Developing Pragmatic Competence in a Foreign Language

Yined Tello Rueda

Abstract

This article presents a theoretical discussion about the inclusion of explicit pragmatic instruction as a facilitative tool to develop pragmatic competence in a foreign language. Given the theoretically and empirically informed fact that this competence is generally neglected in the classroom, the rationale here presented may serve as a foundation for foreign language teachers, who face the necessity of helping learners develop pragmatic skills in the target language. Likewise, this article intends to be a prompter for classroom researchers, eager to explore the effect of pragmatic instruction, and the potential developmental stages learners undergo, through the conduction of longitudinal and cross-sectional research studies.

Key Words

Pragmatic competence in a foreign language, Explicit instruction in pragmatics

Resumen

Este artículo presenta una discusión teórica sobre la inclusión de la instrucción explícita en pragmática como una herramienta facilitadora del desarrollo de la competencia pragmática en una lengua extranjera. Como se ha comprobado teórica y empíricamente, es un hecho que esta competencia es generalmente descuidada en el salón de clase, por lo tanto, los argumentos que se presentan aquí pueden servir de base para profesores de lengua extranjera, quienes enfrentan la necesidad de ayudar a sus estudiantes a desarrollar habilidades pragmáticas en la lengua objeto de estudio. De igual forma, este artículo pretende llamar la atención de investigadores, deseosos de explorar los efectos de la instrucción en aspectos pragmáticos, así como las fases de desarrollo que los aprendices experimentan, a través de la conducción de estudios longitudinales y transversales.

Palabras clave

Competencia pragmática en lengua extranjera, Instrucción explícita en pragmática

Introduction

For many years, the learning of a second or foreign language (FL) was equated with linguistic or grammatical accuracy. However, since the adoption of the communicative approach, this focus has passed to second place, giving primary importance to the achievement of functional abilities in the target language (TL) with the final purpose of understanding and producing language that is appropriate to communicative situations in accordance with specific sociocultural parameters. Failure to do so may cause misunderstandings and sometimes communication breakdowns as well as the stereotyping of the TL learners as insensitive, rude, or inept (Thomas, 1983).

Research about the performance of speech acts by FL learners have offered various explanations for the differences between learners and native speakers (NSs) realizations, namely, availability of input, proficiency, length of exposure, and transfer (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001). As a way to compensate for this imbalance, recommendations have been made since the late 1980's, for the inclusion of explicit pragmatic instruction as part of foreign and second language (L2) curricula (e.g. Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989). These instructional suggestions have been backed up by authors such as Kasper & Schmidt (1996) and Bardovi-Harlig (1999), who pointed out the necessity of conducting research about the role of instruction in interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) development in order to make stronger the link between ILP and second language acquisition (SLA). Empirical studies on this direction have analyzed the effect of instruction in the development of pragmatic knowledge dealing with a multiplicity of features. The results from most of these studies are promising with regard to the positive effect of pedagogical intervention, supporting in this way the view that pragmatic ability can be systematically developed through planned classroom activities.

Rationale for Explicit Instruction in Pragmatics

Scholars favoring instruction in L2 pragmatics, who in fact are a majority, base their reasoning on the empirically proven fact that learners do not always make use of the knowledge and linguistic resources and strategies they have handy when faced with a new language task. Currently, there is a consensus that the task of acquiring pragmatic knowledge in the L2 can be facilitated by utilizing universal pragmatic knowledge, as well as by the successful transfer

of some aspects from the learners' first language (L1). However, there is no guarantee that learners will spontaneously use these resources. In this respect, Blum-Kulka (1991) highlights that the main obstacle to learners' exploiting their general pragmatic knowledge base appears to be their restricted L2 linguistic knowledge or difficulty in accessing it smoothly. In addition to acquiring processing control over their already existing pragmatic foundations, adult L2 or FL learners need to develop new representations of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge not existing in their L1 (Bialystok, 1993). These difficulties can certainly be aided by instruction, including input exposure to pragmatic realizations, discussions of the metapragmatic knowledge underlying communicative action, and engagement in communicative activities where learners can practice using the linguistic knowledge they have acquired.

Arguments supporting the implementation of a pedagogy of pragmatics in L2 and FL instruction come from studies in the field. Bardovi-Harlig (2001) states that there are many aspects of L2 pragmatics that are not acquired without the benefit of instruction, or in the best case, they are learned more slowly, which makes instruction at least *facilitative* if not *necessary*. Likewise, research addressing the realization of speech acts by FL learners (Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1985; Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990; Bardovi-Harlig, 2001) has highlighted the necessity of instruction in pragmatics based on results reporting that a high grammatical competence is not always indicative of a successful pragmatic performance in the TL. Support for instruction has also been expressed by Schmidt (1993), who underlines the fact that even in a L1, children's pragmatic development is facilitated by a range of strategies employed by caregivers to teach them the communicative practices of their social group; whereas adults, learning a L2 outside of instructional settings, tend to receive little feedback and sometimes lack relevant input for the learning of L2 pragmatics.

What Pragmatic Instruction Entails

Proposals for instruction in pragmatics should seek to furnish students with linguistic tools that allow them to realize and comprehend linguistic action in a contextually appropriate way. This task is evidently related to the teaching of the TL culture, not viewing it as a product, but as a process that shapes language and at the same time is shaped by language. This perspective of culture is shared by several authors, such as Byram & Morgan (1994), Cortazzi

& Jin (1999), Fantini (1997), and Kramsch (1998), who highlight that language expresses, embodies, and symbolizes cultural reality. This idea certainly frames Kramsch's view of "culture seen as discourse," where language and culture are inherent to people's interaction, and consequently susceptible to contextual factors, such as relative power and social distance. These are negotiable and can change through the dynamics of conversational interaction, modifying the way things are said. It is necessary to clarify that *total convergence* to these norms is not always desired, as is highlighted by Kasper (1997a), and Kasper & Schmidt (1996) among others. Some of the considerations for preferring *optimal convergence* deal with: (1) the difficulty of presenting the English native speaker as a homogeneous entity; (2) the impossibility of achieving native speaker competence level in a FL context, given the existence of, for example, critical period issues (Long, 1990), and the lack of quality and quantity of contact with the TL; (3) the fact that native speakers of a given language could perceive *total convergence* from foreigners as intrusive (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991); and (4) the fact that nonnative speakers might want to opt for pragmatic distinctiveness as a strategy of identity assertion.

Coming back to the purpose of pedagogical intervention in pragmatics, Bardovi-Harlig (2001) states: "the role of instruction may be to help the learner encode her own values (which again may be culturally determined) into a clear, unambiguous message (…) without asking a learner to compromise her values and adopt those of the target culture" (p.31). This is backed up by Bardovi-Harlig (2001), Jorden (1992), and Saville-Troike (1992), who point out that FL and L2 curricula should provide students with information on the socio-cultural rules of the TL, letting learners decide to what extent he or she wants to conform to the native speaker (NS) norms.

Defining Pragmatic Competence

Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics that has been defined as "the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication" (Crystal, 1997, p.301).

This term was originally placed within philosophy of language (Morris, 1938), but has developed from this field to be related to sociolinguistics and

other subdisciplines. Currently, this term is extensively used in the field of second and FL acquisition and teaching, especially in reference to *pragmatic competence* as one of the abilities subsumed by the overarching concept of communicative competence. The notion of *pragmatic competence* was early on defined by Chomsky (1980) as the "knowledge of conditions and manner of appropriate use (of the language), in conformity with various purposes" (p.224). This concept was seen in opposition to *grammatical competence* that in Chomskyan terms is "the knowledge of form and meaning." In a more contextualized fashion, Canale & Swain (1980) included *pragmatic competence* as one important component of their model of *communicative competence*. In this model, *pragmatic competence* was identified as *sociolinguistic competence* and defined as the knowledge of contextually appropriate language use (Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983). Later on, Canale (1988) expanded this definition, and stated that *pragmatic competence* includes "illocutionary competence, or the knowledge of the pragmatic conventions for performing acceptable language functions, and sociolinguistic competence, or knowledge of the sociolinguistic conventions for performing language functions appropriately in a given context" (p.90).

These components were taken up again in Bachman's (1990) model of *language competence*, in which *pragmatic competence* is a central component incorporating the ability to use the language to express a wide range of functions, and interpret their illocutionary force in discourse according to the sociocultural context in which they are uttered. More recently, Rose (1999) proposed a working definition of *pragmatic competence*, which has been extensively accepted by researchers in the field of interlanguage pragmatics (ILP). He defines the concept as the ability to use available linguistic resources (pragmalinguistics) in a contextually appropriate fashion (sociopragmatics), that is, how to do things appropriately with words (Thomas, 1983; and Leech, 1983). In Kasper's (1997a) words, **pragmalinguistics** "includes strategies like directness and indirectness, routines, and a large range of linguistic forms which can intensify or soften communicative acts." (p.1) **Sociopragmatics**, on the other hand, refers to the social perception of communicative action. For Kasper & Rose (2002), pragmalinguistic knowledge requires mappings of form, meaning, force, and context, that may be obligatory as when prepackaged routines are used, or not as when non-conventional indirectness is needed. According to Bialystok (1993) *pragmatic competence* includes: 1) the speaker's

ability to use language for different purposes; 2) the listener's ability to get past the language and understand the speaker's real intentions (e.g. indirect speech acts, irony and sarcasm); and 3) the command of the rules by which utterances come together to create discourse.

Grammar and Pragmatics

Two claims have been made about the relationship between the development of pragmatics and grammar. One states that L2 speakers cannot learn pragmatics without the grammar to express it, and the other affirms that learners can manage to be pragmatically appropriate without a command of the grammatical structures that native speakers expect. The *Grammar, then Pragmatics* claim disregards the fact that adult L2 and FL learners are already pragmatically competent in their L1, and consequently able to transfer this ability from their L1 to the L2/ FL. This claim also ignores the existence of universal pragmatic competence, by which L2 and FL learners distinguish principles and practices of turn taking and repair, discriminate between ordinary and institutionalized speech, differentiate acts of speaking and writing, as well as specific communicative acts, recognize conversational implicature and politeness conventions, identify major realization strategies for communicative acts and routine formulae for managing recurrent communicative events. In this respect, Kasper & Rose (2002) state that through universal pragmatic competence, speakers are able to notice sociopragmatic variability and make linguistic choices accordingly, recognizing the role of discourse in the construction of social identities and relations. Bardovi-Harlig (1999, 2001) offers evidence against the hypothesis that a grammatical platform is a mandatory prerequisite for pragmatic development, by displaying advanced L2 learners, employing perfect TL grammar in pragmatically non-target-like fashion. This finding is confirmed by Kasper (2000) and Kasper & Rose (2002), who highlight that the dependence of pragmatics on grammar can take three forms:

1. Learners demonstrate knowledge of a particular grammatical structure or element but do not use it to express or modify illocutionary force (Salsbury & Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Takahashi, 1996).

2. Learners demonstrate knowledge of a grammatical structure and use it to express pragmalinguistic functions that are not conventionalized in the TL (Bodman & Eisentein, 1988; Takahashi & Beebe, 1987).

3. Learners demonstrate knowledge of a grammatical structure and its pragmalinguistic functions, yet put the pragmalinguistic form-function mapping to non-target-like sociopragmatic use (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1991; Scarcella, 1979). (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p.175).

The *Pragmatics in spite of Grammar* claim considers grammar competence as independent from pragmatic competence, and is supported by several studies, among them Schmidt's (1993) study of Wes, that demonstrated that a restricted interlanguage grammar does not necessarily prevent pragmatic and interactional competence from developing, especially when language learners acculturate to the TL community. Other studies confirming these results are Salsbury & Bardovi-Harlig (2001), Eisenstein & Bodman (1986, 1993), and Walters (1980). This last study found that children who spoke ESL appropriately addressed polite requests with ungrammatical forms to adult recipients. This bulk of research has demonstrated that when L2 or FL learners do not have the grammatical resources available to perform an action in the TL, they rely on a pragmatic mode, which points to the perspective that pragmatics precedes grammar.

Notwithstanding the contradictory character of these two hypotheses, they can be reconciled when considering them under a developmental perspective in which adult L2 or FL learners initially rely on L1 pragmatic transfer and pragmatic universals to communicate linguistic action in the TL, even with a limited command of the TL grammar. As their interlanguage development progresses, their learning task changes and they start figuring out not only the primary functions of the TL grammatical forms they have achieved, but also their secondary meanings, so the order reverses, and form precedes function. This discussion offers valid viewpoints to consider that the development of pragmatic competence must be central for the teaching of a L2 or FL since early proficiency stages.

Pragmatics and the Second or Foreign Language Classroom

Traditionally, language classrooms have been considered as poor input environments for developing pragmatic ability in a TL; compared to real interaction outside the classroom, classroom discourse is functionally and formally limited for the achievement of this goal. This statement is associated not with the instructed character of these learning contexts per se, but with

the ways in which SL and FL classrooms are organized to enable or prevent the acquisition of the TL pragmatics. It is an undeniable fact that teacher-fronted initiation –response– follow-up (IRF) is an unproductive format for the development of pragmatic and discoursal abilities in the classroom. As Cook (2001) states, FL instructional settings are characterized by restricted input and practice due to two facts: first, that the TL tends to be treated as an object of study instead of as a means of socialization and a communication tool; and second, that classroom organization is teacher-fronted. In consequence, one function of pragmatic instruction is to compensate for incomplete or misleading input offered to learners by academic talk, instruction, and L2 learning materials. Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford (1996) have characterized traditional teacher-student talk as an unequal status encounter, where the teacher's speech does not serve as a good model for the speech of the learners. Similarly, Mir (1992) found that instruction sometimes emphasizes one semantic formula over others, encouraging the inappropriate overuse of some formulas. Likewise, the vast majority of L2 learning materials frequently do not present realistic input, or sometimes neglect particular speech acts or language functions. Given this limitation, pragmatic instruction based on authentic and research-informed materials becomes a very helpful tool to provide L2 learners, and especially FL learners, with contextualized, pragmatically appropriate input from early stages of acquisition.

The role of explicit pragmatic instruction becomes even more important in FL classrooms where opportunities for the full range of human interactions are limited, and in consequence learners have more difficulties in acquiring appropriate language use patterns (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996). These ideas constitute a rationale for pedagogical intervention, with the two-fold goal of first, making learners aware of their previous knowledge and the ways to take advantage of it by using their existing pragmatic foundations in appropriate sociopragmatic contexts, and second, helping learners to attend to both the linguistic forms of utterances and the relevant social and contextual features with which they are associated (Schmidt, 2001).

Literature in the field has reported that learners can successfully learn grammar and literacy in SL and FL learning contexts, but the same results have not been observed in these environments for the development of pragmatic discourse, and sociolinguistic ability. Kasper & Rose (2002) note that classrooms offer two modalities for developing the pragmatics of the TL: (1)

students may learn from exposure to input and production through instructional activities not necessarily intended for the development of a pragmatic aspect, or (2) learners may learn as a result of planned pedagogical action directed towards the acquisition of pragmatics.

Under the second option, bringing pragmatics into the L2 or FL classroom is associated with two main goals: one addresses the development of pragmatic awareness, and the other deals with practicing TL pragmatic abilities (Kasper, 1997a, 1997b). Wildner-Bassett (1994) also refers to these two functions, identifying the first goal presented here, with the development of *metapragmatic declarative knowledge*, and the second goal with the development of *metapragmatic procedural knowledge.*

Literature documents that the functions of pragmatic learning and teaching can change according to the setting in which instruction takes place. In the case of SLA contexts, instruction is strengthened by learners' previous contact with pragmatic aspects that come to be reinforced through instruction. In such cases, instruction combines learning opportunities inside and outside the classroom: inside the classroom by raising learners' awareness about the aspect under instruction, and outside the classroom by focusing students' attention to observe real occurrences of the targeted aspect, as well as by seeking practice opportunities (Kasper 1997a, 1997b; Rose, 1999). As Kasper (2001) notes, "the great potential of L2 teaching for developing learners' pragmatic ability lies in its capacity to alert and orient learners to pragmatic features encountered outside the classroom, encourage them to try out new pragmatic strategies, reflect on their observations and their own language use, and obtain feedback" (p.56). On the other hand, foreign language learning (FLL) contexts constitute less favorable learning environments, generally characterized by no interaction with native speakers of the TL. This limitation imposes huge demands on instruction that most likely cannot be reached through the classical format of the language classroom. According to Kasper (1998), classroom interaction does not provide learners with adequate input to produce the "linguistic action" required for authentic communication in the TL. These limitations are especially attributed to FLL classrooms, since it has been established (Kasper & Rose, 2002) that they do not provide enough conversational practice, regardless of how communicative and learner-centered they are. It has been highlighted that these drawbacks make it "…difficult for learners to develop the processing control in utterance comprehension and production required for effective participation in conversation" (p.26).

In consequence, pragmatic instruction in the FL classroom needs to fulfill three functions: 1) exposing learners to appropriate TL input, 2) raising learners' pragmatic and metapragmatic awareness about the instructed aspect, and 3) arranging authentic opportunities to practice pragmatic knowledge. A way to compensate for the restricted opportunities for learning TL pragmatics in FL settings is to provide instruction for longer periods of time, supplying sustained focused input in pragmatic and metapragmatic aspects instilled through collaborative practice activities and metapragmatic reflection (Ohta, 2001; Kanagy & Igarashi, 1997). Several empirical studies have confirmed that an instructional approach combining communicative practice and corrective feedback enhances noticing and optimizes learners' abilities to attend to the interactional needs of the addressee. Moreover, continuous practice contributes to faster and more efficient access and integration of sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic knowledge into the learners' interlanguage system. However, as is highlighted by Kasper & Rose (2002) "…unless learners consciously attend to the complex interaction between language use and social context they will hardly ever learn the pragmatics of a new language" (ix).

Conclusion

For some researchers, instruction in pragmatic skills and knowledge needs to be carried out formally, as part of the regular content in L2/ FL curricula. Although there exist proposals for instruction in different aspects of pragmatic competence, few have been examined in action, as they are implemented in classrooms with the purpose of determining how effective they are for the actual learning of the targeted feature. In consequence, it is necessary to conduct research exploring the effects of instruction in pragmatic aspects. Taking theory as the foundation, learners can be instructed on the strategies and linguistic forms by which specific pragmatic features are performed and how these strategies are used in different contexts. This may contribute to the role language teaching has of "help(ing) students situate L2 communicative practices in their sociocultural context and appreciate their meanings and functions within the L2 community" (Kasper, 1997a, 12). The aim of instruction in pragmatics is not to force learners to adopt native speaker pragmatic choices, but to expose learners to positive evidence, making them aware of a variety of linguistic resources that are used in combination with specific contextual factors. This knowledge progressively enables learners to make more sound decisions when choosing linguistic as they interact in the TL.

References

Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language learning, 49,* 677-713.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics. In Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (Eds.). *Pragmatics and language teaching,* (pp.11-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (1990) Congruence in native and nonnative conversations: Status balance in the academic advising session. *Language learning,* 40, 467-501.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (1991). Saying "No": Native and nonnative rejections in English. In L. F. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.) *Pragmatics and Language Learning,* (Vol. 2, pp.41-57). University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International Language

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (1996). Input in an institutional setting. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15,* 279-304.

Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representation and attentional control in pragmatic competence. In Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.) *Interlanguage Pragmatics (*pp. 43-57)*.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1991). Interlanguage Pragmatics: The case of requests. In Phillipson, R. et al. (Eds.) *Foreign/second language pedagogy research.* (pp. 255-272). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating Cross-cultural Pragmatics: An introductory overview. In Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper (Eds). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies.* (pp. 1-34). New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Bodman, J. & Eisenstein, M. (1988), May God increase your bounty: The expression of gratitude in English by native and non-native speakers. *Cross Currents* 15, 1, 1-21.

Byram, M., & Morgan, C. (1994). *Teaching and learning language and culture.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual matters.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In Richards, J. & Schmidt, R. (ed.) *Language and Communication. (*pp.2-27) London: Longman Group Ltd.

Canale, M. (1988). The measurement of communicative competence. *Annual review of applied linguistics,* 8, 67-84.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approach to second language teaching and testing. *Applied linguistics.* 1:1-47

Chomsky, N. (1980). *Rules and representations.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Cook, H. (2001). Why can't learners of Japanese as a foreign language distinguish polite from impolite speech styles? In Kenneth R. Rose & Gabriele Kasper (Eds.) *Pragmatics in Language Teaching.* (pp. 80-102).New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors; Material and methods in the EFL classroom. In Hinkel, E. (Ed.) *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp.196-220)*.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1997). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics.* 4th edition. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. (1986). ,'I very appreciate': Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics, 7*, 167-185

Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. (1993). Expressing gratitude in American English. In Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.) *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (pp. 64-81)*.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fantini, A. (1997). *New ways of teaching culture.* Washington, DC: TESOL.

Giles, H., Coupland, J., & Coupland, N. (1991). *Contexts of accommodation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jorden, E. (1992). Culture in the Japanese language classroom: A pedagogical paradox. In Kramsch & McConell-Ginet. (Eds.) *Text and context: cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study.* (pp. 156-168) Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Kanagy, R., & Igarashi, K. (1997). Acquisition of pragmatics competence in a Japanese immersion kindergarten. In Bouton, L., (Eds.). *Pragmatics and language learning,* monograph series vol. 8, pp.243-265. Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an international language, University of Illinois, Urbana-Campaign.

Kasper, G. (1997a). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* (NetWork #6) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/

Kasper, G. (1997b). The role of pragmatics in language teacher education. In Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (Eds.) *Beyond methods: components of second language teacher education.* (pp.113-136). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kasper, G. (1998). Interlanguage pragmatics. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Learning foreign and second languages: Perspectives in research and scholarship.* (pp. 183-208). New York: The modern language association of America.

Kasper, G. (2000). *Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development* (NFLRC Net Work #19) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW19/.

Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (Eds.). *Pragmatics and language teaching,* (pp.33-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (2002). *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language.* Blackwell Publishing, Inc.

Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in second language acquisition*. 18, 149-169.

Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* London and New York: Longman

Long, M. (1990). Maturational constraints on language development. *Studies in second language acquisition.* 12: 251-286.

Mir, M. (1992). Do we all apologize the same? An empirical study of the act of apologizing by Spanish speakers learning English. In L. Bouton & Kachru, Y. (Eds.). *Pragmatics and language learning,* monograph series vol. 3, 1-19. Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an international language, University of Illinois, Urbana-Campaign.

Morris, C. (1938). Foundations of the theory of signs. In Neuratin, O., Carnap, R., & Morris, C. (Eds.) *International encyclopedia of unified science,* vol.2, bk 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ohta, A. (2001). A longitudinal study of the development of expression of alignment in Japanese as a foreign language. In Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (Eds.). *Pragmatics and language teaching,* (pp.103-120). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olshtain, E., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1985). Degree of approximation: Nonnative reactions to native speech act behavior. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 303-325). New York: Newbury House.

Rose, K. (1999). Teachers and students learning about requests in Hong Kong. In Hinkel, E. (Ed.) *Culture in second language teaching and learning.* (pp.167-180) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salsbury, T., & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). "I know you mean, but I don't think so:" Disagreements in L2 English. In L. F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning,* Vol. 10. 131-151. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International Language.

Saville-Troike, M. (1992) Cultural maintenance and vanishing Englishes. In Kramsch and McConell-Ginet. (Eds.) *Text and context: cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study.* (pp.148-155) Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Scarcella, R. (1979). On speaking politely in a second language. In C. Yorio, K. Perkins, & J. Schachter (Eds.) *On TESOL' 79.* Washington, D.C. TESOL, 275-287

Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takahashi, S. (1996) Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in second language acquisition, 18*, 189-223.

Takahashi, T. & Beebe, L. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal 8:131-155.*

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics,* 4, 91-112.

Walters, J. (1980). Grammar, meaning, and sociological appropriateness in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology,* 34, 337-345.

Wildner-Bassett, M. (1994). Intercultural pragmatics and proficiency: polite noises for cultural appropriateness. *International review of applied linguistics,* 32, 3-17.

THE AUTHORS

Yined Tello Rueda Ph. D. in Second Language Acquisition and Teaching from The University of Arizona, and M. A. in Applied Linguistics from Universidad Distrital "Francisco José de Caldas". Associate professor at Universidad del Tolima, Department of Spanish and English, and researcher of the group "Didáctica de las Lenguas".
E-mail: lytello@ut.edu.co