Toward Critical Applied Pragmatics: Moving from Postcolonial Hegemony to Decolonial Pragmatics Pedagogy

Zia Tajeddin
Tarbiat Modares University, Iran
<tajeddinz@modares.ac.ir>

Abstract

The genesis and consolidation of criticality in applied linguistics have contributed to the reconceptualization of its defining aims and scope. This shift toward critical applied linguistics has created spaces for revising language instruction, language assessment, and teacher education. Nonetheless, despite the nexus between applied linguistics and applied pragmatics, the development of critical applied linguistics and other critical trends informed by decoloniality, linguistic imperialism, native speakerism, and heteronormativity has not prompted a critical movement in applied pragmatics. Against this backdrop, this conceptual article seeks to delve into the relevant critical trends to introduce critical applied pragmatics as an emerging field of inquiry and the 10 principles that underpin its epistemic formation and functioning. In view of these principles, implications for critical pragmatics pedagogy and teacher education are proposed. The article ends with conclusions about the transdisciplinary nature of critical applied pragmatics, which falls beyond the scope of traditional/normative applied pragmatics in theorizing and researching, and suggests directions for future research on pragmatics instruction, assessment, materials development, and teacher education.

Keywords*: Applied Pragmatics, Critical Applied Pragmatics, Criticality, Decoloniality, Linguistic Imperialism*

Since the advent of a critical movement in applied linguistics (Pennycook, 1990), language education has been conceptually reframed. Although language instruction and assessment, materials development, and teacher education have not advanced in line with this conceptual remaking, critical applied linguistics has broadened its scope in two respects. It has gained more credibility, as Pennycook (2010) argued, in its interface with other criticality-informed strands such as critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2010), critical classroom discourse analysis (Kumaravadivelu, 1999), critical pedagogy (Freire, 1996; Giroux, 2009), critical bilingualism (Walsh, 1991), and critical multiculturalism (Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Kubota, 2004). Critical applied linguistics has also undergone a significant shift as the concepts of World Englishes (Firth, 1990; McKay, 2002, 2018; McKay & Brown, 2016), postmethod (Kumaravadivelu, 2001), postcolonialism (Lok, 2012; Phillipson, 2001), linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992, 2010), intercultural language education (Byram, 2008), and nonnative-speaker movement/native speaker fallacy (Phillipson, 1992) have found a position at the forefront of applied linguistics.

Applied pragmatics, as a branch of applied linguistics or a field developing in parallel with applied linguistics, has appropriated the main concepts of applied linguistics in its conceptual enrichment and in pragmatics instruction and assessment. This nexus has been more productive and evident in the application of numerous SLA concepts in pragmatic instruction, including input enhancement and output (Li, 2011; Takahashi, 2001), implicit and explicit instruction (Alcon Soler, 2007; Nguyen et al., 2012), metapragmatic awareness (analogous with metalinguistic awareness) (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2020; Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Eslami-Rasekh et al., 2004; Takimoto, 2012), learner strategies (Cohen, 2005, 2019a, 2019b; Cohen & Ishihara, 2005; Derakhshan et al., 2021; Sykes & Cohen, 2018; Tajeddin & Malmir, 2015), learner motivation (Tajeddin & Zand Moghadam, 2012; Takahashi, 2005), corrective feedback (Tajeddin & Shirkhani, 2017; Takimoto, 2006), pragmatic rating (Alemi & Tajeddin, 2013; Liu, 2006; Sonnenburg-Winkler et al., 2020; Tajeddin & Alemi, 2013, 2014), and pragmatic test washback (Tajeddin & Dabbagh, 2015).

Despite this happy marriage between applied linguistics and applied pragmatics, critical applied linguistics, with a lineup of theorizing scholars and progressive conceptualizations, has not witnessed a corresponding progression in the emergence and expansion of the "critical" in applied pragmatics. Against this backdrop, the purpose of this conceptual article is to delineate how the notion of criticality and principles of critical applied linguistics can inform theory, research, and practice in applied pragmatics. Albeit grounded in the tenets of critical applied linguistics as its point of departure, this delineation draws on more recent trajectories in critical conceptualizations. These trajectories include translanguaging (Canagarajah, 2011, 2013; Conteh, 2018), subalternity and the decolonial option (Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Mignolo, 2011; Mignolo & Escobar, 2010), multilingual/multicultural identity (Barkhuizen, 2017; Fisher et al., 2020; Stille, 2015), resistance to the hegemony of native speaker norms and linguistics imperialism (Canagarajah, 1999a, 2005a; Phillipson, 1992, 2010), and transcultural language education (Liddicoat, 2011; Pennycook, 2007; Risager, 2011) in the context of world Englishes. These trajectories are used to argue for the exigency of consolidating criticality in applied pragmatics to set the ground for critical applied pragmatics. The article draws conclusions about the potential of critical applied pragmatics and suggests implications for pragmatics teacher education and pragmatics instruction and assessment. Finally, directions for future research framed by themes in critical applied pragmatics are proposed.

Moving from Descriptive to Critical in Applied Linguistics

Conceptions of Criticality in Language Studies and Education

Criticality has been defined from different perspectives. Brumfit et al. (2005) proposed the defining features of criticality, which are:

- the motivation to persuade, engage and act on the world and self

- through the operation of the mindful, analytical, evaluative, interpretive, reflective understanding of a body of relevant knowledge

- mediated by assimilated experience of how the social and physical environment is structured

- combined with a willingness and capacity to question and problematize shared perceptions of relevance and experience. (p. 149)

Criticality in language education can be approached from two perspectives: historically and conceptually. The historical shaping of criticality in language education, prompted by an array of movements such as Marxist sociology and postcolonial conceptualization, manifests itself in what Kumaravadivelu (2006) conceived as the paradigm shift from systemic inquiry to critical inquiry. This macro-level shift provides an overall picture of trajectories in language education. As such, it underpins the shaping of critical applied linguistics or is the driving force for its evolution. The inception of this shift dates back to the critical turn in the 1990s that aimed to position the word within the world and to detach itself from the ontology of recognizing language as a system. This shift negated the mainstream language education limited to the phonological, syntactic, and pragmatic domains of language.

This description perceives the treatment of all these domains, including pragmatics, as traditional and non-critical in the language education of the time. As Kumaravadivelu (2006) argued, this criticality historically lingered behind critical turns in other fields of humanities and social sciences. Nonetheless, aligned with critical trends, it has broadened the educational space to frame language use within its social, cultural, and political dynamics. Accordingly, language education has embraced this critically, rather conceptually, as evidenced by the publication of many volumes and journal special issues on critical language education since the 1990s. This surge of interest in criticality has culminated in adopting new ways of looking at language teaching and learning. As Kumaravadivelu's vignette of the surge indicates, language education has been given a value-laden color and "a new horizon of explorations has opened up in hitherto neglected topics that have a significant impact on classroom methodological practices—topics such as learner identity, teacher beliefs, teaching values, and local knowledge" (p. 71). Over time, in the past three decades, this critical perspective has been invigorated by and intertwined with relevant critical trends.

As Kumaravadivelu (2006) depicted, these relevant trends have aided us in grappling with the crucial role of teachers' beliefs, assumptions, and knowledge in their classroom decision making (Johnson & Golombek, 2002; Woods, 1996), language teaching and learning as profoundly value-laden activities, systematic exploration of knowledge production in subaltern communities as resources about different educational traditions, and the exploration of local realities for revealing how the chasm between English as a global language and vernacular languages can inform curricular and teachers' and learners' methodological decisions. Overall, this historical development of criticality in language education has afforded us a new lens of inquiry and understanding in which the "decolonial option" (Jacob, 2020; Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Mignolo, 2011) stands out. This option is described below:

When described by participants as a more 'neutral' language enabling the bypassing of hierarchies and reinvention of political and economic structures, English seems to take on a 'decolonial' function. The concept itself is not used by participants nor by academic coverage, but translates the idea not that English here is seen not as 'anti-colonial' (as this was Arabic's function) but as a way of going beyond the coloniality of power relations thanks to a 'universal' and 'international' language which allows access to new forms of knowledge and belonging. (Jacob, 2020, p. 10)

This historical development, as Kumaravadivelu (2016) argued, shows that coloniality has survived colonialism in both economic, social, and cultural areas and academia. In Academia, this survival is reflected in books, the criteria for the evaluation of academic performance, and subaltern intellectuals' self-image. To counter the pervasive influence of coloniality, many scholars advocate a decolonial option that entails the enactment of action-oriented counter-hegemonic strategies in the global context and in language education (Carroll, 2006; Giroux, 1986; Gramsci, 1971; Keim, 2011; Kumaravadivelu, 2016).

Aligned with the historical trajectory depicted above, the concept of "critical" and "criticality" has been conceptualized and re-envisioned in language education. Any shift toward consolidating criticality in applied pragmatics entails understanding the epistemic borderlines of criticality and the features delineating criticality. The delineation of the scope of criticality, demarcating critical from non-critical language education, is the focus of a number of writings (e.g., Banegas & Villacañas de Castro, 2016; Kubota & Miller, 2017; Pennycook, 2010). Although Kubota and Miller (2017) contended that drawing a rigid line between what is critical and what is non-critical would contradict the postmodernist premise that meaning is multiple and ever-shifting rather than fixed and singular, they drew on Pennycook and other critically minded researchers to tie criticality with a commitment to justice, equality, and anti-oppression. Criticality must "foreground critiques of inequality, oppression, and discrimination. (Kubota & Miller, 2017, p. 4). In demarcating the concept of criticality, they referred to three major theoretical threads, namely poststructuralist theory, Marxist-influenced theories, and postcolonial theories.

Poststructuralist critique is rooted in the Foucauldian envisioning of the construction of truths within discourses which are neither true or false (Foucault, 1980). Accordingly, this criticality, as Kubota and Miller (2017) stated, aims to unravel how discourses produce truths based on the relations of power. The focus of Marxist-influenced approaches to criticality is on power, primarily conceived as a repressive force which is imposed by the dominator over the dominated. This criticality proposes a rather simplistic view of power and power relations in the binary terms of the oppressor and the oppressed. In view of this, it may not be of easy relevance, particularly when it is objectified in critical pedagogy, to the conceptualization I will propose later of critical applied pragmatics. This evaluation of relevance resonates with Pennycook's (2001) general critique of these Marxist-influenced approaches for their thinking superimposed by either-or binary terms.

The third theoretical thread is rooted in postcolonial theories, which I will heavily draw on as an approach to criticality having the potential to bring about a coherent conception of critical applied pragmatics. Whereas both postmodern and Marxist approaches have European origins, postcolonial theory proposes an antithesis to European hegemony as manifested in colonial violence, domination, and exploitation. As Kubota and Miller (2017) maintained, early postcolonial scholars (e.g., Fanon, 1967; Memmi, 2003) revealed the colonial relations of power between the colonizer and the colonized and how teaching and learning English versus vernacular languages in postcolonial locations prolongs unequal power relations between languages and between speakers of languages. The aim is to challenge "the conventional understanding of language and language use, which has viewed them as normative and bounded, and to legitimate linguistic practices of minoritized language learners or users" (Kubota & Miller, 2017, p. 11).

Premises of Critical Applied Linguistics

Critical applied linguistics cannot be detached from the preceding critical movements which have been in vogue in the past three decades as its premises, embedded in the field of language education, are informed by these movements. Since the inception of critical applied linguistics, a number of premises have been appropriated to characterize what "critical" adds to traditional applied linguistics. In what follows I describe these premises.

The first premise of critical applied linguistics is that language education is social, political, and historical (Pennycook, 1990). Pennycook (2010) critiqued asocial, apolitical, and ahistorical modes of inquiry provided that our aim is to change the manifest inequities in the societies and the world. This premise requires that language educators address inequity, discrimination, and difference as central social and political problems. It is argued that there is a paucity of politics in dealing with this in relation to language. Accordingly, applied linguistics should move from its current emphasis on the micro-context of language teaching, language testing, and second language acquisition to embrace a broader and more critical understanding of language in social life. As Iyer et al. (2014) maintained, this shift further moved applied linguistics away from its Saussurean descriptive and positivist foundation to a critical stance viewing language as an instrument for enforcing neoliberal capitalism across the globe.

This shift has impacted the related domain of language testing. As Spolsky's (1995) study showed, language testing has been exploited as a tool for control and power and for selecting, motivating, and punishing. This control is justified through claims to the scientific backing and impartiality of language tests such as TOEFL and IELTS. By virtue of these arguments and related ones in critical applied linguistics, Shohamy (2001) proposed critical language testing (CLT), which "implies the need to develop critical strategies to examine the uses and consequences of tests, to monitor their power, minimize their detrimental force, reveal the misuses, and empower the test takers" (p. 131). As Pennycook (2008) contended, Shohamy's proposal for CLT clearly matches the principles underpinning other areas of critical applied linguistics, particularly the principle that language testing, as with language education, cannot be separated from social, cultural, and political concerns.

The second premise of critical applied linguistics is the embracement of language as local practice and moving away from a continued focus on language as a system. Pennycook (2010) argued that the notion of local practice affords us the ability to better appreciate language ideologies, to understand the local nature of language, and to orient toward politics associated with local language activity. According to Pennycook, the usefulness of critical applied linguistics depends on its applicability in diverse parts of the world. Relevance to different contexts of global language teaching and use is a challenge to both applied linguistics and critical applied linguistics. Pennycook's concern for applicability rests on the observation that much of the work in critical applied linguistics related to minority ("First"/"Western") world contexts, with theories that are not readily usable in the majority ('Third') world. It follows that critical applied linguistics should be enacted through adequately contextualized strategies for engaging with local communities (Makoni, 2003). This engagement contributes to the formulation of a research agenda in collaboration and consultation with local communities (Makoni, 2003) and the development of critical applied linguistics as localized practice.

The third premise is founded on the conception that language education should promote linguistic and cultural diversity in the context of transnationalization and globalization (Iyer et al., 2014). As such, multilingualism and multiculturalism should be pursued to challenge the perception that the ascendency of English as an international language (EIL) is central to the spirit of cosmopolitanism and to the creation of a glocal identity (Pennycook, 2011). Darder's (1991) critical biculturalism or

Walsh's (1991) critical bilingualism are formed by the awareness of the inequitable conditions of language learning. Walsh emphasized the need to not only speak two languages but to be critical of the sociocultural, political, and ideological contexts which affect the positioning and functioning of the languages. Further, in Kubota's (2004) critical multiculturalism, the role of power and privilege in producing and perpetuating inequality and injustice is critically examined.

The fourth premise of critical applied linguistics is entrenched in the rising awareness that language is a means for power, dominance, and linguistic, cultural, and ideological hegemony. This awareness is informed by main critical strands related to language studies such as Fairclough's (2010) critical discourse analysis, Gramsci's (1971) conception of hegemony, and Phillipson's (1992, 2010) linguistic imperialism. As Pennycook (2008) pointed out, the international hegemony of English and the necessity of promoting diversity has prompted the exigency of doing critical work in language policy and planning and moving away from political quietism in language policy to embrace more critical theoretical frameworks. At the forefront of this more overt critical agenda about the global spread of English and the destruction of the world's linguistic diversity, as stated by Pennycook, lies Phillipson's (1992, 2010) concept of English linguistic imperialism. Phillipson did not use positive terms to examine the spread of English and was not trapped into describing varieties of English; rather, Phillipson positioned English squarely in the forefront of the sociopolitical enforcement of imperialism, neo-colonialism, and global economic restructuring (Tollefson, 2000).

Pennycook's (2008) position is grounded in the preceding arguments about resisting the global position of English (Canagarajah, 1999a; Pennycook, 2001) and the need for adopting a more reflexive politics and problematizing practice (Pennycook, 2001). He viewed the agenda of critical applied linguistics not limited to only relating micro-relations of applied linguistics to macro-relations of social and political power or being concerned with relating such questions to a priori critical analysis of inequality. By contrast, critical applied linguistics underlines the need to develop both a critical political stance and a critical epistemological stance and to keep focused on the issues of "dominion, disparity, difference and desire while at the same time maintaining a constant skepticism towards cherished concepts of applied linguistics, from language and ethnicity to identity and discourse" (Pennycook, 2008, p. 175).

As summed up by Pennycook (2008), critical applied linguistics deals with the concerns of applied linguistics from a vantage point which is mindful to the interface among four variables: dominion, dealing with the contingent and contextual effects of power; disparity, meaning inequitable access to material and cultural goods; difference, observed in the construction of and engagement with diversity; and desire, reflected in the operations of ideology, agency and identity. Pennycook stated that doing applied linguistics critically entails an understanding of not only the relationships between various domains of applied linguistic and the workings of power in generating dominion, disparity, and difference but also ethical vision and tools for change. To apply this criticality, four main problems should be addressed: "a rearguard action from the gatekeepers of disciplinary ALx [applied linguistics]; a tension between a normative political stance and the need for constant problematization; the need to move beyond critique to reconstitutive action; and the question of relevance to diverse contexts round the world" (Pennycook, 2008, pp. 174-175).

Moving Toward Critical Applied Pragmatics

Principles of Critical Applied Pragmatics

In describing the domain of critical applied linguistics, Pennycook (2004) included "developing approaches to issues in language policy and planning, translation and interpreting, language education, discourse analysis, literacy, language in the workplace, and other areas of applied

linguistics" (p. 784). However, my proposal for critical applied pragmatics has an instructional orientation and has a narrower concern than critical applied linguistics as depicted above. Hence, it is focused on critical pragmatics instruction and assessment as the principal concern. Framed as such, my position is delineated in scope to methods, tasks, materials, and assessment, as well as to pragmatic norms in intercultural communication, native speakerism in judging pragmatic appropriateness, and teacher education with regard to pragmatics. The purpose here is delimited to questioning common assumptions and to developing a critical stance toward these domains of multilingual pragmatic learning and use for transformative pragmatics pedagogy.

Although critical applied pragmatics has currently no coherent framework, traces of criticality from disperse perspectives can be found in the historical strands of development in L2 pragmatics. The trajectory proposed by Tajeddin and Alemi (2021) reflects movement toward critical issues in L2 pragmatics (Table 1). It includes three periods: "Descriptive Pragmatic Awareness, Acquisitional Pragmatic Awareness, and (Critical) Pragmatic Awakening" (p. 2). Critical applied pragmatics can be placed in the last period, that is pragmatic awakening. As Tajeddin and Alemi maintained, pragmatic awakening carries the modifier of critical in parentheses. This indicates that this period is potentially critical if criticality is pursued in various areas of L2 pragmatics, including teacher education, teacher pragmatic awareness and cognition, EIL-aware pragmatic instruction and assessment, pragmatic variation across world Englishes, learner and teacher pragmatic identity, and legitimacy of (non)native speakers' norms for pragmatic instruction and assessment (Tajeddin & Alemi, 2020). This criticality, albeit not a coherent strand, is reflected in the idealized perceptions of native speakers' pragmatic norms (Tajeddin et al., 2018) and attempts to place pragmatics pedagogy in the zone of EIL (House, 2013; McKay, 2009; Murray, 2012; Taguchi & Ishihara, 2018).

Table 1. Periods in L2 Pragmatic Instruction, Assessment, and Research (Tajeddin & Alemi, 2021, p. 2).

Descriptive Pragmatic Awareness Speech act studies Cross-cultural pragmatic studies Studies of pragmatic features Studies of speech act realization strategies
Acquisitional Pragmatic Awareness Pragmatic acquisition in L1 Pragmatic acquisition in L2 Pragmatic instruction tasks Learner variables in pragmatic acquisition Pragmatic assessment methods Pragmatic rating criteria Interface between L2 pragmatics and SLA theories
(Critical) Pragmatic Awakening Teacher role Teacher pragmatic awareness and cognition Pragmatically focused teacher education Pragmatic instruction and assessment for EIL and postcolonial period Pragmatic variation across world Englishes Learner and teacher pragmatic identity Legitimacy of (non)native speakers' norms for pragmatic instruction and assessment

In what follows, I will draw on the tenets of applied linguistics as mainly formulated by Pennycook (1990, 2001, 2004, 2008, 2010) over the years, hegemony and subalternity (Gramsci, 1971; Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Mignolo, 2011), and postcolonial and decolonial studies (Mignolo, 2011; Mignolo & Escobar, 2010). Also, I will glean insights provided by linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992, 2010), native speaker fallacy (Canagarajah, 1999b; Holliday, 2015; Phillipson, 1992, 2016), variation and heteronormativity in intercultural communication in the context of EIL (Taguchi & Ishihara, 2018), and critical language assessment (Shohamy, 2001). Before proposing the relevance of critical applied pragmatics to pragmatics instruction and assessment, I will delineate the 10 principles of critical applied pragmatics (Table 2).

Table 2. Principles of Critical Applied Pragmatics.

1. Conceiving pragmatics pedagogy as socially constructed, politically motivated, and historically determined

2. Drawing attentively on pragmatically-relevant theorizing and research in critical strands as a transdisciplinary field of inquiry

3. Giving legitimacy to pragmatic heteronormativity and variation

4. Raising teachers' and learners' awareness of the political, social, and ideological aspects of L2 pragmatics

5. Adopting a decolonial option for past colonies and a de-centered option for expanding-circle countries

6. Foregrounding critical pragmatic awareness as the key to the move toward epistemic detachment from native-speaker centeredness

7. Viewing pragmatic language policy and planning as the site for the enactment of native speakerism and linguistic hegemony

8. Being alert to biases against and marginalization of the pragmatic norms of world Englishes, languages other than English, and ethnic, linguistics, and religious minorities

9. Regarding the management and maintenance of L1 pragmatic norms as integral to the identity of L2 learners and users of English

10. Viewing pragmatic language assessment as a tool for enforcing the native speaker benchmark and exercising bias against world Englishes

Principle One: In line with the argument advanced in postmethod (Kumaravadivelu, 1994, 2001) and critical applied linguistics (Pennycook, 2001, 2008), critical applied pragmatics considers pragmatics pedagogy as socially constructed, politically motivated, and historically determined. It has a critical orientation toward forces behind this construction, motivation, and determination. As such, it principally goes beyond "normative" applied pragmatics, interlanguage pragmatics, and L2 pragmatics in scope, assumptions, and concerns. Also, it is not limited to the critical evaluation of these assumptions and concerns. Rather, it problematizes and prioritizes the scope of pragmatics pedagogy from a critical or revisited perspective.

Principle Two. As critical applied pragmatics situates pragmatics education in its historical and social context, it is transdisciplinary by nature. It constantly draws on theorizing and research in globalization and postcolonialism in language education (Block & Cameron, 2002; Canagarajah, 2005a, 2005b; Phan, 2017), linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992, 2010), native speakerism (Holliday, 2006, 2015), EIL (Matsuda, 2012, 2017; McKay, 2002, 2018; McKay & Brown, 2016; Sharifian, 2009), linguistic, ideological, and cultural hegemony (Kumaravadivelu, 2008, 2016; Said, 1993), a decolonial option as related to the discourse of disobedience (Kumaravadivelu, 2016;

Mignolo, 2011), and marginalization/subalternity (Guha & Spivak, 1988; Mignolo, 2011) to develop a coherent pedagogy for pragmatics instruction and assessment which is critically informed. Notwithstanding its ties with these strands, critical applied pragmatics has its own evolving agenda and pedagogical space for pragmatics instruction and assessment.

Principle Three. Critical applied pragmatics, unlike the mainstream trends in periods of Descriptive Pragmatic Awareness and Acquisitional Pragmatic Awareness (Tajeddin & Alemi, 2021), gives legitimacy to pragmatic heteronormativity and variation (Schneider & Barron, 2008), constantly emerging from the expansion of world Englishes and the use of English as an international language. What counts is pragmatic appropriateness from EIL users' perspectives when they negotiate multilingual pragmatic norms, rather than native speaker norms, and when interlocutors from different linguistic backgrounds interactively construct comprehensibility and a sense of appropriateness.

Principle Four. Critical applied pragmatics, drawing on the notion of critical language awareness (Fairclough, 2014; Taylor et al., 2018), is founded on the need to raise both teachers' and learners' awareness of the political, social, and ideological aspects of L2 pragmatics, pragmatic norms, speech acts, and politeness. Like other aspects of language, pragmatic aspects of language – including pragmatics conventions, instruction, assessment, and use – are invested with power relations and ideological assumptions. This critical pragmatic awareness, in certain contexts, may lead to pragmatic resistance against the norms and conventions enforced by the inner circle and native speakers. Critical ethnography and autoethnography (Palmer & Caldas, 2015; Yazan et al., 2021) could afford critical mirrors for reflecting on this pragmatic resistance.

Principle Five. Despite working for the reinforcement of the legitimacy of world Englishes and heteronormativity practiced in EIL, critical applied pragmatics is against the hegemony of English in two respects. First, it works against the hegemony of native speaker norms in pragmatics pedagogy. Although the adoption of these norms seemingly affords coherence and consistency to the pragmatics instruction and assessment of learners, critical applied pragmatics looks critically at this *pre*formed assumption and instead values *per*formed pragmatic practice for the negotiation of interlocutors' norms in intercultural communication. Therefore, it adopts a decolonial option for past colonies and a de-centered option for expanding-circle countries by resisting marginalization and empowering the subaltern to act agentively in intercultural communication. The decolonial option aims to boost the legitimacy of world Englishes despite the designation "outer-circle" and to invigorate the pragmatic rights of marginalized, subaltern communities. The de-centered option highlights the need to draw on L1, L2, and EIL to negotiate pragmatic norms intersubjectively in multilingual interactions. In normative/interlanguage pragmatics, expanding-circle countries are conceived to be norm-dependent and hence are encouraged to draw on native speaker pragmatic norms. Second, while resisting inner-circle hegemony in enforcing its pragmatic norms and conventions in language pedagogy and use, critical applied pragmatics challenges the very hegemony of EIL as the sole medium of international communication and espouses the multiplicity of languages used in multilingual and intercultural communication. Framed by this goal, it values translanguaging and multilingualism in pragmatics pedagogy and use.

Principle Six. In line with principled pragmatism (Kumaravadivelu, 1994) and critical reflective practice (Farrell, 2018; Fook & Gardner, 2007; Liu, 2020), critical applied pragmatics foregrounds teachers' critical pragmatic awareness as the key to both teacher' and learners' move toward epistemic detachment from native speaker-centeredness in the conceptualization of pragmatic norms and appropriateness and native speaking teachers' supremacy in instructing L2 pragmatics. From this understanding, teacher education courses and programs lie at the heart of creating or impeding teachers' anti-hegemonic critical pragmatic awareness and epistemic emancipation from

pragmatically oriented native speakerism and idealization of native speaker pragmatic norms as framing the aim of pragmatics instruction and assessment.

Principle Seven. Critical applied pragmatics views language policy and planning, including those akin to the pragmatic dimension of language education, as the site for the enactment of native speakerism, linguistic hegemony, and marginalization of world Englishes. This understanding entails a critical awareness of pragmatics-related policies for language curriculum development, the idealization of native speaker pragmatic norms in ELT textbooks, underrepresentation of multiple, varied pragmatics of world Englishes and EIL users, and representation of the pragmatic norms of world Englishes as degenerate or centrifugal. In practice, due to their mediating role between macro policies and language learners and teachers, textbooks are central to creating hidden spaces for depicting native speakers' pragmatic norms as natural and universal and for prioritizing the acquisition and use of these norms as the best route to native likeness, prestige-boosting, and successful intercultural communication. Critical applied pragmatics aims to raise awareness about this role and to contribute to alternatives to what Kumaravadivelu (2016) called center-produced methods and center-produced materials of marginality.

Principle Eight. Informed by critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2010; van Dijk, 1993; Wodak & Chilton, 2005), gender discourse studies (Speer, 2005; Wodak, 1995), and studies on discrimination against minorities (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Leonardo, 2013; Su, 2005), critical applied pragmatics is alert to biases against and marginalization of the pragmatic norms of either gender, world Englishes, languages other than English, and ethnic, linguistics, and religious minorities. As these biases are enacted in language policies, textbooks, and classroom discourse, they need to be unraveled and resisted to create adequate spaces for heteronormative pragmatics pedagogy. Also, in the use of English as an international language in multilingual and multicultural contexts, interlocutors need critical awareness to negotiate and resist these pragmatic biases through agentive intersubjectivity. Besides opposing these biases in language learning and language use, epistemic underpinnings of these biases entrenched in the conceptualizations and discourse of inner-circle-favored scholars are unraveled and countered to allow for subaltern religious, linguistic, ethnic, and gendered users of EIL to enact their pragmatic norms and to be equal partners in the communication process through pursuing the decolonial option of disobedience and learning to unlearn taken-for-granted assumptions (Mignolo, 2011).

Principle Nine. As L2 pragmatic ability is entrenched in deep-rooted sociocultural values and sociopragmatic norms initially developed in L1 or heritage language acquisition for those who learned English as an additional language, critical applied pragmatics regards the management and maintenance of these norms, such as politeness conventions, as integral to the identity of L2 learners and users of English. Identity is a notion that has captured the attention of critical language educators and researchers in the past two decades. Although it has received scant attention in L2 pragmatics research (e.g., García-Pastor, 2020; Kim, 2014; Kinginger, 2013), pragmatic identity is a dimension of non-native teachers', language learners', and language users' identity along with their other identities. In the English learning process, learners should be enabled to critically negotiate and enact their pragmatic identity. Additionally, users of English from world Englishes backgrounds or expanding-circle backgrounds should be empowered to engage in negotiation and enactment of their pragmatic identity as it is central to the flow of intercultural communication in multilingual contexts.

Principle Ten. Critical applied pragmatics views pragmatic language assessment as one of the main sites of enforcing the native speaker benchmark for test validation, evaluation of pragmatic production appropriateness, test interpretation, and exercising bias against world Englishes. As pragmatics instruction and assessment are interrelated, those critical concerns pursued in

pragmatics instruction such as marginalization of the subaltern, homonormativity, and native speakerism are considered in pragmatics assessment. Learners' and teachers' voice, in conjunction with the assessment needs of a particular context, are measures in evaluating pragmatic tests' authenticity, consequential validity, and fairness.

Pedagogical Implications of Critical Applied Pragmatics

The 10 principles of critical applied pragmatics, as an initial but not inclusive attempt to mark the borders of this field which is evolving in nature, offer implications for pragmatics pedagogy, including pragmatics teaching materials and tasks, assessment, and teacher education, among others. Teaching materials should adequately represent the pragmatic norms of world Englishes. Overrepresenting inner-circle pragmatic norms could shape the perception in learners that these are the target of pragmatic acquisition and that pragmatic competence can be gained by acquiring these norms. For instance, listening activities can provide exposure to contexts in which multiple, varied pragmatic production strategies for speech acts and politeness used in different world Englishes are represented. Learners should engage in tasks which enable them to use intercultural communication strategies to negotiate pragmatic politeness and appropriateness based on the equal subjectivity of each interlocutor. Learners' L1 pragmatic identity could be preserved when classroom tasks allow them to project their L1 pragmatic norms and to engage in creating a third pragmatic space in which transcultural pragmatic norms are negotiated.

As regards the teachers' provision of corrective feedback, what should count is appropriateness in relation to a particular context of English use and linguistic background of the learners as well as the learners' ability to initiate and manage pragmatics-based negotiation of meaning and intention rather than pre-established native speaker pragmatic norms. Besides the representation of these norms in teaching materials and activities, users of world Englishes and EIL should be represented not only in their own national ELF or L2 context of English use but also in intercultural contexts where users from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds strive for pragmatic comprehensibility. In these materials and activities, the learners' voice and agency for context-specific pragmatic appropriateness should be encouraged. Also, translanguaging could be enacted in pragmatics instruction. As McKay and Brown (2016) pointed out, learners' awareness should be raised about the widely accepted misconceived belief that "an English-only classroom is the most productive for language learning needs to be fully examined; in addition, careful thought should be given to how best to use the L1 in developing language proficiency" (p. 171).

Language assessment is another area for the enactment of the principles of critical applied pragmatics. As with pragmatics teaching materials, pragmatic assessment tasks such as role plays and discourse completion tasks should represent the use of English in various EIL contexts. Rather than constructing scenarios that are use- and context-neutral, pragmatics test developers should construct scenarios that are relevant to the learning contexts and to the learners' future use of English. Tests that measure learners' pragmatic ability should have (situational) authenticity for learners. As such, pragmatic competency needed by learners in a particular EIL context should be prioritized, and tests representing center-oriented needs and contexts should be avoided.

Regarding test interactiveness, test tasks could measure learners' ability to negotiate pragmatic norms and appropriateness for more effective pragmatic performance. In the same vein, in pragmatic comprehension test tasks, learners should be challenged for their understanding and interpretation of pragmatic meaning and intention of interlocutors speaking different world Englishes and using English in different multilingual and multicultural contexts. This allows for positive pragmatic washback and consequential validity to the learners and teachers about EIL-informed pragmatics assessment. In addition to authenticity, the interactiveness of pragmatic test

tasks could be boosted if they require test takers to engage in the negotiation of pragmatic meaning in intercultural contexts. A critical approach to pragmatic assessment also entails rating criteria for pragmatic performance that are EIL-informed and negotiated, gives legitimacy to world Englishes, and is sensitive to local pragmatic norms.

Critical applied pragmatics, in view of the principles described above, can provide great insights into redefining the substance and aims of teacher education and the roles traditionally assigned to teachers in teaching and assessing L2 pragmatics. The traditional purpose of teacher education for pragmatics has been limited to training teachers for the effective instruction of sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic abilities. This effectiveness has been characterized mainly in terms of the teacher use of implicit/explicit pragmatic teaching tasks, consideration of learners' age, L1 background, gender, proficiency level, motivation, consciousness about L1 pragmatic transfer, provision of corrective feedback, and instruction of direct and indirect strategies for speech act production. The roles assigned to the teacher and teacher effectiveness, if any, were dependent on the application of this knowledge base in the classroom for pragmatics instruction and assessment. Although this knowledge base is required for pragmatics instruction, it does not allow teachers to be alert to important critical issues in pragmatics pedagogy due to its limited scope and normative orientation. Critical pragmatics teachers, as partly described by Kumaravadivelu (1994) in his treatment of language education in general, are reflective on their own pragmatic practice, rely on principled pragmatism, and have a sense of plausibility in pragmatics instruction. Traditional applied pragmatics has almost never addressed these issues. For instance, to my knowledge, there is scant research addressing teachers' critical reflection on their pragmatics instruction. Teachers of pragmatics need to reflect not only on the long-established issues of pragmatics instruction but also on social and political issues framing pragmatics instruction.

Pragmatics teachers, like Kumaravadivelu's (1994) postmethod teachers, need to rely on their principled pragmatism to theorize from what they practice in their pragmatics instruction and to practice what they have theorized in order to problematize pragmatics teaching priorities. In this process, pragmatics teachers can draw on the three parameters of particularity, practicality, and possibility (Kumaravadivelu, 2001). The pedagogy of particularity enables teachers to make their pragmatics instruction relevant to a particular group of language learners who pursue a particular set of goals in a particular educational context embedded in a particular sociocultural setting. The pedagogy of particularity is antithetical to the belief in one set of pedagogic aims that can be achieved through one set of pragmatic instructional principles and procedures. The practicality parameter encourages a teacher-generated theory of pragmatics teaching practice as a theory of practice is useful and usable provided that it is generated through practice. The pedagogy of possibility takes the position that the experiences that learners and teachers bring to the educational setting are partly shaped by the broader social, economic, and political ecology. In view of this position, the pedagogy of possibility aims to empower learners and teachers to develop theories, knowledge, and practices in the educational setting that are tied to these experiences.

Critical applied pragmatics for teacher education and pragmatics pedagogy also draws on the principles of EIL instruction developed by McKay and Brown (2016). Acknowledging pragmatic variation in world Englishes and native speaker fallacy, critical pragmatics teachers could consider the following two principles: due to the variety of English spoken today and the diversity of L2 learning contexts, all decisions for pragmatics pedagogy should be made in reference to learners' local pragmatic needs and local sociopolitical factors; and the widely accepted belief in the superiority of native speakers' pragmatic norms and pragmatic production strategies should be seriously challenged.

Conclusion and Directions for Research in Critical Applied Pragmatics

In this article, I described different conceptions of criticality as relevant to critical applied linguistics, and, by extension, to critical applied pragmatics. This was followed by the encapsulation of principles of critical applied linguistics as a key area of critical inquiry informing critical applied pragmatics. However, as discussed in this article, many other strands gaining momentum after the inception of critical applied linguistics can afford great insights into the conceptualization of critical applied pragmatics. They include the decolonial option, subalternity, heteronormativity, translanguaging, identity studies, and postmethod condition. Drawing on these strands and past developments in applied pragmatics, 10 principles of critical applied pragmatics were developed. These principles do not negate the rich history of theorizing and researching in applied pragmatics. Rather, they underscore the need to formulate a critical domain for applied pragmatics. It follows that critical applied pragmatics does not aim to replace all areas of research and teaching practice currently enacted in pragmatics pedagogy. Further, critical applied pragmatics is not limited to adjoining "critical" to the existing areas of pragmatics theorizing, research, instruction, and assessment. Based on its rich transdisciplinary nature, it pursues numerous areas of studies that fall beyond the scope of traditional applied pragmatics.

The consolidation of criticality in applied pragmatics entails research on pragmatics instruction, assessment, materials development, and teacher education informed by the 10 principles of critical applied pragmatics. In pragmatics instruction, tasks and activities could be studied for their effect on learners' abilities for effective intercultural communication and negotiation of pragmatic meaning, on learners' knowledge of pragmatic variation across world Englishes, and on learners' tolerance for this variation. Another strand of research is to investigate learners' perceptions of pragmatic norms in EIL and their likely resistance to pragmatic norms of others. Research is also needed to explore how the criticality-informed methodology of pragmatics instruction heightens learners' critical understanding of the socially, culturally, and politically situated nature of pragmatic conventions.

Another area of research is to investigate the realization of pragmatic norms of world Englishes in international ELT textbooks. Regarding language users, future research could focus on interlocutors', whether native or nonnative, negotiation of appropriate pragmatic performance, agency in enacting their preferred pragmatic production strategies, attempts to interactively enhance pragmatic comprehensibility, and resistance to native speakers' subjectivity in enforcing their own pragmatic norms as the benchmark for appropriateness in the process on intercultural, multilingual communication. For pragmatics language testing, studies are needed to investigate how pragmatic performance is measured and rated based on local needs, how test takers negotiate appropriateness and comprehensibility in interactional tasks, what consequential validity EIL-informed test tasks and rating criteria bring about to prompt pragmatics instruction alignment, and how the existing pragmatic rubrics could be revisited to clearly embody the principles of EIL. Finally, studies are needed to explore teachers' beliefs about the 10 principles of critical applied pragmatics and how critical pragmatics teacher education can help reshape teachers' beliefs about idealized native speakers' pragmatic norms and native teachers' supremacy in pragmatics instruction and, in turn, how teachers' reshaped beliefs inform more critically-oriented pragmatics instruction and assessment.

About the author

Zia Tajeddin is Professor of Applied Linguistics at Tarbiat Modares University. His main areas of research include L2 pragmatics and language teacher education. He is the co-editor of two international journals: *Second Language Teacher Education* (Equinox Publishing) and *Applied*

Pragmatics (John Benjamins). He has numerous published works in international journals and has recently published two edited books, including *Lessons from Good Language Teachers* (Cambridge University Press, 2021) and *Pragmatics Pedagogy in English as an International Language* (Routledge, 2020). He is also working on two volumes titled *Enabling Language Teacher Reflection* (Multilingual Matters) and *Teacher Identity and Reflective Practice* (Equinox Publishing).

Acknowledgments

To cite this article:

References

Alcon Soler, E. (2007). Fostering EFL learners' awareness of requesting through explicit and implicit consciousness-raising tasks. In M. P. García Mayo (Ed.), *Investigating tasks in formal language learning* (pp. 221–241). Multilingual Matters.

Alemi, M., & Tajeddin, Z. (2013). Pragmatic rating of L2 refusal: Criteria of native and nonnative English teachers. *TESL Canada Journal, 30*, Special Issue 7, 63–81. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v30i7.1152

Banegas, D. L., & Villacañas de Castro, L. S. (2016). Criticality. *ELT Journal, 70*(4), 455–457. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw048

Barkhuizen, G. (2017). Investigating multilingual identity in study abroad contexts: A short story analysis approach. *System, 71*, 102–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.09.014

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: Critical perspectives.* Continuum.

Block, D., & Cameron, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Globalization and language teaching,* Routledge.

Brumfit, C., Myles, F., Mitchell, R., Johnston, B., & Ford, P. (2005). Language study in higher education and the development of criticality. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(2), 145–168. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00085.x

Byram, M. (2008). *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship.* Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999a). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching.* Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999b). Interrogating the 'native speaker fallacy': Non-linguistic roots, nonpedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77–92). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2005a). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2005b). Dilemmas in planning English/vernacular relations in post-colonial communities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 9*(3), 419–447. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_3

Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review, 2*, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations.* Routledge.

Carroll, W. K. (2006). Hegemony, counter-hegemony, anti-hegemony. *Socialist Studies/Études Socialistes, 2*(2), 9–43. https://doi.org/10.18740/S44G7K

Cohen, A. D. (2005). Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 2*(3), 275–301. https://doi.org/10.1515/iprg.2005.2.3.275

Cohen, A. D. (2019a). Strategy instruction for learning and performing target language pragmatics. In A. U. Chamot & V. Harris (Eds.), *Learning strategy instruction in the language classroom: Issues and implementation* (pp. 140–152). Multilingual Matters.

Cohen, A. D. (2019b). Considerations in assessing pragmatic appropriateness in spoken language. *Language Teaching, 53*(2), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000156

Cohen, A. D., & Ishihara, N. (2005). *A web-based approach to strategic learning of speech acts.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA), University of Minnesota. https://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/Japanese%20Speech%20Act%20Report%20Rev.%20June05.pdf

Conteh, J. (2018). Translanguaging as pedagogy—a critical review. In A. Creese & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language and superdiversity* (pp. 473–487). Routledge.

Darder, A. (1991). *Culture and power in the classroom: A critical foundation for bicultural education*. Bergin and Garvey.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction.* New York University Press.

Derakhshan, A., & Eslami, Z. R. (2020). The effects of metapragmatic awareness, interactive translation, and discussion through video-enhanced input on the Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners' comprehension of implicatures. *Applied Research on English Language, 9*(1), 637–664. https://doi.org/10.22108/ARE.2019.118062.1476

Derakhshan, A., Malmir, A., & Greenier, V. (2021). Interlanguage pragmatic learning strategies (IPLS) as predictors of L2 speech act knowledge: A case of Iranian EFL learners. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *18*. http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2021.18.1.1.1

Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal, 59*(2), 199–208. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci039

Eslami-Rasekh, Z., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Fatahi, A. (2004). Using metapragmatic instruction to improve advanced EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. *TESL-EJ, 8*(2), 1–12. https://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume8/ej30/ej30a2/

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Pearson.

Fairclough, N. (2014). *Critical language awareness* (4th ed.). Addison-Wesley Longman.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks* [Translated by C. Markmann]. Grove Press.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2018). Reflective practice for language teachers. In J. I. Liontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons.

Firth, A. (1990). 'Lingua franca' negotiations: Towards an interactional approach. *World Englishes, 9*(3), 269–280. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1990.tb00265.x

Fisher, L., Evans, M., Forbes, K., Gayton, A., & Liu, Y. (2020). Participative multilingual identity construction in the languages classroom: A multi-theoretical conceptualization. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 17*(4), 448–466. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1524896

Fook, J., & Gardner, F. (2007). *Practising critical reflection: A resource handbook*. Open University Press.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977.* Pantheon Books.

Freire, P. (1996[1970]). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* [Translated by M. B Ramos]. Penguin.

García-Pastor, M. D. (2020). Researching identity and L2 pragmatics in digital stories: A relational account. *CALICO Journal, 37*(1), 46–65. https://doi.org/10.1558/cj.38777

Giroux, H. (1986). Radical pedagogy and the politics of student voice. *Interchange, 17*(1), 48–69. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01811018

Giroux, H. A. (2009). Critical theory and educational practice. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader (*pp. 27–51)*. Routledge.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.* International Publishers.

Guha, R., & Spivak, G. (Eds.). (1988). *Selected subaltern studies.* Oxford University Press.

Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal, 60*(4), 385–387. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl030

Holliday A. (2015). Native-speakerism: Taking the concept forward and achieving cultural belief. In A. Swan, P. Aboshiha, & A. Holliday (Eds.), *(En)Countering native-speakerism* (pp. 11–25)*. Palgrave Macmillan.

House, J (2013). Pragmatics of Lingua Franca interaction. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1–7). Blackwell Publishing.

Iyer, R., Kettle, M., Luke, A., & Mills, K. (2014). *Critical applied linguistics*. In C. Leung & B. V. Street (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to English studies* (pp. 317–332). Routledge.

Jacob, C. (2020). English as a decolonial language: Academic frames, popular discourses & language practices in Algeria, *The Journal of North African Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13629387.2020.1732627

Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (Eds.). (2002). *Teachers' narrative inquiry as professional development*. Cambridge University Press.

Keim, W. (2011). Counter hegemonic currents and internationalization of sociology: Theoretical reflections and one empirical example. *International Sociology, 26*(1), 123–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580909351324

Kim, K. Y. (2014). Learner investment, identity, and resistance to second language pragmatic norms. *System, 45*, 92–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.05.002

Kinginger, C. (2013). Identity and language learning in study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals, 46*(3), 339–358. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12037

Kubota, R. (2004). Critical multiculturalism and second language education. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 30–52). Cambridge University Press.

Kubota, R., & Miller, E. R. (2017): Re-examining and re-envisioning criticality in language studies: Theories and praxis. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 14*(2-3), 129–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2017.1290500

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(1), 27–48. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587197

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 453–484. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587674

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(4), 537–560. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588427

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 59–81. https://doi.org/10.2307/40264511

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2008). *Cultural globalization and language education*. Yale University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The decolonial option in English teaching: Can the subaltern act? *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(1), 66–85. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.202

Leonardo, Z. (2013). *Race frameworks: A multidimensional theory of racism and education*. Teachers College Press.

Li, S. (2011). *Developing pragmatic competence in L2 Chinese: The effects of input-based and output-based practice and language aptitude factors* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). Carnegie Mellon University.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2011). Language teaching and learning from an intercultural perspective. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2; pp. 837–855). Routledge.

Liu, J. (2006). Assessing EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic knowledge: Implications for testers and teachers. *Reflections on English Language Teaching, 5*(1), 1–22. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.529.3579&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Liu, K. (2020). *Critical reflection for transformative learning: Understanding eportfolios in teacher education*. Springer Nature.

Lok, I. M. C. (2012). World Englishes and postcolonialism: Reading Kachru and Said. *World Englishes, 31*(4), 419–433. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2012.01771.x

Makoni, S. (2003). Review: Critical applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 24*(1), 130–137. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/24.1.130-a

Matsuda, A. (Ed.). (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Multilingual Matters.

Matsuda, A. (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language*. Multilingual Matters.

McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.

McKay, S. L. (2009). Pragmatics and EIL pedagogy. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 227–241). Multilingual Matters.

McKay, S. L. (2018). English as an international language: What it is and what it means for pedagogy. *RELC Journal, 49*(1), 9–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217738817

McKay, S. L., & Brown, J. D. (2016). *Teaching and assessing EIL in local contexts around the world*. Routledge.

Memmi, A. (2003). *The colonizer and the colonized*. Earthscan.

Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of Western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.

Mignolo, W. D., & Escobar, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Globalization and the decolonial option*. Routledge.

Murray, N. (2012). English as a lingua franca and the development of pragmatic competence. *ELT Journal, 66*(3), 318–326. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs016

Nguyen, T. T. M., 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*(4), 416–434. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.01.003

Palmer, D., & Caldas, B. (2015). Critical ethnography. In K. King, Y. J. Lai, & S. May (Eds.), *Research methods in language and education* (3rd ed., pp. 1–12). Springer.

Pennycook, A. (1990). Towards a critical applied linguistics for the 1990s. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 8–28. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5f62s7d6

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pennycook, A. (2004). Critical applied linguistics. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 784–807). Blackwell Publishing.

Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2008). Critical applied linguistics and language education. In S. May & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed.), *Volume 1: Language policy and political issues in education* (pp. 169–181). Springer Science+Business Media.

Pennycook, A. (2010). Critical and alternative directions in applied linguistics. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 33*(2), 16.1–16.16. https://doi.org/10.2104/aral1016

Pennycook, A. (2011). Global Englishes. In R. Wodak, B. Johnstone, & P. E. Kerswill (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 513–525). Sage Publications.

Phan, L. H. (2017). Global English, postcolonialism, and education. In M. A. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory* (pp. 1–6). Springer.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2001). English for globalization or for the world's people? *International Review of Education, 47*(3–4), 185–200. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1017937322957

Phillipson, R. (2010). *Linguistic imperialism continued.* Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (2016). Native speakers in linguistic imperialism. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 14*(3), 80–96. http://www.jceps.com/archives/3209

Risager, K. (2011). The cultural dimensions of language teaching and learning: Research timeline. *Language Teaching. 44*(4), 485–499. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000280

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism.* Chatto & Windus.

Schneider, K. P., & Barron, A. (2008). Where pragmatics and dialectology meet: Introducing variational pragmatics. In K. P. Schneider & A. Barron (Eds.), *Variational pragmatics: A focus on regional varieties in pluricentric languages* (pp. 1–32). John Benjamins.

Sharifian, F. (Ed.). (2009). *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues*. Multilingual Matters.

Shohamy, E. (2001). *The power of tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests.* Longman.

Sonnenburg-Winkler, S. L., Eslami, Z. R., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Rater variation in pragmatic assessment: The impact of linguistic background on peer-assessment and self- assessment. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics, 16*(1), 67–85. https://doi.org/10.1515/lpp-2020-0004

Speer, S. A. (2005). *Gender talk: Feminism, discourse and conversation analysis*. Routledge.

Spolsky, B. (1995). *Measured words*. Oxford University Press.

Stille, S. (2015). Identity as a site of difference: Toward a complex understanding of identity in multilingual, multicultural classrooms. *Intercultural Education, 26*(6), 483–496. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2015.1109777

Su, C. (2005). Cracking silent codes: Critical race theory and education organizing. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 28*, 531–548. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596300701625297

Sykes, J. M., & Cohen, A. D. (2018). Strategies and interlanguage pragmatics: Explicit and comprehensive. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching 8*(2), 381–402. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.9

Taguchi, N., & Ishihara, N. (2018). The pragmatics of English as a lingua franca: Research and pedagogy in the era of globalization. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 38*, 80–101. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190518000028

Tajeddin, Z., & Alemi, M. (2014). Criteria and bias in native English teachers' assessment of L2 pragmatic appropriacy: Content and FACETS analyses. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 23*(3), 425–434. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0118-5

Tajeddin, Z., & Alemi, M. (2021). Pragmatics pedagogy in EIL: A historical perspective. In Z. Tajeddin & M. Alemi (Eds.), *Pragmatics pedagogy in English as an international language* (pp. 1–18). Routledge.

Tajeddin, Z., Alemi, M., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2018). Idealized native-speaker linguistic and pragmatic norms in English as an international language: Exploring the perceptions of nonnative English teachers. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 18*(3), 300–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2017.1413105

Tajeddin, Z., & Dabbagh, A. (2015). Interlanguage pragmatic test tasks: Does a low-stakes test have washback to L2 teachers and learners? *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 12*(4), 129–158. http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2015.12.4.5.129

Tajeddin, Z., & Malmir, A. (2015). The construct of interlanguage pragmatic learning strategies: Investigating preferences of high vs. low pragmatic performers. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS) 6*(4), 153–180. http://dx.doi.org/10.22099/jtls.2015.3016

Tajeddin, Z., & Shirkhani, S. (2017). Pragmatic corrective feedback in L2 classrooms: Investigating EFL teachers' perceptions and instructional practices. *Teaching English Language, 11*(2), 25–56. https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2017.53182

Tajeddin, Z., & Zand Moghadam, A. (2012). Interlanguage pragmatic motivation: Its construct and impact on speech act production. *RELC Journal, 43*(3) 353–372. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212468481

Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 171–199). Cambridge University Press.

Takahashi, S. (2005). Pragmalinguistic awareness: Is it related to motivation and proficiency? *Applied Linguistics, 26*(1), 90–120. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amh040

Takimoto, M. (2006). The effects of explicit feedback on the development of pragmatic proficiency. *Language Teaching Research, 10*(4), 393–417. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168806lr198oa

Takimoto, M. (2012). Metapragmatic discussion in interlanguage pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics, 44*, 1240–1253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.05.007

Taylor, S. K., Despagne, C., & Faez, F. (2018). Critical language awareness. In J. I. Liontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–14). John Wiley & Sons.

Tollefson, J. (2000). Policy and ideology in the spread of English. In J. K. Hall & W. Eggington (Eds.), *The sociopolitics of English language teaching* (pp. 7–21). Multilingual Matters.

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 249–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006

Walsh, C. (1991). *Pedagogy and the struggle for voice: Issues of language, power, and schooling for Puerto Ricans*. OISE Press.

Wodak, R. (1995). *Gender and discourse*. Sage Publications.

Wodak, R., & Chilton, P. (Eds.). (2005). *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity*. John Benjamins.

Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Yazan, B., Canagarajah, S., & Jain, J. (Eds.). (2021). *Autoethnographies in ELT: Transnational identities, pedagogies, and practices*. Routledge.