated Management of Meaning, a specific theory within that standpoint, and draw connections between its concepts and the field of pragmatics. Finally, I will illustrate how these concepts can be integrated into the language classroom with examples from my own experience and practice. Through this, I hope to add to the discussion and help move a systemic view of pragmatics forward.

Communication Pragmatics and Social Construction

In the past, the study of interactions between people was often relegated to the field of sociology. It was only later that communication itself became the focus of study. This led to the development of models trying to explain exactly what communication is and how it works, much in the vein of the physical sciences. This approach, however, gradually started to shift. Rather than focusing on the message or information being transferred, this new approach focused more on looking at communication itself and what is actually going on when people communicate with each other. There are already parallels here with pragmatics and its relationship with other areas of linguistics. As time has passed, this view has grown in prevalence within the field of communication studies.

One of the first instances of a direct reference to the concept of communication pragmatics is in the work of Paul Watzlawick and others (1967) at the Mental Research Institute in Palo Alto. The Mental Research Institute was focused on mental health counseling, and was a foundational and pioneering institution in the field of solution-oriented therapy and family/systemic practice. Watzlawick, along with his colleagues, proposed five axioms used for understanding and describing what was happening within the communication process. These are as follows:

1. *One cannot not communicate.* Every action taken, even the refusal to take action, sends out some kind of message.
2. *Every communication has a content aspect and a relationship aspect.* The interpretation of any content in a message, whether verbal or not, is influenced by the relationship between the participants as well as their relationships with the topic.
3. *Communication is causal and is marked by punctuation.* The act of communicating with others brings out a reaction from others. This reaction becomes the cause for the next turn in the interaction. Each participant also has their own idea of punctuation, or when a conversation begins or ends.
4. *Communication has digital and analog components.* Messages in communication are more than just the words. Digital information is the direct linguistic choices used, as well as commonly understood hand signs. Analog information is everything that doesn't have a distinct, decided-upon meaning such as tone of voice, facial expression, distance, etc.
5. *Communication can be either symmetrical or complementary.* Communication changes based on the perceived or desired power distance between participants. Symmetrical communication is based on participants having an equal power relationship, and complementary communication marks a gap in power. These roles, however, are flexible and people use either action depending on the context.

Watzlawick and his colleagues proposed that, oftentimes, the solution to a problem can itself become a totally different and worse problem. By understanding, describing, and changing the way communication is happening within a system, the framing of the problem changes so that it is no longer seen as a problem. This concept is one of the foundational ideas of systemic practice in social work and mental health. Watzlawick's axioms and approach marked a shift from looking at the message to looking at the process, much in the same way that pragmatics brings to focus the meaning of language in context.

While Watzlawick's work was a shift in the way that communication was viewed, it was only part of a much greater perspective shift in the field as well as other social sciences. More and more, relationships were becoming the focus of research and practice. This shift is exemplified by Social Constructionism. There are many approaches to Social

Constructionism, but for the purposes of this discussion I will be focusing on the ideas developed by Kenneth Gergen (2009). As its basic premise, Social Constructionism proposes that the relationships between individuals and other people, things, concepts, and experiences are constitutive rather than just representational. Instead of just a description of something, these relationships are foundational in shaping the worldview and actions of individuals. These relationships are developed and evolve through the use of communication and language. In this sense, each person is the crossroads of their relationships and is in the constant process of changing and being changed. This is what Gergen refers to as the Relational Self. When people change the language they use and the way they talk about things, they are able to change those relationships. This, in turn, changes the way they view their social world.

In Gergen's perspective, knowledge is neither discovered nor transferred. Instead, learning is the process of co-creating knowledge with others through communication. Without this dialogue, information remains inert. It is only once it is inserted within context and then discussed and negotiated by the people involved that it becomes actionable knowledge. This, to a degree, mirrors the application of pragmatics within language teaching. Language alone is inert, and it is only through negotiation within the sociocultural context that it has actionable meaning. Extending this idea leads to the understanding that the messages used during communication are negotiated with others within their sociocultural contexts, which permit and restrain possible options for communication. One of the challenges of teaching in general, from both a communication and linguistic perspective, is supporting students in understanding the context and how that context influences their possible communicative options.

Coordinated Management of Meaning and Pragmatics in Context

Now that the background is out of the way, I want to introduce one particular theory and how I use it in my work as a language instructor. The theory I want to focus on is called the Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM). It was framed by Barnett Pearce and Vernon Cronen (1980) and was designed to be a practical theory. To them, a practical theory is one that can easily be applied and modified in a wide variety of situations. This positions theory as more of a tool than a description. CMM represents communication through a repeating loop of two steps, managing meaning and coordinating action. Within a conversation, the participants must decide together what the situation means to them as well as what they are going to do about it. The guiding question of CMM is simple. *What are we making together?* There is always an other involved in this process, and the actions taken within communication create the social world of the participants. This is consequential, and the results of that conversation go on to shape future interactions between participants as well as their interactions in other contexts.

Pearce (2009) further elaborates on the CMM standpoint, proposing that the end goal of communication is to establish coherence with others. Meaning is negotiated and, once some kind of coherence is established, actions are decided. However, creating perfect coherence is impossible, as there will always be some difference in understanding caused by the differing relationships between participants and their context. In CMM, this is called mystery. This isn't a problem, though, as mystery serves as a driver for continued communication, as there is always more over the horizon outside of one's social world. One obstacle that people face in communication is logical force. Pearce and Cronen describe this as a sense of how things *should* be. Past experiences, sociocultural background and norms, goals and desired outcomes, as well as expectations and implications are examples of logical force, and they serve to push conversations in a certain direction.

The results of conversations can become the logical force that determines the direction and how coherence is established in future conversations.

The process creates patterns of communication that can affect an entire relational system. If a certain kind of communication pattern seems to be effective at coordinating action, it makes sense to repeat it in other contexts. Oftentimes, this happens without any of the participants knowing. Whether this is a good or bad thing, however, is ambivalent. If more positive patterns of communication are repeated, then begin to appear on a systemic level. Likewise, more negative patterns of communication give way to more negative communication systemically. CMM looks at what is happening within communication and what kind of patterns of communication are being created and propagated rather than trying to just describe a communicative episode. Pearce and Cronen refer to this as the Communication Perspective. By taking a Communication Perspective and looking at both the patterns of communication prevalent in a system as well as the conversations happening at an individual level that give shape to the systemic patterns, practitioners can more effectively intervene within a system and help participants become active participants in shaping a better social world. This is looking at the pragmatics of communication.

But how does all of this connect to pragmatics? Of course, there are numerous similarities in the way pragmatics looks at language use rather than just structure. However, my opinion is that linguistic pragmatics and communication pragmatics are interlocking ways of observing language use and meaning-making, albeit from different angles. I view linguistic pragmatics as a way to understand things on a moment-to-moment ground level. How is language being used in this communicative context and what factors are influencing that usage? Communication pragmatics then looks at the impact of that on a systemic level. What kind of patterns of communication did that language usage create and what influence does it have on other communicative contexts going forward? This multilevel approach is the standpoint I tend to take when designing and implementing my own language classes. I view each class as a conversation, and my pragmatic choices within each class have a systemic impact on each class going forward. It is my job, then, to make sure that my moment-to-moment communication and language choices in class as well as the patterns of communication and language embodied by my materials serve to construct better patterns and help students communicate more reflectively.

While designing my class, I often engage in reflection on my design, asking myself questions at both an individual level as well as a content level in my material design. Here are some of the questions I ask myself:

What are the dynamics of the conversations I engage in with my students?

Which communicative acts am I encouraging in students and which am I discouraging?

What stories and voices are most prominent in the classroom? What impact does that have on my class engagement?

What kind of conversations do my choices of vocabulary allow? What conversations do they restrict?

What questions and activities would create the kind of communication I want to see in students?

Are the patterns of communication that I want to see supported by the content of my materials? Are they supported by my instructional choices?

Are my students able to understand the frames at play in their pragmatic choices? What pragmatic choices can I make to engage with and make those frames visible?

Of course, these are only a few of the questions, but they serve to illustrate my attempt at recognizing both the moment-to-moment pragmatic usage of language in my classroom as well as the systematic pragmatic usage of communication within the greater scope of my class as a whole. Using this approach, I have seen growth in students' personal reflexivity, their ability to understand the experiences in context. Students, as well, have commented on this within their class reflections.

I think my English skills have improved compared to before. This is because I have acquired the skills of expressing my opinions in my own words and speaking them out. Also my communication skills have improved.

I think I have become better at connecting questions to my own experiences. I feel that I am getting faster at answering questions as I go through the classes. I believe this ability will be useful when applying my experiences to things.

I feel that I have grown up a little. I usually avoided thinking deeply about one thing or sharing it with many different people. However, I was able to actively do what I had avoided knowing that it was important to share my thoughts with each other through class.

I think my abilities and skills have improved in this class. The reason is that compared to my previous self, my thoughts came out smoothly. I became able to introduce myself well. Also, I often worked with my friends so my communication skills improved. I was able to listen to other people's opinions and think about it for myself.

These reflective comments show that students felt that they were able to develop a degree of both personal reflexivity and self-expression ability. The patterns of communication that I had hoped to create were careful attention to one's own thoughts and experiences, free expression of those ideas, and a serious appreciation for the expressions of others. From both a linguistic and communication perspective, the language classroom can be more than just a place to learn language. I encourage every language instructor to reflect upon their own practice from not only the individual pragmatic level, but also from a systemic communication perspective. Through our language and actions, we are all active agents in the creation of not only our personal social worlds, but also the social worlds of our students. What kind of social worlds do we want to help make in our classrooms?

References

- Gergen, K. J. (2009). *Relational being: Beyond self and community*. Oxford University Press.
- Pearce, W. B. (2009). *Making social worlds: A communication perspective*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Pearce, W. B., & Cronen, V. E. (1980). *Communication, action, and meaning: The creation of social realities*.
- Watzlawick, P., Bavelas, J. B., & Jackson, D. D. (1967). *Pragmatics of human communication: A study of interactional patterns, pathologies and paradoxes*. WW Norton & Company.

Pre JALT Conference 2024

This is a “sneak peek” to the program for the JALT conference 2024. Nobuko Trent, our past Membership Chair and long-time SIG member, will present this poster session at the conference in November. She touches upon the possibility that AI use could potentially lead to a greater and undue influence of North American pragmatics. She also provides useful guidelines for students using AI. It will be Sunday, November 17, 12:00-13:30...Don't miss it!

Navigating the Role of Generative AI in College

Classrooms: A Balance Between Innovation and Academic Integrity

Nobuko Trent
Gakushuin University

The rise of Generative AI, particularly tools like ChatGPT, has sparked a transformation in higher education. As AI becomes more accessible and ubiquitous, students are increasingly integrating it into their academic tasks, from generating ideas to completing essays and even preparing for oral exams. While this technology offers undeniable benefits, it also raises critical questions about originality, skill development, and ethical use.

In the past year, I conducted a study involving 220 college students—72 in 2023 and 148 in 2024—to explore their perspectives on AI in education. Students were asked about how they use AI for their coursework, the value they assign to it, and their concerns about its impact on learning. Interestingly, the data revealed a growing awareness among students of the potential drawbacks of relying on AI. Many acknowledged that while AI streamlines certain tasks, it also risks diminishing essential skills such as critical thinking, research capabilities, writing proficiency, and foreign language acquisition.

Notably, students also expressed concerns about the ethical implications of using AI-generated content. It was discussed that AI, being a global tool, might contribute to cultural homogenization—particularly through the dominance of English as the primary academic language—and the marginalization of local languages and cultures. It was also a concern that North American English pragmatics would be the de facto global dominant linguistic pragmatics. These reflections align with broader concerns in the academic community, such as those highlighted by Asogwa et al. (2022), who warned of AI's potential to deepen educational disparities across cultural and linguistic lines.

My own experiences with students further illustrate these challenges. In a recent oral exam, I provided 24 students with 10 open-ended questions in advance to allow for preparation. To my surprise, 19 students submitted nearly identical responses, likely generated by ChatGPT. This incident not only raised questions about originality, but also highlighted the need for clear guidelines on the responsible use of AI in academic settings.

Drawing on these insights, I established a set of class rules to help students engage with AI responsibly:

Guidelines for AI Use in Academic Tasks:

1. **Verify Accuracy:** Always check AI-generated content against reliable sources to ensure its accuracy and completeness.
2. **Use AI as a Personal Tutor.** Rather than asking AI direct questions, a student should explain what they know and understand to the AI, and then ask for advice step-by-step to further advance academic investigation. Use AI as a helper for self-directed learning. The goal is to improve student knowledge and critical thinking.
3. **Avoid Plagiarism:** Since AI output is sourced from publicly available content, the risk of unintentional plagiarism is high. Students must exercise caution.
4. **Personalize Responses:** Using AI for class questions may result in similar answers from multiple students. It's essential to rework AI content into personalized responses.
5. **Protect Privacy:** Students should not input personal, confidential, or sensitive academic information into AI platforms to safeguard privacy.
6. **Cite AI Use:** If AI-generated content is incorporated into assignments, students must include a note detailing the prompt used and their interaction with the AI tool.

Researchers such as James Brusseau (in Medina, 2024) have examined the broader ethical implications of AI, particularly the risks it poses to cognitive and creative capacities. Brusseau argues that while AI can enhance productivity, it may also lead to a diminished capacity for higher-order thinking if not used carefully. Similarly, Medina (2024) emphasizes that unchecked reliance on AI in educational contexts could undermine the development of essential competencies necessary for critical analysis and creative problem-solving.

Despite these concerns, the majority of students in my study expressed a balanced view of AI, recognizing its potential as a learning aid while also being acutely aware of its limitations. As educators, it is crucial that we guide students in using AI thoughtfully. Encouraging them to view AI as a supplementary tool, rather than a replacement for their intellectual efforts, ensures that they continue to hone their critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving abilities.

In conclusion, as tools like ChatGPT become integral to academic life, educators must take on the responsibility of fostering a meaningful learning environment by encouraging reflective engagement with AI.

References

- Asogwa, V. C., Isiwu, E. C., & Nwakpadolu, G. M. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: Benefits and risks. *Propellers Journal of Educational Research and Theory*, 1(1), 1-18. <https://ijvocter.com/pjert/article/view/8> (Retrieved on August 24, 2024)
- Medina, J. (2024) An ethics experts' perspective of AI and higher ed. *Pace University*. <https://www.pace.edu/news/ethics-experts-perspective-ai-and-higher-ed> (Retrieved on September 6, 2024)

Pragmatic Incidents

“What is a pragmatic incident, just things that are said by mistake?” I was asked this evening. Well, it does include things that are miss-spoken, or misheard, or misinterpreted. But maybe we might describe pragmatic incidents as language use that we notice for some reason -- and very often it might be because it involves one of these “misses”. This issue includes a selection of these misses. For the next issue, a collection of “right on target” might help to bring some balance as, together, we explore our worlds of pragmatic incidents.

Jim Ronald

Harmony Martin

“Yesterday in the staff room at work, I was quietly talking to myself (which I seldom do but happened to be doing). I said, "I have a persimmon; I have a knife." I picked both up from their places on my desk to go cut the fruit to have for a snack. A teacher sitting next to me stood up quickly and, while backing away from me, said, "Is that a threat?! Don't stab me!" It turns out he heard only the second half of my sentence and didn't focus on the sound of my voice, but only heard the meaning of the words alone. (We did both end up laughing about the craziness of how voice tones can change messages so drastically.)

Jim Ronald (for a friend!)

An American friend of mine has a job as a wedding celebrant at the weekend. He told me about a mistake he made with the final words at a wedding just recently.

First he said,

本日は本当によろしくお願ひいたします。

Honjitsu ha hontouni yoroshiku onegaitashimasu.

Er... (realizing his mistake)

本日はありがとうございました。

Honjitsu ha hontouni arigatou gozaimashita.

Er... (that wasn't right, either)

本日は本当におめでとうございます！

Honjitsu ha hontouni omedetou gozaimasu!

He said that no one seemed to notice, the wedding just finished and moved on, with no post-wedding criticisms! He said the wedding went really well, apart from that, and we agreed that a non-Japanese wedding celebrant might be allowed a degree of latitude that a Japanese celebrant would not.

Jim Ronald

Talking with a student in a group in my *Social English* class:

Student: I understand. Thank you.

Jim: Oh, you mean “goodbye, go away”.

Student: (Laughing) No, no, no!

Jim Ronald

One Sunday afternoon, I was in Tokyo and walking with my son (Josh) and daughter (Grace) towards Shinjuku Gyoen, and I asked my son, who had an exam coming up

Jim: Will you be studying tomorrow?

Josh: Hai!

(はいっ!)

Grace: Hike? Are you going hiking?

Josh: No! Why?

Mizuki Yashio

I: 「あ、すみません。ここ大丈夫ですか？」

(“A, sumimasen. Koko daijoubu desu ka?”)

Woman: 「あ、全然。どうぞ。」

(“A, zenzen, douzo.”)

I: “Oh, excuse me. Is this seat free?”

Woman: “Of course, go ahead.”

She walked past me with a blank look on her face. I had thought she was the person who had left her belongings on the chair next to me, but I was wrong!

Kathleen Kitao

A fellow board member from an organization I belong to emailed me, offering to take over some of my tasks while I was overseas. In my response, I wrote: “That’s very kind of you to offer, and it would be nice to have one item deleted from my to-do list. Thank you.”

However, as I looked back over that and thought about it, I wondered if that reply could be ambiguous. Did the first sentence sound like it should be followed by “... but I can take care of it”? So I added: “(That’s a ‘yes, please,’ in case I wasn’t clear.)”

Often when we’re using what might be called an unconventionally indirect speech act (as opposed to being direct or conventionally indirect), we think we’re being perfectly clear, but our interlocutor can be confused. Having sometimes experienced this on the receiving end (“Was that a yes or a no?”), I wanted to make sure it was clear that I was accepting the offer.

That said, I’m not sure why I didn’t just change my reply to “Thanks, that would be helpful,” or something else less ambiguous. An attempt at Pragmatics humor, perhaps?

Pragmatic Incidents in Cartoon (with video): The Meeting

Here is a Pragmatic Incident contributed by Donna Fujimoto. Until a Japanese friend criticized one of her colleagues, Donna had never realized that nodding at the appropriate time can make others feel uncomfortable.

The cartoon and video were produced by Robert Olson.



Here is the video:

<https://youtu.be/VoPHnc1KbfM>

The Meeting



↑



←



←

Member Focus: Yosuke Ishii

Did you know that our current Co-Membership Chair, **Yosuke Ishii** is also a prolific and active materials writer? We wanted to learn more, so we asked him to tell us about his work.



Yosuke: I have written more than twenty books so far. They include commercial self-study books, college textbooks, correspondence course materials, and books for language teachers. My career as a materials writer began inadvertently, but I enjoy writing these materials, and I am proud of all the projects I have completed. Although I am still teaching some classes at universities to make my living, I currently consider myself a writer rather than an instructor. Below are the reasons why I write, how I decide what to write, how I get it done, what I am currently working on, and what I plan to do in the future.

Why do I write? I probably shouldn't mention this, but I write because I struggle with teaching effectively. I struggle to establish a strong rapport with English language learners (ELLs) in my class, and even when I understand their needs, I have difficulty providing them with engaging activities that promote learning. This inability often leads to the accumulation of numerous "should've done," which serve as valuable resources for my future books. When writing books for ELLs, I always keep these people in mind: those who received inadequate instructions from someone like me, or those who are struggling to teach ELLs like I did. My books should make up for my teaching deficiencies and assist other instructors.

Each book has a theme, unlike my previous handouts or worksheets. How do I decide what to write? I've written about topics such as the TOEIC test, speaking, writing, pragmatics, and pedagogical grammar. These topics were my primary concerns during the writing process. Also, I always want to write something that fills the gap. There are already a lot of excellent materials available, but sometimes I feel like something is missing. I want my books to be the missing pieces. This thinking makes me decide what I will write about.

After deciding what to write, how do I get it done? Each project is unique, but the writer alone cannot complete a book project. I have to communicate with the project's editor a number of times to refine the contents. This process is sometimes very frustrating, especially when you have to give up on what you consider necessary. However, you can't avoid this process as long as the book is out from a publisher. This process often requires extensive research, which ultimately contributes to my personal growth. Therefore, I consider the process to be really important.

Now, allow me to briefly discuss my current projects. I am working on commercial self-study language books. One is about American idioms, and I work with another author. Our original goal was to release it by the end of the year, but I think we need more time. Also, I have been discussing some other books with multiple publishers, but since they haven't given green lights to those projects, I can't reveal what they are about. In addition, I have been working on a few college textbooks, which usually take more time to complete and are likely to be out in 2026 at the latest.

In addition to these projects, I am ready to write more books in the future. When I find some intriguing topics, I write proposals and send them to publishers. If any of the publishers are interested in any of those proposals, a new project may be initiated. Sometimes I get offers from publishing companies; I will take them as long as they sound interesting. I am also thinking of trying something that is not directly relevant to learning English or linguistics. When I was a kid, I was interested in reading mystery stories and wanted to be a novelist. So, writing mystery novels is one thing I want to do.

Interviewer: *How does pragmatics fit in your teaching/writing/everyday life?*

Yosuke: Pragmatics makes me recognize that everything is context-driven.

Interviewer: *If you have any free time what do you do when not writing?
If there is no time, what would you like to do?*

Yosuke: I like to walk outside carrying my camera. I expect to bump into kingfishers and raccoon dogs, but I hardly have such luck. Other than that, I like to watch movies at a small local theater, but it is difficult to find time to do so during the semester.

Interviewer: *Do you have any favorite mysteries?*

Yosuke: My favorite mystery novel is Cornell Woolrich's *Phantom Lady*. Although not typically classified as mystery novels, I appreciate Paul Auster's *The New York Trilogy* and Haruki Murakami's *Colorless Tsukuru Tazaki and His Years of Pilgrimage*, both of which are literary works infused with mystery.

Interviewer: *Any hints about what type of mystery you are working on now?*

Yosuke: I refrain from mentioning too much about the story I am currently writing.

Interviewer: *I understand. We will just have to wait until your mystery gets published. Thank you for sharing your work.*

Interviewer: Donna Fujimoto

Here are just two of Yosuke's books. You might be interested in checking all his other books.

「15の論理展開パターンで攻略する英文ライティング」

日本能率協会マネジメントセンター <https://shorturl.at/8b9SB>



「ゼロから覚醒 はじめよう英作文」

かんき出版 <https://shorturl.at/OZGiw>



JALT 2024 Presentations on Pragmatics

Pragmatics AGM

Saturday, November 16th 11:15am-12:00pm Room 903

Forum: Pragmatics and Globalization

Sunday, November 17th 1:45pm-3:15pm Room 906

Yosuke Ogawa Nobuko Trent Tilabi Yibifu

Saturday, November 16th

How Do University Students Disagree in English?

Keishin Kaku & Melissa Huntley 11:15am-11:40 am Room: 909 | 208

Intercultural Interactions in a High School Study Abroad

Mayumi Kawashima 11:15am-11:40 am Room: Hikae 1 457

A Comparative Study of Boosters in Written Media Discourse

Kayo Fujimura-Wilson 11:50am-1:20pm Room: EME 149

Examining Intensifiers Taught in English Language Textbooks

Timothy Wilson 11:50am-1:20pm Room: EME 160

Pragmatic for Future Success: What Students Aspire to Learn

Sanae Oda-Sheehan 2:10pm-2:35pm Room: 1202

Pragmatic Knowledge in Japanese High School EFL Textbooks

Chie Kawashima 2:45pm-4:15pm Room: UMI (EME)

Chatbot-Powered Role-Plays for Nursing English Coursework

B. Bricklin Zeff 5:50pm-6:15pm Room: 1003

Developing Interactional Competence for Higher Education

P. Ezra Vasquez 6:25 pm-6:50 pm Room: A/V Hall 465

Sunday, November 17th

Not any, Not one: Expressing Negative Existence in English

John Campbell-Larsen

9:30am-9:55am

Room: Practice Room (B1)

Student Awareness of Negative AI Impact on College Learning (Poster Session)

Nobuko Trent

12:00pm-1:30pm

Room: UMI (EME)

Kakkoi English!: An Analysis of Compliments in K-pop Videos

Benio Suzuki

2:20pm-2:45pm

Room: 1202

AI-enabled Pragmatics in Intercultural Communications Course

Salazar Javier & Alan Schwartz

2:20pm-3:20pm Room: A/V Hall 611

Impact of Acculturation Attitudes on Pragmatic Development

Vahid Rafieyan

5:25pm-5:50pm Room: 909 | 23

Phenomenology of Intercultural Communication: "!" in Kenya

Zane Ritchie & Tosh Tachino 6:00pm-6:25pm

Room: 901 | 187

Monday, November 18th

Helping Learners Develop Professional English

Katherine Song

10:00am-11:05am

Room: 910

Using Strategic Interaction to Develop Pragmatic Competence

Taylor Meizlish & Christopher Ziffo

11:15am-11:40am

Room: 905

JALT Pragmatics SIG Committee Members (2024)

Coordinator	Donna Fujimoto
Treasurers	Chie Kawashima, Reiko Fischer
Program Chairs	Yosuke Ogawa, Jim Ronald
Publicity Chair	Rob Olson, Amy Takebe
Membership Chairs	Yosuke Ishii, Akiko Chiba
Web Manager team	Benio Suzuki, Saki Araki, Todd Allen
Publications Chair	Noriko Ishihara
Newsletter Editor	Kathi Kitao
Members-At-Large	Sanae Oda-Sheehan, Bricklin Zeff



Photo Credits: Donna Fujimoto, Tim Knight