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ABSTRACT
Recent research in interlanguage pragmatics has demonstrated that at least some aspects of pragmatics can be taught in the second or foreign language classroom, and that explicit teaching methods are particularly effective. Oftentimes, however, textbooks present information on language use that is either decontextualised or inauthentic. Naturalistic interactions, if available at all, occur outside the classroom and are not experienced by the class as a whole. Videotapes of naturalistic interactions can overcome these shortcomings and be an effective medium for explicit instruction in pragmatics. This paper draws on the academic literature from interlanguage pragmatics, TESL, second language pedagogy and visual anthropology as well as on the author’s personal experience in the production of a videotape for teaching Indonesian pragmatics. Its purpose is to guide teachers and materials developers, who would like to produce a pragmatics teaching video, by presenting some of the practical and theoretical considerations that must be taken into account in order to achieve a high level of authenticity in the language used in the scenarios. These issues concern how to select the events, filming locations and actors, and how to film them so as to attain this goal.

Introduction
During the twentieth century and continuing into the twenty-first, the world has become increasingly international with greater numbers of people travelling abroad for tourism, study and work. In addition, some nations such as Australia, Canada and the United States of America have continued to receive large numbers of immigrants from other lands and cultures. English is the most common lingua franca in situations of inter-group contact in travel, education and business and is a national language in the aforementioned countries. Therefore, in order to prepare language students for a sojourn abroad and immigrants for life in their new country, teachers of English as a second or foreign language have, in recent years, given greater attention to the development of communicative competence.

One key component of communicative competence is pragmatic competence (Bachman 1990) or the ability to use language appropriately in a given
sociocultural context. Consequently, researchers have begun to investigate pragmatic instruction in order to determine whether pragmatics can be successfully taught (see Kasper 1997 for a review), and, if so, which aspects can be taught most successfully, which teaching approaches (explicit vs implicit) are the most effective, and whether instruction in foreign language classrooms can be effective given that learners typically do not have the opportunity to interact with native speakers outside the classroom. The findings of these studies indicate that while the comprehension (Bouton 1999) and production (Tateyama 2001) of at least the more formulaic aspects of pragmatics can be successfully taught, other more idiosyncratic expressions (Bouton 1999) are difficult to teach and perhaps should be developed through repeated exposure and experience. The evidence to date suggests that in the classroom learners do better with some explicit metapragmatic instruction (Kasper 2001; Trosberg 2003) than when only implicit teaching methods are used. Furthermore, research has found that some aspects of pragmatics can be successfully taught even in foreign language contexts (for example, Liddicoat and Crozet 2001; Ohta 2001; Takahashi 2001; Tateyama 2001; Yoshimi 2001; Safont Jordà 2003; Salazar Campillo 2003; Trosberg 2003). Although these foreign language learners lack access to native speakers in live interactions, they can nevertheless gain exposure to them through other means. One such means of exposure is the use of videotaped material (Rose 1994; Washburn 2001).

**Videotapes and language instruction**

Videotaped materials not only provide students with variation in the medium of classroom materials but also give the closest approximation to real life situations (Stempleski and Tomalin 1990), thus adding interest to the lessons and increasing motivation (Fluitt Dupuy 2001). In addition, videotaped materials in classroom instruction have some advantages over other means of input such as naturalistic interactions and textbooks.

Although naturalistic interactions with native speakers provide an excellent means for learners to obtain input and practice, there are certain drawbacks. First, naturalistic input is not always available outside the classroom, particularly in foreign language contexts, due to the lack of availability of native speakers. Second, even when naturalistic input is available, certain pragmatic features may not be sufficiently salient for learners to notice them (Schmidt 1993; Washburn 2001). Third, native speakers are not likely to give learners feedback on certain types of pragmatic violations, particularly those that are considered to be social rather than linguistic (Siegal 1995; DuFon 2000a, 2000b), and learners may be more sensitive to the correction of pragmatic errors that seem to reflect more upon their knowledge of the world than on...
their knowledge of the second language (Thomas 1983). Videotapes can help overcome these problems if the pragmatically aware instructor stops the tape at critical moments and points out non-salient pragmatic features and pragmatic violations in order to raise the students’ awareness of them (Washburn 2001). All this can be accomplished without correcting the learners on sensitive errors; yet the learners receive the benefit of the feedback through the pragmatic deviations witnessed in the video.

A fourth problem with naturalistic interactions can occur when teachers ask students to become mini-ethnographers, who observe and write about naturalistic interactions they witness (for example, Roberts et al 2001). While this can be a useful and worthwhile exercise, it does have several drawbacks. In the first place, it relies on the accuracy and thoroughness of the learners’ note-keeping and reporting procedures, and even with high-quality field notes, it still does not give the density of linguistic data that a video recording can (Grimshaw 1982). Secondly, it might compel the teacher to conjecture about events that he or she did not witness. In contrast, watching a video gives all those involved the opportunity to view the same event. Thirdly, in naturalistic interactions where the learners are participants as well as observers, more of their attention must go to planning what they are going to say. When viewing a videotape, they have the advantage of being observers rather than participants; therefore, they can focus more of their attention on what the interlocutors are saying and the linguistic forms they are using to achieve their communicative goals (Washburn 2001). Furthermore, while naturalistic interactions are transient, videotapes have permanence (Grimshaw 1982; Washburn 2001), which allows the learners to view the same interaction repeatedly by playing it back. Repeated viewings let the learners redirect their attention somewhat and notice things they might have missed in previous viewings (Erickson 1982, 1992; Fetterman 1998), such as pragmalinguistic forms or contextual features of the interaction.

Videotapes also have several advantages over textbooks. One problem with textbooks is that the language used in them is often decontextualised, and even when it is contextualised it frequently deviates from the language used in comparable naturalistic interactions (Myers Scotten and Bernsten 1988; Cathcart 1989; Bardovi-Harlig et al 1991; LoCastro 1994; Boxer and Pickering 1995). Videotapes, on the other hand, provide more contextual information in a more efficient manner than do textbooks. They give learners a more complete picture of the interlocutors and the setting, as well as information about posture, gestures, clothing and proxemics (the use of space), all of which contribute to politeness in interactions (Stempleksi and Tomalin 1990; Gass and Houck 1999, Iino 1999). This may be particularly...
important for those learners who have never had any experience of the target culture and whose familiarity with it is limited, particularly when the native and target cultures are quite different from each other. Yet even in English as a second language settings, videos can be useful in introducing learners to the pragmatics of situations (for example, job interviews, citizenship interviews) that they have not as yet encountered but are likely to eventually. In addition, with video the learners can hear paralinguistic features such as loudness, stress and intonation, all of which carry pragmatic and affective information (Washburn 2001). Moreover, because of these extralinguistic and paralinguistic cues, videotapes can improve learners’ comprehension of the discourse (Stempleski and Tomalin 1990). Furthermore, when the videotapes display naturalistic interactions, they allow learners to hear authentic language.

Another way in which videotapes are advantageous as a tool for the teaching of pragmatics is that they can portray similar events but with variations in the contextual variables that allow learners to view how participant variables – such as age, gender, social status and so forth, as well as variables related to the linguistic act such as the ranking of the imposition (Kasper 1998) – might affect the language used in the interaction (Rose 1994; Washburn 2001).

Thus, videotapes have some clear advantages for the teaching of pragmatics, but this is not to claim that they are superior to textbooks or naturalistic interactions. However, given that they do have the advantages discussed above, they should be included among the classroom media for pragmatic instruction.

Given that the research to date indicates the benefit of explicit instruction in the teaching of pragmatics, and given that the video medium as a teaching and learning tool has some clear advantages over naturalistic observations and textbooks, it makes sense to produce a video for the teaching of pragmatics in the second and foreign language classroom. By producing a video, it would be possible to approach the authenticity and richness of context found in naturalistic interactions, and yet also have the permanence and portability of a textbook in that it could be brought into the classroom to be studied and re-studied jointly by the teacher and students together.

While permanence and portability are inherent in the videotape medium, authenticity and richness of context depend on the way the taping and editing are carried out. In this paper, I will address some of the theoretical and practical issues related to the taping and editing of videotaped materials in order to provide a rich context and authenticity in videos produced specifically for the teaching of pragmatics in the second or foreign language classroom. In discussing these issues I will bring together the literature from interlanguage pragmatics, TESL, second language pedagogy and visual anthropology, and
combine them with my experience in video production. This experience began when I was an ethnographic researcher in Indonesia, and I was videotaping learners and native speakers in naturalistic interactions for the analysis of certain aspects of politeness (DuFon 2000a; DuFon 2002). I was able to build upon that research experience in video when I became involved in the production of video materials for instructional purposes for the National Foreign Language Resource Center's (NFLRC) project on *Teaching the pragmatics of Indonesian as a foreign language*. The NFLRC’s mission includes the production and dissemination of low-cost materials to teachers of the less commonly taught languages in the United States. In addition to the goal of producing a video that could be used to teach pragmatics in the classroom was that of providing a model for instructors and materials developers to follow when producing materials for pragmatic instruction in other languages, including English as a second or foreign language. This paper is a result of that goal. In order to assist classroom teachers and materials developers in the production of highly authentic video materials for the teaching of pragmatics in the second or foreign language classroom, this paper will explore some of the factors that need to be taken into consideration. These considerations include selecting the events, the locations, and the actors to be used in the videotape, and then deciding how to film them so as to provide as much context as possible and to retain the naturalness and authenticity of the action and the discourse.

**Selecting events, locations, and actors**

**THE EVENTS**

From a practical standpoint, in order for a video to be useful to the students it should include the events in which they are most likely to be involved. The events selected to be videotaped for this project were chosen based on research documents such as diaries and field notes that I had written during research in Indonesia as a language learner (DuFon 1998) and as a researcher (DuFon 2000a). The selected events also corresponded to a high degree with the situations presented in the most commonly used Indonesian textbook in the US: *Beginning Indonesian through self-instruction* by Wolff, Oetomo and Fietkiewicz (1992) and *Mari berbahasa Indonesia* by Rafferty, Barnard and Suharni (in preparation). It was reasoned that if the events in the video scenarios corresponded with the events in the textbook lessons, the students would be more familiar with the language associated with these events and thus would be better able to comprehend the language in the videos.

From a theoretical standpoint, because one point of pragmatic instruction
is to sensitise learners to the way language varies across contexts (Rose 1994), it was important to choose not only different events but also different types of events. Consequently, events were chosen that occurred in homes (for example, visits among families and friends, a housewife giving instructions to her maid, etc) and in service encounters (for example, shopping in the market or in stores of various kinds, changing money at the bank, etc).

The same would hold true for an English as a second/foreign language classroom. Teachers who produce a video for the teaching of pragmatics would do well to film several types of events, such as the home or dormitory situations that learners interact in, service encounters, and perhaps social encounters like those taking place in clubs or on teams. The specific events chosen in each category should relate to experiences in the learners’ daily lives, and be arranged to correspond with the curriculum so that learners are at least somewhat familiar with the language encountered in the video. In order to determine what the events are that learners engage in, the ESL teacher could utilise various observation, interviewing or journalling techniques.

THE LOCATIONS

Since some pragmatic features of the language index features such as the setting or the level of formality of an event (Ochs 1996), we felt it important to give the learners a sense of the space where the interaction occurred. At the same time, we wanted to videotape in an environment that was as authentic as possible. We felt this would be best accomplished by videotaping on location – at the immigration office, the bank and so on – rather than on a set. This made videotaping easier, as it did not require a studio, but it meant we ran the risk that the noise and busyness of certain locations could interfere with the sound quality and that our presence might disrupt business. Therefore, where possible I preferred to shoot in smaller offices and businesses, such as a branch bank and a secondary post office, as they tended to offer a quieter environment in which to videotape and meant that we would be less disruptive to business.

While this approach helped to maintain the authenticity in the videotape, it ran the risk of giving the viewer the mistaken impression that all businesses in Indonesia are quite small. This, in fact, was a concern of the head of the bank in the city where we did the videotaping. He wanted us to videotape at the main bank, rather than the small campus branch we preferred, because he did not want the learners viewing the videotape to think that this small establishment was typical of an Indonesian bank. We compromised by going to a larger branch bank, which was small enough and quiet enough for our purposes but, at the same time, was large enough to protect the image of the bank. Thus, when choosing where to videotape, it is necessary for ESL
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teachers/materials developers to take into consideration not only the need for quietness and authenticity in setting and dialogue, but also how the images of the particular location are chosen. If these are not typical of the target language culture as a whole, the videotape might bias the learner/viewer in terms of their perceptions of what is typical in that culture.

THE ACTORS

Participant factors such as social identities, roles, and relationships in terms of power and social distance are important in determining which linguistic forms and politeness strategies are appropriate in a given interaction (Brown and Levinson 1987; Ochs 1996; Kasper 1998). Therefore, in addition to considering the events when making our video, we also needed to consider who would be appropriate to have in it. First, we had to decide whether or not to hire professional actors or just use people who represented a good cross-section in terms of age, gender, occupation, and so forth in order for there to be a sufficient range of power and social distance variables. Second, we needed to decide whether to videotape only competent native speakers, who would be good models of appropriate behaviour, or to include Indonesian language learners as well, even though their pragmatic (and grammatical) competence might be limited. Third, we had to decide what characteristics our ‘actors’ needed to have in order to achieve our goals.

Ultimately, to keep the events and the language used in them as authentic as possible, we chose people who could be themselves in the video scenarios rather than actors pretending to be someone else. Thus, the chief of immigration, the becak (pedicab) driver, the manager of the hotel, and so on were all people who had those roles in real life.

As one of the goals in pragmatics instruction is to sensitise learners to variation in language use according to contextual variables (Rose 1994), it was crucial to videotape a wide range of people who varied in terms of age, occupational group, ethnicity, social status, religion, gender, and the degree of familiarity with their interlocutors. As a result, we enlisted a wide range of participants.

Furthermore, since research has shown that native speakers in a host culture often have different norms for interacting with foreigners than they have for interacting with other members of their own culture (Iino 1996; DuFon 2000a, in press), we felt it essential to include both Indonesian learners and native Indonesians in the video scenarios. Therefore, most scenarios have at least two versions: one with native speakers only and one with native speakers interacting with a learner. Some, such as eating a meal in the village, present Indonesians interacting with each other and with learners in the same scenario.
When selecting the native Indonesian speakers, for various reasons we needed to choose Indonesians from different ethnic groups. Indonesia is a multilingual nation (Nababan 1991) with each ethnic group or each region speaking its own language among in-group members and using Indonesian, the national language, only for inter-group communication. Therefore, when combining people from different ethnic groups in the same scenarios, they naturally chose to communicate in Indonesian, thus keeping the interactions more authentic. Using Indonesians from a variety of provinces also had the advantage of reducing the bias towards the norms of one particular region, making the video more representative of the nation as a whole.6

For the foreign learners of Indonesian, we would ideally have liked to use learners at the intermediate levels of proficiency as they would most likely be fluent enough to communicate in Indonesian and have enough pragmatic competence to serve as a good role model. At the same time, Indonesians would be likely to use some foreigner talk (Ferguson 1971), naturally adjusting their language so that it could be understood by the learner, thereby making the language more comprehensible even for beginners viewing the video. However, it was not possible to find enough intermediate learners willing to participate in the videotaping activities during our timeframe, so we were forced to use a range of proficiency levels from high beginner to advanced levels. When the more advanced learners were used, both the native interlocutors and the learners tended to talk at a more rapid rate. Although this retained the naturalness and authenticity of the scenario, it made them less comprehensible to the slower, lower level learners. However, when the lower level learners were used, we found that they were more likely to make pragmatic as well as grammatical errors, as is natural for them. While this has the disadvantage of providing inappropriate input to the learners viewing the video, the Indonesian language instructor can use these errors to provide feedback on what might be more appropriate. In this way they make appropriate and inappropriate pragmatic behaviour more salient, and provide the learners viewing the video with feedback on pragmatic errors they are not likely to get during naturalistic interactions (cf Washburn 2001).

In choosing the actors for a videotape to be used for teaching pragmatics in English, the materials developers need to consider whether to hire professional actors or to use people who actually work in the roles that they want to portray. We chose to use the latter as they would already be familiar with the discourse associated with that role. Another possible approach would be to collect naturalistic data in the various situations and write a script for actors based on that data. A second decision we made was to include both NS–NS and NS–Learner interactions. ESL materials developers might want to include
an ESL learner in their videos so that the language will be comprehensible to the learners’/viewers’ levels, and any adaptations in the language that are made by native English speakers when talking to non-native English speakers will also be captured on tape.

Finally, ESL materials developers will need to consider the characteristics they want their ‘actors’ to possess. They will need to decide which characteristics are key markers of social identity in their particular speech community, and the range of people their learners are likely to interact with. In some areas of large and diverse nations – such as Australia, Canada and the United States – it might be necessary to include ‘actors’ from various English dialect groups, both regional and social, so that learners can observe the pragmatic norms of different subcultures and how accommodations are realised in contacts between members of these subcultural groups.

**Deciding how to videotape**

Once the events, the locations, and the actors themselves were selected, we needed to decide how to videotape and edit the scenarios so as to maintain authenticity and provide learners with as much contextual information as possible while at the same time making the video interesting to them. In this section, I will discuss which decisions need to be made with respect to presenting the context – by videotaping whole events and including the larger context – and maintaining the naturalness and authenticity of the events and the dialogue by videotaping events that were naturalistic, or as close to naturalistic, as possible.

**PRESENTING THE CONTEXT**

**Whole events**

One way in which we provided contextual information was by giving the viewers a sense of the whole event. Videotaping whole events from start to finish enabled the participants’ ‘actions to influence the structure of the final film’ (Asch 1992: 199), keeping it more in line with reality. Presenting a whole event was generally easy enough for service encounters such as shopping in the market, changing money at the bank or buying stamps at the post office. For longer events, however, it was necessary to edit some out while still retaining a sense of the whole. For example, in those scenes involving bargaining for, riding in and paying for a ride in a **becak**, the entire bargaining and payment scenes were retained, but the riding scene was kept to a minimum, just enough to give the viewer a sense that the ride had taken place. This is a common technique used in films which viewers
would be accustomed to. In such cases, no dialogue was lost as the passengers did not converse with the becak driver during this time. In other cases, editing was more severe. For example the longest scenario, the visit to the village, takes 25 minutes to view, but in reality the visit took hours. Much of the dialogue was removed during the editing process. What were retained were the pragmatically important aspects of the event including speech acts – greetings, invitations (to enter, sit, eat and drink), and leave taking – and the formulaic routines associated with them, which can be successfully taught in the classroom (Tateyama 2001). Enough small talk is kept to give the viewer a sense of the kinds of topics discussed and of the passage of time. That is, we tried to strike a balance between authenticity and interest by retaining enough material, and using fade-outs and fade-ins to show that time had passed. We did this without retaining everything, as this would have made the videos too long for beginners and may have become tedious even for advanced learners, given the mundane nature of the interactions.

**Capturing the larger context**

In addition to deciding how long to videotape, we also needed to determine how much of the location to show. As with the initial selection of the location, this was important because setting is often indexed by language use (Ochs 1996). While a scenario may have taken place inside a house or a store, we wanted to give the viewer a sense of the larger context. To do this we usually tried to show some footage at the beginning of the video of where the scenario was taking place. For example, before the scenario of renting a room, we shot scenes of the prospective renters approaching the house. The shot of the outside of the house gives some idea of the neighbourhood and adds to the learners’ knowledge regarding the status of the owner. For the visit to the village, we shot some footage not only of the house to be visited but of the village and its surrounding fields as well. A few seconds of this kind of footage gives learners a sense of the larger context in which the event portrayed is taking place, which may be useful in interpreting the linguistic forms used in terms of their pragmatic intent.

Likewise, ESL video producers ought to film and present both the larger context and whole events whenever possible, and to give learners at least a sense of the whole event in other cases. While this is especially important in foreign language classrooms, it can be useful even in second language settings, as learners might encounter events and situations in the video that they have not yet experienced in real life. A sense of the larger context of the event prior to their real-life experience of it will put them in a better position to deal with the pragmatics of the situation when they do.
MAINTAINING NATURALNESS AND AUTHENTICITY IN THE
ACTION AND THE DISCOURSE

In addition to deciding how to use time and space, we also needed to
determine how to use our participants in the videotapes. That is, we needed
to decide whether to shoot only naturalistic events which the participants
engaged in during everyday life, or whether to include less than naturalistic
events such as role enactments and role-plays. While we probably would
have been able to achieve the highest degree of naturalness and authenticity
by videotaping events as they occurred in the lives of the participants, this
was not practical. We were paying a film crew by the day and so it was to
our advantage to fit in as much videotaping in that time as possible. As this
required planning, we scheduled most of the events that we shot. While
some of the events we videotaped were highly natural, spontaneous and
authentic, others were less so. Consequently, the scenarios in the final product
vary widely in terms of their authenticity and naturalness.

Naturalistic events

The most natural events are those that occur and unfold without any
direction from the director, producer or film crew. When some kind of
intervention takes place – manipulation of the set, the actors or the naturally
emerging dialogue – the naturalness of the event is reduced (Watson-Gegeo,
Maldonado-Guzman and Gleason 1981), which jeopardises the authenticity of
the event and the discourse. While non-naturalistic events such as role-plays,
simulations and scripted dramas have many characteristics of naturalistic
interaction, and the language used in them is similar to naturally occurring
dialogue, there are nevertheless important differences between the two. These
differences are attributed in part to the lack of social consequences in role-plays
that are present in real-life interactions (Kasper and Rose in press). Because
the precise ways that pragmalinguistic features are used in interaction can
affect the social or relational message of what is said, it is important that the
videos present authentic discourse so as not to lead language learners astray
in terms of what is considered appropriate in a given situation. Therefore,
whenever possible, we videotaped people as they engaged in naturalistic
interactions. On rare occasions, these events were quite spontaneous. For
example, in one scenario a child returned home on the last day of school with
his report card while we were videotaping another event at the house. We
had not planned in advance to videotape this event, but since it happened
while we were there we took advantage of the situation and added it to our
agenda. More often, the events were pre-planned, but nevertheless natural.
For example, we videotaped the actors buying stamps and mailing a letter in
the post office, as well as eating a meal while visiting a village.
Role enactment

In other cases, the events were not completely natural but enacted. Role enactment, where the actors maintain their own identities or play themselves, is more natural than role-play, where they pretend to be someone else or to be in a different situation than they are (Kasper and Rose in press). Even though role enactments are not totally natural, because the participants are familiar with their role and the situation they are more likely to have, and be able to access, schemata for the event. This enables the participants to act in accordance with the rights and obligations of their role, and to speak in ways that are more authentic and realistic than when they play a role in an unfamiliar situation. Furthermore, in spite of the risk of reduced authenticity in the language of role enactments, as compared with naturalistic interactions discussed earlier, language use can remain reasonably authentic. It is also more likely to approximate that of real-life situations if role enactments are not too carefully predetermined and the participants are given sufficient freedom to create their own enactment (Kasper and Rose, in press). For all these reasons, role enactment can approximate naturalistic interactions and is more natural and authentic than role-play.

Therefore, when we could not videotape naturally occurring events our next choice was to videotape role enactments. For this, the participants or actors maintained their own identities and performed tasks that they were accustomed to doing, such as buying a ticket at the travel agency, reserving a room in a small hotel, or applying for a passport or visa at the immigration office. They performed these tasks in a natural way, that is, in the locations in which they occurred with the vendors, clerks and officers who worked in those places. However, they did not really buy a ticket, reserve a room or obtain an immigration document, but merely pretended to. Despite the reduced authenticity of the events as compared with truly naturalistic ones, the events nevertheless had a high degree of authenticity: they occurred on location; the confederates were enacting the roles they carry out in real life; and the native Indonesian and learner clients were acting in roles they had engaged in or would potentially engage in some time in the future.

To preserve the naturalness and authenticity of the dialogue, we allowed the actors to speak and behave in ways that were natural to them. We tried to keep the actors behaving in a natural manner by giving them general guidelines regarding what to do (for example, you will take a ride in a becak to the post office), and by allowing them to develop their own dialogue rather than giving them a script to follow or telling them specifically what to say. Thus, even the role-enacted scenarios were reasonably authentic.

However, we experienced a few problems maintaining total authenticity.
There was one scenario – buying vegetables from the door-to-door vendor – in which all the actors were Javanese and it would have been natural for them to speak to each other in Javanese rather than to interact in Indonesian, which we asked them to do. But although the language was somewhat unnatural and inauthentic for them, their role relationships remained stable. As such, I believe that our compromise in this situation still gives a good indication of the types of things that the participants would say to each other in this sort of encounter. Nevertheless, the discourse is inauthentic at least in terms of code choice.

Another problem was that sometimes the director of the film crew tried to make the videotape more interesting for the audience, thereby sacrificing authenticity in the process. Such was the case when videotaping one of the becak scenes. When bargaining for the price of the pedicab, the Indonesian man originally gave in quite readily to the becak driver’s counter-offer (as he normally would do). The director cut the videotaping and instructed him to bargain hard. He did, but his friend teased him for such behaviour. At that time, I approached and asked him if he would bargain hard or not in this situation. He said that he would not, so I told him to behave naturally, that is, to give in readily as he normally would do. For the Indonesian women, in contrast, bargaining hard was quite natural. Thus, by encouraging the actors to behave normally, I was not only better able to preserve the naturalness and authenticity of the interaction, but was also able to capture an important contrast in the bargaining behaviour of men as opposed to women in this particular context – a contrast that has been noted in the ethnographic literature as typical of Javanese Indonesian society (Keeler 1987).

Role-play

Although we avoided role-play because of the pitfalls described above, there was one case in which we broke that rule. This one exception occurred in the scenario of an American woman giving instructions to her maid. On the day that we were scheduled to videotape the maid was unavailable, so the woman had arranged for a friend to come in and play the part of the maid. In this case, the ‘maid’ did not maintain her own identity nor did she act out a role that she had ever had or was ever likely to engage in. Consequently, the ‘maid’s’ language is less authentic, to the extent that one native speaker of Indonesian who viewed the videotape asked if she was a student, because he felt she talked more like a student than a maid. In spite of this problem, we decided to keep this scenario because the housewife was enacting her role, and therefore her language use was probably authentic. The scenario also provides a good example of how an American interacts with her maid,
which contrasts rather starkly with the way an Indonesian typically does, as illustrated in the dialogue in *Beginning Indonesian through self-instruction* (Wolff et al 1992). Therefore, this scenario still has instructional value regarding pragmatics even though it is problematic in terms of authenticity.

When deciding how to film for a pragmatics teaching video for ESL, materials developers need to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of the various degrees of naturalness from naturalistic interactions at one end of the continuum to role-play at the other: the greater the naturalness, the more likely that the dialogue will be authentic. Filming completely naturalistic events, however, is not always feasible, in which case role enactment or even role-play might be necessary. Materials developers need to be aware at all times of the limitations of role-play, as it might lead to inauthentic discourse. Videotapes using this technique must be scrutinised carefully by native speakers of English so that teachers and learners can be informed about any atypical discourse that has resulted from this type of filming choice.

**Filmed versus unfilmed interaction**

In addition to the problems mentioned above in maintaining authenticity and naturalness in the videotaped scenarios, we also experienced problems stemming from the fact that people often act differently when being observed. The presence of the video equipment and the videographer (if he or she is present), and even that the videotape is being made, typically cause participants to become camera conscious and behave in atypical ways, at least initially (Ruby 1980; Watson-Gegeo, Maldonado-Guzman and Gleason 1981). At times, this was clearly a problem. For example, in one scenario a papaya vendor offered his better papayas for 1500 rupiah each. The buyer countered with an offer of 1000 rupiah, which the vendor readily accepted. We suspected that because the vendor wanted to appear cooperative and non-confrontational on tape, he accepted a price he would not ordinarily accept. In this case, we asked him if would normally bargain and he admitted that he would. Therefore, we re-taped the interaction and instructed him to bargain as usual.

Another problem was that the actors never quite forgot they were on camera, and never seemed quite as relaxed when the camera was running as when it was not. They often waited until it was stopped to do certain things, such as take a bathroom break. Since the pragmatics of excusing oneself to go to the bathroom is important for language learners to know, I had to ask the person to repeat that routine after the camera began rolling again in order to capture it on tape.

Finally, there were times when the actors’ responses might have been longer and more precise than normal. This may have been done to get themselves
more air time or because they wanted to make sure that the foreigners who would be viewing the tape would understand them. Thus, even though they were sometimes interacting only with other Indonesians, they were aware that they had another audience.

These are problems that might arise in an ESL setting as well, so it behoves video developers to be aware of them in order to prevent them from happening, if possible, or at least to work around them such as we did.

Conclusion

The explicit teaching of at least some aspects of pragmatics has been found to be effective in both second and foreign language contexts, and videotapes of human interactions are an effective tool toward this end. This article has been directed primarily at materials developers and teachers of ESL who would like to produce their own videos for the teaching of pragmatics. It presents some of the practical and theoretical considerations that need to be taken into account in order to attain a high degree of naturalness and authenticity in the interaction as a whole, and in the discourse specifically. These centre around: 1) the selection of the events, locations and actors to be taped; 2) decisions regarding how to videotape so as to retain the naturalness and authenticity of the discourse; and 3) the effect of the camera on the naturalness of the videotaping. I have illustrated how we took these considerations into account in the production of a video for the teaching of pragmatics in the Indonesian language, including the kinds of issues that arose for us, and the sorts of decisions we had to make. This can help to prepare other video producers for the kinds of issues that they need to consider before and during taping and editing, the groundwork that needs to be laid prior to taping and the vigilance that needs to be maintained during taping. While some of these issues may be common across many situations, others might be more specific (for example, whether the target community is linguistically diverse or not). For any given situation, then, the video producer will need to be sensitive to the local issues that arise. If the video producer does take these considerations into account, he or she is more likely to produce a video of interactions that are as authentic as possible and that will serve well as a tool for teaching pragmatics in the English language classroom.

NOTES

1 According to Bachman’s (1990) model, language competence is subdivided into pragmatic competence (which consists of illocutionary competence and socio-linguistic competence) and organisational competence (which consists of grammatical competence and textual competence).
2 Other suggestions for accessing NS input include the use of classroom guests (Bardovi-Harlig et al. 1991) and Internet communications with a class living in a country which speaks the target language (DuFon 1998).

3 In the United States, Indonesian, which is taught only at the tertiary level and only at a few universities, is classified as one of the less commonly taught languages.

4 This paper does not deal with the strictly technical issues of videotaping and editing. Nor does it deal with the issue of producing an accompanying text, which is recommended, but which is outside the scope of this paper.

5 Rafferty, Barnard and Suharni (in preparation) has been field-tested by several Indonesian language programs in the US, including the only summer program in which students from all universities in the Consortium of the Teaching of Indonesian and Malaysian (COTIM) participate.

6 One problem I did experience when I worked on developing the pragmatics section of Language Learning Framework for Indonesian in the United States was that it was biased toward Javanese Indonesian culture, because my own experience and that of the textbook authors whose books I had used were in Java. Indonesians from other areas sometimes express that the information presented does not fit with the politeness norms of their region.
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