2009

Towards pragmatic competence in communicative teaching: the question of experience vs. instruction in the L2 classroom

Sarah J. Vitale

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses

Part of the Arts and Humanities Commons

TOWARDS PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE IN COMMUNICATIVE TEACHING: THE
QUESTION OF EXPERIENCE VS. INSTRUCTION IN THE L2 CLASSROOM

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

in

The Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures

by
Sarah J. Vitale
B.A., Southeastern Louisiana University, 2006
December 2009

encouragement was invaluable. Your commitment to the students and dedication to your

own work is impeccable. Thank you most of all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Traditionally, pragmatic aspects of the Spanish language are overlooked in the communicative classroom. Pragmatic competence is important because it may ultimately determine whether a successful communicative interaction takes place. Successful communication in language learning must not only address linguistic forms but also acknowledge language as a reflection of the socio-cultural norms of the L2 community. The research questions of this thesis explore the aspects of experience and instruction and their degree of influence as they relate to the development of pragmatic competence. This thesis reports on the results of a pedagogically-based, empirical study in which the researcher investigated the extent to which course level, study abroad, and pedagogical intervention facilitate the development of pragmatic competence of L2 learners when making a request in Spanish. Two main aspects of politeness, pronominal address forms and verbal forms, were examined to measure the learners' level of pragmatic competence. Whether responses were pragmatically-appropriate were based on the responses of native speakers of Spanish. The results of this study reveal that learners who have more experience or exposure to the language, or explicit classroom instruction do not necessarily possess a higher degree of pragmatic competence than those who have not. These findings suggest that perhaps grammatical competence and pragmatic competence may develop separately and at differing rates. Further research and attention to the various factors surrounding pragmatic competence is necessary in the language educator's goal to aid the student towards acquisition of overall communicative competence.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

What does the process of learning a second language (L2) entail? How can success in a foreign language be accurately defined? These are two significant questions that consistently pose substantial challenges to both language theorists and pedagogues today. However, perhaps an appropriate starting point and first attempt at addressing these current challenges is through an observation of a common setting in which the language learning process commonly takes place: the foreign language classroom. As a rule, it is not uncommon to discover that decidedly similar frustrations are experienced by the instructor as well as the learner in this highly complex process.

For the L2 learner, a significant amount of time is spent pondering how exams will be structured and contemplating which grammatical features will be the focus of assessments as chosen by the instructor. A common approach to learning a language may include tasks such as memorizing endless vocabulary lists and grammatical paradigms. And while this may suffice for students enrolled in a beginner-level course, frustrations arise when they then find they are unable to use the language creatively as they progress to more advanced levels. Why, a student might inquire, have I just successfully constructed a sentence that is grammatically correct yet am unable to successfully convey the message I wish to express?

At the other end of the spectrum, the instructor has a challenging task at hand. S/he must attempt to expose learners to grammatical forms as well as address semantic aspects of those forms. Similar frustrations to those experienced by the student arise as s/he searches for a model that recognizes the significance of both of these aspects as essential components in the language learning process. As traditional language teaching

methodologies emphasize the learners' mastery of the grammatical features of the language, the pragmatic aspects of the language are frequently overlooked. In recognizing the importance of pragmatic competence set forth in current language teaching approaches, how can an aspect of the language that was assumed to emerge with increased grammatical instruction, the instructor might inquire, now be taught in the classroom?

Just as complex to the process that involves the acquisition of pragmatic competence in relation to the student, then, is its implementation in the classroom established by the instructor. Though one precise model that provides a step-by-step approach to teaching pragmatic awareness in the classroom may not exist, there is one conclusive result that has been collectively embraced by language pedagogues and subsequently expressed in the communicative goals of current teaching approaches today: Successful communication in language learning must not only address linguistic forms but also acknowledge language as a reflection of the socio-cultural norms of the L2 community. And while grammatical competence continues to serve as a common assessment to evaluate language proficiency, there has been a growing interest in the considerations surrounding the acquisition of pragmatic competence, or appropriate use of linguistic form.

As a result, many researchers such as Fraser (1978), Rintell (1981), Koike (1992, 1996), Bardovi-Harlig (2001), and Félix-Brasdefer (2008) have examined this matter more in depth. As a whole, these researchers have reached an agreement that success pertaining to overall communicative competence must encompass not only a mastery of linguistic form but also knowledge of how, when, and with whom it is appropriate to use

the linguistic forms acquired. Various aspects of pragmatic competence, however, must be approached in distinct manners, especially regarding how it is assessed in the classroom.

One venue by which to begin to assess pragmatic competence as it pertains to language learning can be explored through an examination of two principal theoretical issues: speech act theory and politeness theory. The interrelation between the two bridges the gap between a learner's linguistic choice and the surrounding sociolinguistic factors of the corresponding speech community. Both theories have received a considerable amount of attention in the field of pragmatics. Fairly recently, however, these frameworks serve as a significant point of interest to researchers in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA).

Recent literature in the first theoretical framework, speech act theory, lends much consideration to specific speech activities such as requests, apologies, and compliments. Of these studies, research on the speech act of requests has invariably received a significant amount of attention (Márquez Reiter & Placencia 2005). Since a request concerns two interlocutors, where the speaker wants the hearer to do something (Searle 1969), the speaker must choose a linguistic form that reflects certain sociolinguistic factors of a particular speech community. The direct link to the second theoretical framework, politeness theory, can be seen due to the various manners by which one can make a request to produce utterances that convey a certain degree of what is considered polite. The language user must use caution in his/her choice to use a certain linguistic form so as not to offend the hearer and ultimately draw the response that the speaker wishes to receive.

As such, the present study focuses on the L2 learner's pragmatic abilities as another tool to evaluate language proficiency. Specifically, this research examines politeness as it relates the following two factors: verb form and address form choice. Both of the aforementioned factors will be examined as they relate to the following three factors that can broadly be classified as variables that are affected by the learner's level of experience: overall level of proficiency, pedagogical intervention (or lack thereof), and study abroad.

Each of these factors will be discussed more in detail in the literature review and outlined in the principal research questions outlined below. However, one of the three variables notably unique to this study that should be emphasized in this introductory chapter is the influence of study abroad and its effect on the acquisition of pragmatic awareness. As a direct link of language and culture, past research (such as Lafford 2006) suggests that the study abroad environment serves as an unparalleled context for language learning and therefore serves as the ideal venue for the learner to truly become pragmatically competent. Certainly, then, this variable presents itself of equal importance to the other variables as it pertains to pragmatic competence concerning language learning. However, it distinguishes itself from the other variables as it concerns itself with language learning outside of the classroom setting. For this reason, this observation is of particular interest and therefore included as a variable in this study.

To evaluate factors that affect the pragmatic competence of L2 learners, I attempt to explore the following questions in this thesis: 1) Do advanced L2 learners possess a greater quantity of pragmatic awareness as compared to less experienced learners? As a corollary to this issue, I also briefly examine the effect of experience in a study abroad

program when added to experience in the classroom setting: do learners who have this type of increased exposure to the L2 possess a higher degree of pragmatic competence than those learners who have only received classroom instruction? 2) Does pedagogical intervention (defined as explicit classroom instruction of pragmatic aspects of language) increase the learner's pragmatic awareness and competence and to what extent?

To organize the various aspects of this study, a background of the relevant literature will be discussed after this brief introductory chapter. Primarily, the fundamental topics central to this study include the areas of L2 teaching methodology, pragmatic competence, communicative competence, Speech Act Theory, and Politeness Theory. Each of these topics will be discussed in detail in chapter 2 as well as their correlation with one another as they relate to fields of SLA and pragmatics. In chapter 3, the research methods employed in this study such as selection of participants, data collection procedures, data instruments, data, and results of the data will be examined in detail. In addition, the results of the study will be analyzed in detail. In chapter 4, the implications of this research are explored and theoretical and practical conclusions are drawn and discussed based on the data results. In addition, limitations of the study will be examined accompanied by related topics for further study that may aid in future research in this field.

In sum, the purpose of this study is to assess the role of experience and exposure to the second language and its relation to overall language proficiency. As will be discussed in the review of literature, researchers now acknowledge the significance of pragmatic competence in communicative language teaching. As this is the case, the next step may be to investigate how pragmatic competence is acquired. The present study will

add to the literature by exploring aspects of foreign language learning that may be of significance to this process. While challenging the long-held assumption that pragmatic awareness is eventually acquired as the learner progresses to more advanced levels of proficiency, this study will also explore the interrelation between pragmatics and communicative competence in language teaching today.

CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Recent pedagogical research in the second language learning sphere reflects a multi-faceted exploration of the various second language acquisition theories as well as their corresponding practices via current teaching methodologies and approaches. While many reformers of language pedagogy continue to recognize the assorted limitations regarding specific implementation of these approaches, one component remains the focal point of language learning success: meaningful language use at all stages of the second language acquisition process.

2.1 Development of Pragmatic Competence in the Communicative Spectrum

A brief overview of past teaching methodologies reveals that the focal point of language learning has shifted considerably. Until the early 1970s, second-language researchers and pedagogues concerned themselves primarily with linguistic form, reflected in generative approaches such as the Grammar-Translation Method. This method was developed as a first attempt to provide a "method to the madness". It would provide students with knowledge not only pertaining to the target language but also with an appreciation of foreign language literature. Through translation exercises and grammar presentations based on deductive application of explicit grammar rules, students would become more knowledgeable about grammar of their own native language, therefore improving speaking and writing skills in both the L1 and L2. Learners were encouraged to develop grammatical proficiency by memorization of verb conjugations and other linguistic paradigms. As such, the success of this method was supported by the belief that learning was facilitated through emphasizing similarities between the L2 and the native language. (Larsen-Freeman 2000).

However, educators soon began to recognize a lack of attention to other essential linguistic components such as pronunciation. In addition, little attention was given to the skills of speaking and listening (Brown 2006). Perhaps the most salient critique of this method and relevant to this particular study was the role of culture and its questionable significance as a vital component of language learning. At this point, culture was viewed as only consisting of literature and the fine arts. Hence, linguistic knowledge and its sociocultural features were viewed as two separate entities. As such, the Grammar-Translation method greatly emphasized translation, reflected in the exclusive teaching of language form while neglecting the role of language function. (Larsen Freeman 2000).

In response, pedagogues presented a new method that attempted to address several of the aforementioned deficiencies. Unlike the Grammar-Translation method, the Direct Method introduced and emphasized correct pronunciation as an essential component of language learning from the beginning of instruction at the introductory level. Grammar was taught inductively and only in the L2. In this way, any form of translation was prohibited, requiring the instructor to demonstrate grammatical concepts and vocabulary instead of providing explanation in the native language. This was accomplished through the instructor's use of visual aids or examples in response to students' questions. Yet perhaps one of the more notable contributions of this method was the emphasis placed on spoken language as well as written language. Reading and writing exercises were viewed as secondary skills and based upon the students' oral production (Larsen-Freeman 2000: 30).

While the Direct Method afforded several notable contributions to language teaching, perhaps one drawback was the overemphasis on oral communication and

pronunciation. As an oral-based approach, the frequency of written activities in the classroom was greatly reduced, therefore resulting in a subsequent lack of emphasis on written communication (Omaggio-Hadley 2000). In addition, culture and language remained detached as culture was only depicted through presentation of historical and geographical aspects of the language and discussion of the everyday lives of speakers of the language (Larsen-Freeman 2000).

The Audio Lingual method undoubtedly addressed many of the problematic issues of both the Grammar-Translation and Direct methods (Larsen-Freeman 2000). Contrary to these methods, the Audiolingual Method had a strong base in linguistics and psychology. Drawing on the contributions of Charles Fries (1945) in structural linguistics and Skinner's (1957) contributions in applying principles from behavioral psychology, this method maintained that the sentence patterns of the target language could be acquired through conditioning—or "helping learners to respond correctly to stimuli through shaping and reinforcement" (Larsen-Freeman 2000: 35). The underlying objective of this method, then, is realized by recognizing the importance of habit formation, which would result in 'overlearning'. Consequently, the learner was able to automatically produce grammatically correct speech without stopping to think (Larsen Freeman 2000). One of the most salient features of this approach was that it allowed students to observe all previously learned grammatical structures put together in a sentence. In addition, more emphasis was placed on the skills of speaking and listening as a means to communicate. More important, however, was the emergence of one particular notion of this method that would be adopted as the general goal of language learning today: achieving language proficiency by learning how to use the language to

communicate. This notion provided significant insight to language educators as they began to not only recognize the existence of other internal and external factors in the language acquisition process but also pursue a definition of what successful communication entailed part of that process.

Based on the increase of students' ability to successfully produce utterances that were both complex and grammatically sound (due to their continual repetition and memorization of stock phrases, not due to actual grammatical instruction), this method became increasingly popular in the L2 classroom (Larsen-Freeman 2000). Nevertheless, there were also several shortcomings that would have to be addressed. A primary concern was that students were unable to move beyond the Novice level. In this case, students were only able to respond to utterances they had been exposed to at some point. When faced with an unfamiliar utterance or a foreign context, the student was unable to respond. In addition, a significant part of moving beyond the novice level is not only that students are able to understand utterances they have heard previously but also that they are able to generate responses that are not memorized. In essence, the Audiolingual method did not acknowledge dialogue as characteristically natural and unpredictable, therefore impeding creative language production. Furthermore, this method distinguished itself from previous methods by its neglect of language form. This deviation from one extreme to another reinforced the notion that, whether language form was to be an objective point of instruction or wholly neglected, there remained another component of language learning that remained in question.

The Natural Approach developed by Terrell (1977) and Krashen (1983) attempted to address these shortcomings. Instead of strict dedication to mastery of grammatical

perfection, this method catered to learners' needs. First and foremost, grammatical perfection was not considered a main objective of this method. Instead, classroom activities reflected a more communicative approach, focusing on the overall meaning of utterances instead of grammatical form. Thus no form of corrective feedback was given during oral activities. Secondly, the instructor strived to lower classroom anxiety by allowing students to speak when they felt comfortable enough to do so. Finally, students were permitted to speak using the L1 at the beginning of instruction in the L2 (Omaggio-Hadley 2000).

Certainly the Natural Approach represented advancement to language instruction as it emphasized the importance of the accommodations of the learners themselves and recognition of their particular needs. Meaning took precedence over form through the approach's main objective: successful communication in the L2. In this way, communication is only considered effective when the learner understands and is understood by a native speaker of the L2. Yet similar to each method before it, the Natural Approach failed to recognize the significant role of culture in the classroom. As such, language educators began to recognize that students were able to produce grammatically accurate, meaningful utterances within the classroom but could not use them appropriately when genuinely communicating outside the classroom dimension. (Larsen-Freeman 2000).

In effect, Communicative Language Teaching emerged as the leading current framework and has since been readily embraced by language educators (Larsen-Freeman 2000). Also called the Communicative Approach, it emphasizes the importance of the combination of linguistic form, meaning, and functions as its principal objectives. Instead

of focusing on the development of flawless grammatical utterances or the acquisition of native-like pronunciation, learners are taught that the target language is not another grammar lesson to be studied but rather the actual means to communicate. Therefore, students communicate in the L2 through activities that are truly communicative. Morrow and Morrow (1981) define a truly communicative activity as one that includes an information gap, choice, and feedback. An information gap occurs when one interlocutor knows a piece of information that the other person does not. Larsen-Freeman notes that "In communication, the speaker has a choice of what she will say and how she will say it. If the exercise is too tightly controlled so that the students can only say something in one way, the speaker has no choice and the exchange, therefore, is not communicative" (2000: 129).

To more specifically define the seemingly general concept of communicative teaching, Nunan (1991: 279) developed the five requisites of CLT. They can be classified as the following:

1. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.
2. The introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.
3. The provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language but also on the learning process itself.
4. An enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.
5. An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activities outside the classroom.

Subsequently, Savignon (1997) posed additional components that also comprise the objectives of CLT. She contends that the communicative competence equation cannot simply be comprised as the sum of its parts. She draws attention to the importance of the interdependent nature of each communicative component and their ability to function

12

together as a collective amalgamation towards overall proficiency.

Theoretically, the communicative teaching approach seems to address many of the shortcomings of previous teaching methodologies. Yet practically, it continues to develop as an approach concerning its actual application in the classroom. Certainly, though, this approach has laid the foundation for further advancement in the foreign language field. Mainly, it re-defined the notion of successful language learning by broadening the concept of what learning a language entails. For learners to acquire more advanced language proficiency, pedagogues must acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication. Therefore, the communicative approach has made communicative competence the goal of language teaching and successfully learning a foreign language is assessed by how well it is developed by the learner.

2.2 Communicative Competence

The focus on meaning and purpose through the learners' exposure to authentic language was first introduced in the late 1970s under the influence of the sociolinguistic theory of communicative competence by Dell Hymes. In an effort to interrelate what he believed to be essential to true communicative learning, Hymes (1972) coined the term "communicative competence." Through this term, Hymes was able to emphasize the importance of a language user not only being able to apply and use grammatical rules but also to form correct utterances and know how to use them appropriately.

The recognition of context as an essential component of the communicative spectrum would then require a more all-inclusive definition of communicative competence. While many definitions of communicative competence continue to emerge, Hymes' initial acknowledgement of the role of context in communication serves as a

13

frame of reference in present-day communicative teaching (Savignon 1997). According to Hymes (1974), Chomsky's emphasis on grammatical competence was not to be neglected but instead accompanied by the acknowledgement of meaning in communication determined by a particular speech community and the content of the interaction. In addition to producing grammatically correct utterances, one must also know "when to speak, when not,...what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner" (Hymes 1972).

Researchers soon began to recognize that an accurate definition of communicative competence would also need to reflect its multidimensional features. As a result of these observations, three principal theoretical models emerged, each one acknowledging a set of various subdivisions of competences.

Canale and Swain (1980) defined communicative competence by categorizing its components into four main aspects of competence: grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic. Grammatical competence addresses the linguistic knowledge and ability to effectively use the grammatical structures in communication. This competence is largely based on Chomsky's understanding of linguistic competence. It includes knowledge of syntactic, phonological, semantic, and morphological patterns or rules of the language. Sociolinguistic competence refers to the extent to which utterances are produced and understood appropriately in different sociolinguistic contexts depending on contextual factors. However, as sociolinguistics is a considerably broad discipline, many researchers have consolidated its definition to solely refer to the recognition and use of appropriate varieties of the language. Strategic competence is the ability to recognize and repair

breakdowns in communication and how to circumnavigate the gaps in one's knowledge of the language.

Later, Canale and Swain (1983) introduced an additional competence type to the spectrum: discourse competence. Discourse competence takes into account the socio-cultural context of the communicative act. Due to the undeniable role of socio-cultural knowledge in sociolinguistic competence, there is a clear overlap between discourse and sociolinguistic competence. Hornberger (1989) notes that both types of competence address appropriate use of the language, therefore exhausting the concept by redundancy.

The most current framework and that which this study concerns itself with is that of Bachman (1990). Through a restructuring of the former framework models, Bachman categorized communicative competence into three main subdivisions of competences: organizational competence, strategic competence, and pragmatic competence. Organizational competence is also divided into two principal categories: grammatical competence and contextual competence. While grammatical competence had already been introduced in previous competence schemas, the addition of contextual competence highlighted the importance of the structural aspect of the language. This type of competence concerns itself with the rules of cohesion of grammatical forms and word meaning. Strategic competence can be classified into three main categories: assessment, planning and execution. These components can be practiced to compensate for the two other types of competences. Specifically, it is executed when the speaker uses strategic tools such as circumlocution to effectively communicate a particular utterance. The last of the competences, pragmatic competence, is perhaps the most salient and relevant to this study. This competence entails knowledge of both pragmatic and sociolinguistic

conventions to perform acceptable language functions as well as perform these functions appropriately (Bachman 1990).

2.3 Role of Pragmatic Competence in the Communicative Classroom

Pragmatic competence is a critical component in the communicative spectrum due to its attention to the role of the hearer in the communicative process. Widdowson (1978) notes that although students may have learned the rules of linguistic usage, they are often unable to use the language in context. Effective communication, then, can only take place when the message conveyed by the speaker is interpreted appropriately and understood by the hearer (Savignon 1997). As was discussed in section 1, in response to the various shortcomings of previous methods and approaches, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) then emerged as an approach that reflected pragmatic competence through recognition of the interdependence of language and communication. This approach emphasizes language meaning in addition to language form, placing profound emphasis on contextualized communication in the target language. Currently, it serves as the most widely accepted and commonly used approach in the United States. Through the use of authentic materials and small-group work, learners are given the opportunity to use meaningful, purposeful language pertaining to real-world topics (Larsen-Freeman 2000). More importantly, however, is the acknowledgement of pragmatic competence as an essential component to achieve proficiency in the L2. For this reason, this study serves as a contribution to second language pedagogy.

2.4 Factors in Determining L2 Pragmatic Competence

Bardovi-Harlig (1998) posits that the following factors have a direct influence on the acquisition or pragmatic competence: input, instruction, level of proficiency and

16

length of stay living in the L2 culture, and the L1 culture. Shortcomings pertaining to input may be found in academic materials such as textbooks or even the instructor. The present author's cursory analysis of several textbooks reveals that speech acts are not presented at all; therefore, primarily using textbooks to teach students pragmatic information about a language may be ineffective. Also significant to the type of input available is the input provided by the instructor. For instance, the instructor may consider it appropriate to use one register when speaking to the learner but inappropriate for the learner to produce an utterance using the same register. This case may be illustrated in the case of imperatives, where the instructor uses an informal register to address the student but expects to be addressed in a formal register. This choice, then, is dependent upon what the instructor considers appropriate according to his/her understanding of the cultural norms of the target language (Bardovi-Harlig 1998).

Instruction may also be influenced by the instructor's emphasis on similarities and differences between the L1 and L2. The amount of exposure to specific pragmatic features may have an effect on the learner's pragmatic awareness. As testing assessments have typically evaluated the learner's linguistic competence through grammar-oriented tasks, the learner may not feel it is necessary to prepare for tasks based on pragmatic understanding of these forms. As such, the pragmatic component of language learning is neglected.

Another factor that influences pragmatic competence is the learner's level of proficiency. Though only a limited amount of research has been done in this area, some studies reveal that advanced learners are more likely to perform a speech act that is considered more appropriate in a given context. A study conducted by Koike (1996) to

17

evaluate the pragmatic knowledge of EFL and ESL learners from Hungary, found that both sectors of advanced learners were undoubtedly more pragmatically competent than intermediate students. Bardovi-Harlig (1998) also asserts that the longer the learner interacts with NSs or is immersed in a community of speakers of the L2, the more pragmatically aware the learner becomes.

Finally, the area that has received the most attention in the literature pertaining to influence on the realization of speech acts is the first language and culture. Kasper (1007b: 119) defines pragmatic transfer as "the use of L1 pragmatic knowledge to understand or carry out linguistic action in the L2" and clarifies that, in a language learning situation, a positive or negative transfer may occur. A positive transfer takes place when the learner successfully communicates the message s/he is trying to convey because of a perceived similarity between the L1 and L2. On the other hand, a negative transfer occurs when the learner incorrectly uses a speech act, linguistic form of a speech act, or opts to omit a speech act where it is needed based on his/her comparison of the L1 and L2 (Bardovi-Harlig 1998).

2.5 Speech Act Theory

A speech act can be defined as linguistic action, or an utterance that serves a function in communication. It "can exist only if there is a match between manifested intention and a display of uptake, either in non-verbal reaction to what has been said or more often in what another speaker says next. Speech acts, then are created by the joint action of the participants in a conversation" (Mühlhäusler and Harré 1990). J. L. Austin was the first to design a classification system of the various speech acts. These language-

18

related speech acts can be classified into three main categories: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts (Austin 1962).

A locutionary act can be defined as the act of saying something meaningful, or the actual utterance that is expressed by the speaker. This act embodies the linguistic aspect of speech performance which is associated with the syntactic and semantic aspects of the utterance. An illocutionary act goes beyond the mere speech of the utterance by materializing itself as the actual performance of that utterance. It encompasses the notion that a certain force or function is being conveyed through the utterance. The final component of a speech act, the perlocutionary act, can be described as the intended effect as a result of the utterance. The speaker's goal, then, is to clearly communicate his/her intentions in an attempt to achieve something. It is important to note, however, that the speaker's attempt to convey a particular message may not successfully be communicated to the hearer. An indicator of the success of the utterance can be measured by analyzing the 'uptake' of the utterance. The uptake can be interpreted through observation of the hearer's reaction in the form of a verbal or non-verbal response (Márquez Reiter & Placencia 2005: 13).

It is with the illocutionary acts that many language pedagogues are concerned in recent literature. This is due to its direct correlation with communicative competence. To begin with, it is clear that a locutionary act shares many of the same features reflected in linguistic competence, chiefly in its interrelation with grammatical features of the language. Therefore, it is clear that a locutionary act is linked to only one aspect of the communicative spectrum. In contrast, an illocutionary act is concerned with the real, intended purpose of using the speech act. In this way, an illocutionary act also concerns

itself with the contextual factors of the communicative act. As was discussed in section 2.2, this notion fundamentally parallels the goals of pragmatic competence in its consideration of extralinguistic factors as well as the utterance itself.

Searle (1977), however, criticizes Austin's work, which he believes to be essentially inconsistent, incomplete, and inaccurate. In particular, Searle finds inadequacy in Austin's classification system. He not only finds fault with the arrangement of conflicting elements within the same categories but also for including material under headings that do not serve the purpose of that particular category. For instance, verdictives as well as expositives may be included in the speech act subdivision of 'describing.' Primarily, Searle believes Austin neglects to distinguish a speech act from a speech act verb. He asserts that whether or not a speech act verb exists should not determine whether a speech act exists itself. (Mey 2001: 117). By the same token, Leech goes so far as to commission a name for this erroneous speech act verb. Called the "Illocutionary-Verb Fallacy," Leech finds fault in Austin's assertion that "verbs in the English language correspond one-to-one with categories of speech acts" (1983: 176), a statement that provides a clear example of confusion between a speech act and a speech act verb.

There have been numerous criticisms regarding Austin's original framework of speech acts; however, as Mey (1997) notes, credit must be given where credit is due in that Austin himself was not satisfied with his own classificatory proposal. Furthermore, Austin greatly contributed to foreign language pedagogy by recognizing that language is a vehicle of action and not just written or spoken words. This finding has been fundamental chiefly concerning the fields of pragmatics as well as applied linguistics.

In an effort to repair the shortcomings in Austin's schema, Searle (1977) re-grouped the speech acts into the following divisions: representatives (or assertives), directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. Directives are of particular interest to this study regarding the various ways they can be expressed as one way to assess a learner's pragmatic awareness. In consonance with Searle's categorization, a directive is a speech act that requires the hearer to do something in response to the speaker's ordinance. As Mey (2001) notes, the classical imperatives appear at one extreme end of the directive spectrum, illustrating their various force levels from "pious wish" to "harsh order". Classified by Austin (1962:109f) as 'exercitives' or 'behabitives', these communicative acts intend to cause a change to take place corresponding to the wishes of the speaker. Fraser (1978: 1-21) posits that directives fall into the following six subclasses:

(i)   Appeal to the hearer's sense of moral obligation. Examples include appealing, begging, and pleading.
(ii)   Appeal to the hearer's sense of mutual cooperation. Examples include asking, requiring, and *requesting*.
(iii)   Appeal to the hearer's sense of well-being. Examples include urging, suggesting, and advising.
(iv)   Appeal to the hearer's sense of pride. Examples include daring, challenging, and defying.
(v)   Appeal to the hearer's sense of lack of status. Examples include ordering, commanding, and requiring.
(vi)   Appeal to the hearer's sense of fear. Examples include demanding, insisting, and enjoining.

To further clarify, Fraser recognizes the possible limitations of his own work. He indicates that although he does not need to provide a further explanation of what he defines as a "sense", he acknowledges that the ideas of "morally obligatory" or "mutual cooperation" may vary from culture to culture. Also, it is possible that directives fall into

more than one category. However, this potential drawback, according to Fraser, did not affect the end product of his study.

2.6 Strategies for Requesting

Recent literature in speech act theory lends much consideration to specific speech activities such as requests, apologies, and compliments, and thanks. Of these speech activities, however, studies on requests greatly outweigh past research of any of the others. Fraser & Nolen (1981: 93-109) outline a comprehensive set of strategy-types, indicating the relationship between the actual meaning of the sentence and the act of making a request. He also provides examples to illustrate this concept. Most importantly, in each one of the cases, the intended uptake is for the hearer to respond to the speaker.

(1)   By announcing the intent to perform the act ("I *request* that you help me")
(2)   By using a speech act idiom which conveys the directive intent ("How about helping me")
(3)   By using an imperative sentence, which conveys the intent ("Please help me")
(4)   By suggesting that the hearer act ("I suggest that you help me"/"You might help me")
(5)   By requesting permission of the hearer ("May I request that you help me")
(6)   By expressing a desire for hearer action ("I would like you to help me")
(7)   By expressing an obligation to request help ("I must ask you to help me")
(8)   By expressing a desire to request help ("I would like to ask you to help me")
(9)   By expressing that the hearer has an obligation to act ("You must help me")
(10)   By expressing that the hearer has the ability or permission to act ("You can help me")
(11)   By expressing that the specific act would be appropriate ("I am in need of some help")
(12)   By expressing a reason for the hearer to act ("I cannot finish without some help")
(13)   By expressing a consequence of the hearer action ("If you help me, I'll buy you a new comic book")
(14)   By asking if the hearer has the ability to act ("Can/could/can't/couldn't you …help me?")
(15)   By asking if the hearer wants to act ("Would you like to help me?"
(16)   By asking if the hearer intends to act ("Will/would/won't you help me?")

(17)   By asking if the hearer has a reason for (not) acting ("Why are (aren't) you helping me?")

(18)   By asking if the hearer has (doesn't have) an obligation to act ("Don't you have to help me?")

Furthermore, he categorizes these strategies by grouping them in terms of directness and whether the speech act is explicit or implicit. He first explains that numbers 1-3 can be used to directly perform a request. In contrast, the remaining strategies are considered indirect requests in that they are indeed conveying the idea of requesting but take the form of another speech act. For example, number 4 may be considered a suggestion. In any case, however, it is important to note that although these strategies are used to make requests *indirectly*, it is implied that the speaker is in fact making a request at the same time. This then depends on the content, the context, and the manner by which the request is made.

2.7 Politeness

One aspect of language that is associated with but not limited to directives is politeness. Watts (2003) notes that the politeness phenomena had not yet developed due to a lack of a theoretical basis until Speech Act theory emerged in the 1960s. For this reason, politeness in linguistic pragmatics and sociolinguistics is considered a fairly new subdiscipline in North America and in western Europe. The notion of politeness is considered to be one of the most disputable facets of human language in the field of pragmatics. This is due to the very nature of politeness as a cross-cultural phenomenon, varying from one social context to the next. While one learns at a very young age what is considered to be polite or impolite, social as well as linguistic challenges may be faced when traveling across borders. As Koike (1992) notes, politeness is a social constitution

that comprises the interrelationship between sociocultural norms, linguistic form, and function.

For this reason, a true definition of politeness remains in question. Primarily, its contextual variability and complexity has prohibited researchers from providing one precise definition inclusive of all cultural contexts. While many have delved into particular politeness strategies concerning specific cultures, several notable universal definitions of politeness surfaced early in the history of this area. Lakoff (1973) believed politeness could be conveyed by following two principal rules of interactional competence: (1) Be clear and (2) Be polite. Clarity is further defined based on Grice's (1975) maxims regarding conversational cooperation. According to Lakoff (1973), politeness is also further illustrated by the following principles: (a) don't impose; (b) give options; and (c) make the listener feel good-be friendly. Lakoff herself points out that there is inconsistency within her own postulation that being polite may not always coincide with expressing oneself clearly and adequately. In addition, following Lakoff's original politeness formula, it became clear that evaluating politeness as a universal construct would not suffice. At the very least, a more accurate definition would need to be more detailed and one that would essentially not contradict itself.

Consequently, four main approaches towards politeness emerged that addressed these issues to some degree: the social norm view, the conversational-maxim view, the face-saving view, and the conversational contract view. The social-norm view illustrates the classical representation of what the general public perceives as politeness. Specifically regarding the English-speaking population, this view is derived from the belief that each society has a set of explicit rules that determine an individual behavior, state of affairs, or

manner of thinking within a certain context. These rules are reflected in the social standards of that society. When the individual's behavior coincides with the social norms, this is called a positive evaluation, or politeness. Conversely, a negative evaluation, or impoliteness, occurs when the individual's actions are contrary and do not conform to the social norms (Fraser 1990: 220).

The conversational-maxim view is fundamentally derived from Grice's (1975) belief that the ultimate goal of any two or more individuals engaged in a conversation is to achieve comprehension, or clearly convey the message. This notion is based on Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP), which states that you should "make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of talk exchange in which you are engaged." (1975: 45). Simply stated, the speaker should always communicate what s/he would like to express, when s/he would like to express it, and also in the way s/he would like to express it. In addition, Grice outlines several specific maxims and sub-maxims that must also be followed. These conversational maxims serve as guidelines for 'rational' linguistic usage; however, they are decidedly different from grammatical rules. Fraser clarifies this statement by asserting that "Whereas the violation of a grammar rule results in ungrammaticality and the assessment not 'knowing' the language, violation of a conversational maxim may be accepted as signaling certain speaker intentions" (1990: 81).

In effect Lakoff (1973) adopted this view, relating it to her previous assertions regarding politeness. In accordance with Grice's maxims, she further develops the concept of grammaticality to denote the direct interrelationship between the grammar itself and pragmatics as it relates to the concept of politeness: "We should like to have some kind of

25

pragmatic rules, dictating whether an utterance is pragmatically well-formed or not, and the extent to which it deviates if it does" (1973: 296). Therefore, in this view, specific sentence constructions themselves can essentially be categorized as polite or impolite.

Together with Lakoff, Leech (1983) maintains the fundamentals of Grice's approach but with the alternative approach of classifying politeness as a component of rhetorical pragmatics regarding goal-directed linguistic behavior. In brief, he highlights the interrelationship between language usage and the speaker and addressee. He distinguishes between the motives of the speaker in using the illocutionary speech act as well as the speaker's social goals. These social goals include how the speaker regards the notions of truth, politeness, and irony (Fraser 1990: 224). Above all, he contributed to politeness theory through his development of the Politeness Principle. The objective of the Politeness Principle is to establish and socially maintain the alliance of the speaker and hearer so that the speaker may assume cooperation (Koike 1992).

Fraser sums up the principle by stating that "Other things being equal, minimize the expression of beliefs which are unfavorable to the hearer and at the same time (but less important) maximize the expression of beliefs which are favorable to the hearer" (1990: 225). With this in mind, Leech (1983) provides six Interpersonal Maxims and proposes that each maxim upholds a general spectrum that the hearer must consult. The maxims include: Tact, Meta, Generosity, Approbation, Modesty, Agreement, and Sympathy. The spectrums by which these maxims are upheld include the Cost-Benefit Scale, Optionality Scale, Indirectness Scale, Authority Scale, and Social Distance Scale.

The third view, the conversational-contract view, was developed by Fraser (1975) and Fraser and Nolen (1981). Drawing upon both Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle

and Goffman's (1959) notion of 'face', this view contends that both the hearer and speaker have certain rights and obligations that will initially determine what the two parties can expect from one another. Due to the variability of the communication process regarding time and context change, the conversational contract may be re-negotiated. Essentially, both parties may accommodate one another by re-negotiating these unique rights and obligations (Fraser 1990).

Fraser (1990) observes that the interactive scope of the participants that establishes these rights and obligations may deviate greatly. He notes that particular terms of the conversation may be imposed by circumstantial factors such as convention, social institutions, or by previous encounters or specifics of the situation. Yet the most salient feature of this particular view inclusive of each of these aforementioned factors is the idea that the notion of politeness veritably exists in every conversation. Both the hearer and speaker are mindful of the conversational contract and understand that a violation of the contract will be perceived as impolite or rude. In accordance with this disposition, it is not the language itself nor any particular component of the language that is inherently polite but rather the speaker him/herself. It is the speaker who chooses how s/he will express him/herself, undoubtedly aware of whether his/her utterances adhere to the rights and obligations of the contract.

Yet the view that has been regarded as the most substantial framework in the politeness sphere and that with which this investigation concerns itself is the face-saving view. Proposed by Brown & Levinson (1978, 1987), there are two principal types of politeness, both established based on Erving Goffman's concept of face. Face can be defined as the "public self-image" that each individual claims as well as the presentation

of that self that he/she would like to project to others (1987: 61). In order to protect the "face" of both parties, both the speaker and listener use particular communication strategies to assuage the communication (Koike 1992). The first type of politeness, negative politeness, refers to making an unobtrusive request with respect to the other person's right to act freely. According to Koike (1992: 21) it refers to the "consideration of the listener's wish to be unimpeded in taking action and having attention." This type of politeness is based on the notion of negative face, or "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his action be unimpeded by others" (Brown & Levinson 1987: 62). Positive politeness, on the other hand, pursues a relationship between both parties, respective of a person's need to be liked and understood. This type of politeness is derived from positive face, or "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 62). According to Koike (1992), it can be defined as the speaker's attempt to make the hearer aware that the needs of both parties are somewhat similar.

Face, then, requires consistent oversight as it can be lost, maintained, or enhanced from moment to moment. Assuming that most interlocutors will guard their face against any potential threats, it is generally accepted that each participant in a conversation strives to maintain the other's face, constantly aware of the intentions of both parties. Coupled with Brown & Levinson's idea that some acts are inherently threatening to face, each communicative participant must practice particular linguistic strategies to reflect politeness principles. Through mitigation strategies, both the intended message as well as the willful politeness objective is realized.

In addition, Brown & Levinson (1987) propose three interdependent variables to assess the degree of politeness required in a given interaction. Chiefly, these variables determine the degree of seriousness of a face-threatening act and encompass all other variables that play a role in the communicative process. They include the social distance between two interlocutors, the relative power one interlocutor has over the other, and the absolute ranking of impositions in the culture in which the two are in. Social distance reflects the degree of familiarity and solidarity that both the hearer and speaker share. Relative power indicates the degree of imposition that the speaker may inflict on the hearer due to the power differential between the two parties. Finally, absolute ranking refers to the weightiness of impositions relative to a given culture's expectations and mores. This includes "the expenditure of goods and/or services by the hearer, the right of the speaker to perform the act, and the degree to which the hearer welcomes the imposition (Brown & Levinson 1978: 74ff). With these variables in mind, the speaker must choose specific linguistic forms that reflect particular politeness strategies relative to the variables that are involved in a specific context.

While Brown & Levinson's theory has been recognized as a significant contribution to the field of pragmatics, it has also been widely criticized as not being universally valid. Matsumoto (1988) and Ide (1989) claim that Brown & Levinson assume that the speaker's choice of language is based on volition. As a result, the speaker uses this as a basis to decipher which linguistic forms to use to maintain face. In East Asian cultures like that of Japan, for example, politeness is more commonly achieved based on discernment concerning that particular culture's social norms. Certainly, scholars such as

Ide and Matsumoto have also contributed to pragmatics through their well-known assertion that politeness is culturally-bound.

In recent years, other additional views on politeness have come to the forefront of the field to challenge the more traditional views. One significant theory emerged in the 1990s when Richard Watts proposed his view of politeness and politic behavior. In accordance with Matsumoto and Ide, Watts also finds fault in defining politeness as a universal feature of social interaction. Watts argues that if an accurate definition of politeness were to exist, "it would be one which forms of human interaction could be interpreted and described as instances of politeness and in which forms of linguistic usage in any language community could be observed and analysed as helping to construct and reproduce politeness" (2003: 49). Furthermore, he establishes a current politeness framework based on what he classifies as first-order and second-order politeness. First-order politeness, or *politic behavior*, can be defined as the linguistic and non-linguistic behavior that participants choose to display based on what is considered appropriate to that particular communication process. Second-order politeness is described as the behavior that goes beyond what is deemed appropriate to the communication process in order to achieve a specific communicative goal. This classification system, then, underscores that linguistic structures themselves cannot be considered inherently (im)polite because politeness is dependent upon the interpretation of the structures by the speech community.

2.8 Past Studies -Teaching of Pragmatics

The notion of politeness, although somewhat difficult to define as a culturally-determined phenomenon, exists nonetheless in every speech community. This, in part, has

led many foreign language pedagogues to question the significance of pragmatic competence as a component of overall communicative competence. With specific regards to politeness, it serves as one essential aspect of pragmatic competence for a variety of reasons. First, its use demonstrates cultural awareness and sensitivity within a particular culture. Second, it allows the speaker to successfully convey his intentions and meaning, assuming his/her intentions coincide with what is regarded as respectful to the culture. This can be accomplished through knowledge of the culture in question as well as awareness of any linguistic forms that may reflect politeness according to a particular culture's social norms. Finally, it allows the student to observe the direct correlation between language and culture. In this way, a certain linguistic form denoting politeness may be a clear reflection of the cultural values of a particular speech community.

If pragmatic competence is an essential component of communicative classroom teaching, it is surprising, then, to note the meager number of studies that have been conducted for further exploration. Specifically regarding pragmatic variation in English and Spanish, there is a significant margin for expansion and advancement, especially in the sphere of speech act realization (Klee 1998). Perhaps further studies of various speech acts would give more insight into this matter. Therefore, it would be constructive to review past studies that mark the potential risk of a communicative classroom in the absence of pragmatic instruction.

2.9 Speech Acts, Politeness, and Pragmatic Competence: Connecting the Dots

The evidence of a speech act's role in pragmatic competence can be reflected in its communicative nature. This is because the sociocultural context of an utterance determines the actual grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic entities of the speech act.

Each of these entities, or systems, contributes to the overall communicative process. The grammatical system concerns interdependent linguistic fields such as syntax, phonology, and lexicon/morphology. The semantic system includes the individual messages and their meanings, or interpretations, as they relate to one another. Finally, and most significant to this study, is the pragmatic system. The speaker chooses from a set of linguistic forms to express him/herself. These linguistic forms may be expressed by particular speech acts in the speaker's attempt to convey a particular message to the hearer. The amalgamation of these systems are governed by cultural rules and expectations, establishing organization schemes and order in that society (Koike 1992).

Within the L2 classroom, the learner acquires pragmatic competence through awareness of these rules and expectations. Without this awareness of cultural norms, the learner cannot convey a message that is appropriate to the communicative act. As politeness is a phenomenon that is a direct reflection of the norms of the L2 community, the learner may be unable to convey the degree of politeness s/he wishes to express without appropriate instruction. To address this matter further, the following two sections will discuss two aspects of a language that may be used to assess politeness: forms of address and verbal forms. Both of these aspects may be observed in the grammatical form that is chosen in making a request.

2.10 Forms of Address

One significant aspect of pragmatic awareness can be assessed via choice of address pronoun. While many classification systems regarding interpersonal address models have surfaced, the model proposed by Brown & Gilman (1960) continues to serve as the traditional model which many researchers tend to adopt as a mode of comparison.

Brown and Gilman note that the development of pronouns began with the Latin *tú* and *vos*, which later became *tú* and *usted* in Spanish. They developed the symbols *T* and *V*, respectively, which have become universal representations for the bipartite address systems of European languages. Factors that may influence the choice of address forms include sex, race, age, religion, and social relationship. According to Brown & Gilman, this choice depends on two principal, determinant factors: power and solidarity. A relationship that is characterized by power is regarded as nonreciprocal and asymmetrical in that the two interlocutors do not have an equal amount of power in their social relationship; the inferior says *V* and receives *T*. As such, elders have power over younger people and instructors over their pupils. On the other hand, solidarity is regarded as symmetrical as well as reciprocal. It is linked to pronouns as a means of differentiating address among power equals. In this way, those whose status reflects high power use *V* with one another and those of lower status will mutually use the *T* form.

Though determining pronouns of address based on power and solidarity may broadly apply to a wide range of societies in the Spanish-speaking world, notable shortcomings may challenge this particular framework. Braun (1988) underscores the inability to impose this semantic proposition on every society. Namely, she asserts that one cannot superimpose the use of similar address systems across the linguistic board; the languages mentioned within this framework will undoubtedly correspond to varying address systems. In addition, King (2009) addresses one marked concern regarding tripartite systems such as that which was utilized specifically in Renaissance Spain. He contends that the *T* and *V* forms are not the only linguistic options available to

interlocutors of some European dialects and that further investigation should be considered regarding the choice of address form a speaker selects in a particular context.

2.11 Pragmatic Hierarchy

The second variable this study considers is deixis, based on the pragmatic hierarchy of politeness forms developed by Koike (1992). Specific to directives and their respective degrees of politeness, this hierarchy establishes a range of politeness based on a set of linguistic forms, ranging from most polite to least polite. To explain the actual grammatical form of the verb tense or mood dictates the degree of inference, or pragmatic understanding.

Koike posits that there are three reasons as to why the formulation of a pragmatic hierarchy is advantageous. First, it provides insight into the cognitive processes pertaining to the way pragmatic information is stored. The organizational schema that is provided may explain why the speaker may feel an order in the directive forms. Second, a hierarchy may serve as a feature system, each linguistic form distinguishing itself from all others. Finally, it may attempt to explain an order of second language acquisition. The hierarchy demonstrates a direct parallel between the order in which a child learns politeness forms in his/her native language and that in which an adult learns these forms in a second language. These features of the hierarchy are reflected in both the grammatical and pragmatic features of an utterance. The grammatical features may be demonstrated through the actual verb tense or mood while the pragmatic features are reflected "in the degree of inference expected from the addressee or the degree of control given to the latter to comply or not with the directive while still saving face" (67). These

two features are co-dependent on one another, as the pragmatic implication is expressed through the actual grammatical marker.

2.12 The Role of Pedagogical Intervention on the Development of Pragmatic Competence

Recently, many studies in second language learning have been conducted to examine the topic of pedagogical intervention and its relevance to pragmatic competence (such as Félix-Brasdefer 2008). Implemented specifically in interventional studies, pedagogical intervention takes place through the explicit teaching of pragmatic themes at hand. In practice, the instructor pointedly discusses the relationship between the language form and function of the pragmatic feature. These studies differ greatly from observational studies, where pragmatic awareness is presumed to develop through conventional language teaching focused on discrete points of the L2 grammar. Under the latter methodology, any degree of pragmatic competence that is realized has only been done so incidentally. Foremost to this particular topic, though, is that extensive attention to the linguistic form and its role in a particular communicative act may facilitate a higher degree of pragmatic awareness. While incidental learning of the pragmatic aspect is possible, the explicit teaching of the aspect may be more beneficial to the learner. According to Schmidt (1993: 35), "consciously paying attention to the relevant features in the input and attempting to analyze their significance in terms of deeper generalizations are both highly facilitative."

There has been a moderate amount of research that has examined the explicit instruction of speech acts and their role in communicative action in the classroom setting. Less prevalent are studies particularly pertaining to the Spanish language. A recent study by Félix-Brasdefer (2008) examined the development of pragmatic competence of

learners in their fifth semester of Spanish. Specifically observing their performance pertaining to the production of refusals, Félix-Brasdefer compared the data from L1 English and L1 Spanish learners. His results demonstrated that most of the pragmatic features emphasized through explicit instruction were retained by the learners. In accordance with research conducted by Bardovi-Harlig (2001), he concludes that certain aspects of pragmatic competence do not and will not have the opportunity to develop properly without instruction.

Specifically, the present study addresses the differences between native speakers (hereafter NSs) of the Spanish language and L2 learners of that language. Bardovi-Harlig (1998) classifies how learners can differ from NSs in the production of speech acts into four principal areas: the use of distinct speech acts, or the use of the same speech acts which may differ in its semantic formula, content, or form. First, the choice of speech acts may differ between NSs and learners in that they may produce different speech acts in the same context or by electing not to use a speech act at all. Secondly, the NS and learner may choose to use the same speech act while selecting a different way to express the message they wish to convey: "Semantic formulas represent the means by which a particular speech act is accomplished in terms of the primary content of an utterance" (Bardovi-Harlig 1998: 16). This is reminiscent of Brown and Levinson's framework of politeness strategies and is more accurately representative of negative politeness. Here the speaker may choose a particular speech act to avoid a certain level of imposition on the part of the hearer. The speaker will elect to use the speech act that is least imposing on the hearer. As a subset of the semantic formula, the third classification is represented by the actual content of the speech act. While a semantic formula identifies the type of

information given, the content indicates the particular information expressed by the speaker. When performing a refusal specifically through the use of an explanation, the particular explanation given by a speaker that identifies himself as a member of one particular type of speech community may vary greatly compared to a speaker of another community. Finally, the NS and NNSs may choose to use the same speech act but express the speech act differently through the surface form. Common areas of research in this field may encompass mitigation techniques such as aggravators and downgraders (Bardovi-Harlig 2001).

2.13 Do Advanced Learners Possess a Higher Degree of Awareness than Intermediate Learners?

While most studies have assessed language proficiency solely based on grammatical competence, one cannot assume that the learner is equally proficient in the grammar and appropriate pragmatic usage of the language. That is to say, while learners may exhibit a high degree of grammatical competence, this does not guarantee a corresponding level of pragmatic development when compared to native speakers (Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford 1990, 1991, 1993). The terms 'advanced' and 'intermediate' in this study refer to the particular course level of the learner.

Regarding the second aspect of the experience variable, study abroad can be characterized as "…a particular set of established arrangements for foreign study between institutions of higher education, namely an ongoing, regular exchange of students…" (Teichler & Steube 1991: 325). Generally, language researchers have recognized that these immersion programs are one of the more successful ways for students to experience the dynamic relationship between language and culture (Gorka & Niesenbaum 2001:101), where one entity is a direct reflection of the other. Freed (1995) contends that

37

the combination of classroom instruction with extended practice in an immersion setting is considered one of the foremost methods to achieve communicative competence. Particularly, study abroad programs increase cultural awareness in addition to mastery of grammatical form.

The present study draws from several different areas of linguistics and the varied nature of this chapter reflects this. In this chapter, studies done on such topics as Politeness Theory, Speech Act Theory, SLA, and others have been discussed as they relate to the research questions outlined in this study. Many of the ideas presented in this chapter were implemented into methods and procedures that were used to carry out the present study. In the following chapter, each of the variables of this study will be analyzed and discussed individually. The chapter will conclude with further discussion of patterns pertaining to the results of all of the variables.

CHAPTER 3. EMPIRICAL STUDY AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Scope of Study

The present study attempts to address the following research questions:

1) Do advanced L2 learners possess a greater quantity of pragmatic awareness as compared to intermediate learners? As a corollary to this question of experience, do learners who have spent time abroad in immersion programs have greater opportunities to acquire, and therefore possess, a higher degree of pragmatic competence than those learners who have only received classroom instruction? These two research questions will be examined separately in this chapter.

2) Does pedagogical intervention increase the learner's pragmatic competence and to what extent?

In sum, the basis of these research questions considers whether a learner acquires a higher degree of pragmatic competence with opportunities that provide the learner with varying types of exposure to the L2. The first research question examines whether a learner's pragmatic awareness increases as s/he progresses through more advanced courses in the L2. The second research question explores the role of explicit instruction in the L2 classroom as compared to the classroom in which traditional language learning takes place. Both research questions 1 and 2 concern themselves with the learner's experience and exposure to pragmatic topics in the foreign language classroom setting. In contrast, the final research question pertains to communicative processes outside of the classroom in a setting that ideally allows for constant exposure to pragmatic aspects of the language.

Specifically, these research questions are proposed to better understand these variables as they pertain to learners of Spanish and their progression towards the acquisition of native-like pragmatic behaviors concerning the production of requests in the L2. Through observation of requests that were produced by the participants, two aspects of linguistic politeness were examined: pronominal address forms as well as the degree of politeness reflected in the linguistic forms based on a pragmatic hierarchy. Both of these issues are considered manifestations of linguistic politeness as they reflect a certain degree of politeness through the choice of form communicated by the speaker.

Use of pronominal address forms were chosen as a focus of this study not only due to their direct relation to politeness (as discussed in section 2.10) but also based on their primary position in the sequence of topics that are presented in the classroom. Many students encounter the question of *T* and *V* address forms as early as the first few weeks of an Spanish course. Generally presented in the introductory sections of textbooks, both forms are commonly introduced in the section pertaining to greetings and introductions. In addition, the significance of address forms can also be seen later in the explicit teaching of the formal and informal forms of imperatives. Formality is emphasized as the formal and informal grammatical forms are taught separately in most commonly used L2 textbooks. In both of the aforementioned cases, though, the learner considers both forms but ultimately selects only one based on his/her understanding of what is deemed appropriate for the given context.

Also relevant to this study is the extent to which an instructor explains the situational uses of these forms beyond the mere description of the formality/informality dichotomy. At such an early state of language learning, the learner may have difficulty

deciphering which form is most fitting for a given context. At this point, the instructor may or may not choose to give explicit instruction. Providing students with extended instruction pertaining to the pragmatic feature at hand may affect how well the learner understands formality as it applies to politeness. For this reason, this issue will be examined more extensively in the results section in the discussion of pedagogical intervention.

A pragmatic hierarchy of politeness was also chosen as a variable in this study as it has become of particular interest to both researchers in the fields of pragmatics and SLA. Based on a hierarchy in a similar study conducted by Koike (1992), the hierarchy presented in this study has been modified and made more specific to the objectives of this research. Though Brazilian Portuguese served as the designated language this author chose to examine, it is important to note that she later adopted this hierarchy for several other languages including Spanish.

As past studies have noted, varying degrees of politeness can be manifested in the framing of a request by a speaker via grammatical structures (Koike 1988: 198). Namely, this pragmatic hierarchy classifies varying degrees of politeness manifested in the speaker's choice of verb form when issuing a directive. As discussed in the review of literature, it is important to note that how the hearer perceives a request will ultimately dictate how s/he responds to the request.

Based on both temporal and personal deixis, or ways in which language encodes the context of utterances, Koike (1996: 187-193) posits that the strategies used to form a request are chosen to distance the proposition of the utterance in verb tense and person reference from the speaker's deictic center, or the speaker's present moment of

speaking. According to the author, in languages such as Spanish and Portuguese, a speaker is able to convey a high degree of politeness through the use of the conditional or subjunctive moods because these verb forms indicate a time frame furthest from the speaker's coding time in relation to the present moment.

3.2 Pilot Study

Before data was collected and variables were established as focal points of this study, a pilot study was conducted. This preliminary study was carried out to investigate the objectives outlined at the beginning of this chapter. In addition, the pilot study was conducted to explore which particular variables should be considered as they pertain to the research objectives outlined in section 3.1.

3.2.1 Participants

3.2.1.1 Experimental Group

The participants of the pilot study were thirty-eight students between the ages of 18 and 25 and were enrolled in intermediate-level Spanish courses at a major university in the southeastern region of the United States. This particular group of students was chosen based on their exposure to all verb forms presented in the pragmatic hierarchy of politeness, and specifically the conditional and subjunctive moods, which at the university at which this study was conducted are presented last in the sequence of verb morphology. Learners in class levels lower than that chosen for the pilot study do not have access to all verb forms in the hierarchy. As this is the case, learners in these less advanced class levels would therefore have been unable to choose the most pragmatically appropriate form in some contexts.

3.2.1.2 Control Group

To triangulate the data retrieved in this study and to test the validity of the hypothetical situations presented on the testing assessments discussed in the following section, eight native speakers (NSs) of Spanish were recruited to serve as a control group for the study. Their participation in the study was on a voluntary basis. Two of the native speakers were from Costa Rica, three were natives of Spain, and the remaining three were natives of Mexico, Colombia, and Venezuela. The role of NSs was substantial to this study in that their responses served as the standard regarding which politeness forms (outlined in section 3.1) were considered pragmatically appropriate to the circumstances presented on the DCT.

3.2.2 Instruments

A pre-test/post test design was utilized as the preferred method by which to evaluate the learners' performance. This design was chosen to ensure that these measures assessed the features appropriate to the scope of this study. The participants were not allowed to interact with one another while completing the task.

The pre-test consisted of contextual situations that were similar to the experimental task. The pre-test not only served as the means by which to practice the verb forms as well as demonstrate correct usage of pronominal address forms but also to expose students to what they would encounter on the post-test.

The data in this study was collected by a pragmatic judgment assessment that was presented in the form of a Discourse Completion Task (DCT). The DCT questionnaire served as the post-test and was chosen for a variety of reasons. In the first place, this assessment was selected because of its relative ease of being administered to the informants in the pilots study as well as the anticipated larger number of informants that

43

would participate in the main study. Golato notes that DCTs are "widely used in the field of pragmatics, intercultural communication, and second language acquisition, mainly because their simplicity of use and high degree of control over variables lead to easy replicability" (2003: 93). Second, due to the nature of the linguistic data the researcher was seeking (i.e., directives), using a DCT was nearly unavoidable, as it would have been all but impossible to collect 'natural' data as a result of observer fieldwork with a reasonable number of participants interacting with all of the different types of interlocutors and communicative situations that were proposed. Finally, it would have been nearly impossible to collect all the data from the L2 group, who rarely use Spanish in their everyday lives. Huth (2006) conducted a study that examined compliment-responses and the variations of their use in German. He used slightly different methodology but still utilized methods that did not allow data to occur naturally. Instead he 'drew it out' of the participants by having pairs of his students sit in different faculty offices at a university campus and exchange compliments over the phone.

All L2 learners and NSs of Spanish were presented with seven hypothetical scenarios and asked how they would respond to each scenario within a context also given on the DCT. Directions were given in the L1 of each respective group to ensure comprehension. Each scenario was created by the researcher. Specifically, each scenario featured two interlocutors: a hypothetical interlocutor and the respondent him/herself represented on the DCT by the address form *tú* ('you'). Rejoinders were included on the DCT to ensure clarity of context. Although the instructions did not explicitly state that the respondent use one specific format to respond to the scenarios, placing question marks in the response space did overtly elicit a request form.

3.2.3 Procedure

The pilot study was conducted during two consecutive 50-minute class periods. At the beginning of the first class period, the instructor briefly reviewed all verb forms presented in the hierarchy in no particular order. Afterwards, the instructor distributed a pre-test to the learners. At the beginning of the next class period, the instructor distributed a Discourse Completion Task (DCT), which would serve as the post-test as well as the source of the data that would be analyzed in the final results of this pilot study. To ensure that that the pre and post-tests were equitable regarding their degree of difficulty, the situations presented on the pre-test were comparable to those given on the DCT.

3.2.4 Results of Pilot Study

As a result of the pilot study, two principal adjustments were made to the methodology employed in the large-scale study. First, pedagogical intervention was included as a third independent variable in this study. This issue emerged after several students in the class expressed interest in the pragmatic elements of the study. Specifically, learners requested an explanation as to which linguistic forms were considered more polite than others. In response, the instructor provided supplemental instruction pertaining to both main aspects of the study. As a result, the question arose as to whether or not students who did not receive this instruction would perform at the same level as the other students who had received instruction. Provided that this finding could potentially have a substantial degree of influence on the results of this study, the idea emerged to include pedagogical intervention as a variable in the final study.

Second, scenarios VI and VII were excluded from the study based on the responses of native speakers. These scenarios were excluded from the DCT used in the

large-scale study because they failed to produce results related to the two variables in question. In reference to number VI, seven out of eight of the NSs did not produce any linguistic form involving a T (*tú*) or V (*usted*)[1] form. Scenario VII elicited responses which utilized plural pronominal address forms which are not a topic of investigation of this study.

After excluding both of these scenarios from the DCT that was distributed to participants in the large-scale study, the remainder of the scenarios were based on the following four variables: the power relationship between two interlocutors, the level of familiarity between them, and their age. These five hypothetical situations (represented by Roman numerals as presented on the DCT) and their corresponding variables can be observed in the following table:

Table 3.1: Classification System of Hypothetical Situations

	Hypothetical Interlocutor	**Social Variable**
I	**Fellow Student**	**Imposition or Familiarity**
II	**Fellow Student**	**Familiarity**
III	**Family Member (Sister)**	**Familiarity**
IV	**Elderly Woman**	**Age**
V	**Best Friend**	**Familiarity**

For a list of the judgment task scenarios, see Appendix.

---

[1] The pronominal address form *vos*, present in many dialects of Spanish, was not included as a third possible address form as it did appeared neither on the testing evaluations of the native speakers nor on those of the participants.

Although the data are limited, they suggest several patterns, such as the forms that are used most often in informal and formal contexts as well as verb forms that represent varying degrees of politeness. Tables 3.2 and 3.3 (shown below) demonstrate the patterns that emerged based on the responses of the NSs.

Table 3.2: Pilot Study-Pronominal Address Forms

		Native Speakers (NSs) (8)
Pronominal Address Forms	I	T – 100% (8)
		V – 0% (0)
		O – 0% (0)
	II	T – 75% (6)
		V – 25% (2)
		O – 0% (0)
	III	T – 100% (8)
		V – 0% (0)
		O – 0% (0)
	IV	T – 0% (0)
		V – 100% (8)
		O – 0% (0)
	V	T – 100% (8)
		V – 0% (0)
		O – 0%(0)

Table 3.2 illustrates the pronominal address forms used by NSs according to the hypothetical situations presented on the DCT. The only variation that occurred can be observed in Scenario II. This may be due to the fact that the hypothetical situation depicts two interlocutors that are enrolled in the same course at the university. Though they share the same level of power, the situation alludes to the fact that they have not previously met before this dialogue takes place. These numbers suggest that many native speakers of Spanish share the same beliefs regarding the issue of formality of a request based on certain contextual factors such as those presented in this study.

Table 3.3: Pilot Study- Hierarchy of Politeness

Hierarchy of Politeness	I	CM – 12.5% (1)
		C – 12.5% (1)
		PM – 50% (4)
		P – 25% (2)
		O – 0% (0)
	II	CM – 25% (2)
		C – 12.5% (1)
		PM – 50% (4)
		P – 12.5% (1)
		O – 0% (0)
	III	CM – 0% (0)
		C – 0% (0)
		PM – 37.5% (3)
		P – 62.5% (5)
		O – 0% (0)
	IV	CM –25% (2)
		C – 62.5% (5)
		PM – 12.5% (1)
		P – 0% (0)
		O – 0% (0)
	V	CM – 0% (0)
		C – 12.5% (1)
		PM – 50% (4)
		P – 37.5% (3)
		O – 0% (0)

(*CM=Conditional mood with Modal Verb; C=Conditional Mood; PM=Present Tense with Modal Verb; P=Present Tense; O=Other*)

Table 3.3 illustrates the verb forms that were used by the eight NSs pertaining to the five scenarios presented on the DCT. These results indicate that the majority of NSs believe that it is more appropriate to use the present tense forms (P&PM) to make a request pertaining to Scenarios I, II, III, and V. Scenario IV, on the other hand, is considered to be the only context presented on the DCT that requires the speaker to be more polite and therefore the NSs used the conditional verb forms. The results show that a substantial 87% of NSs chose to use the conditional mood in this scenario. Scenario III is of particular interest in that none of the NSs chose to use the conditional mood to

reflect a higher degree of politeness. This finding may indicate that many Spanish speakers do not find it necessary to use high degrees of politeness when making a request to a family member.

3.3 Large-scale Study

The order of the main sections pertaining to the three independent variables examined in this study will be the following: participants, instruments/procedure, and the researcher's hypothesis for the study. The only variation occurs within the examination of pedagogical intervention where the procedure is of utmost importance within the scope of this research and is therefore discussed in its own section.

3.3.1 Course Level

3.3.1.1 Participants

3.3.1.1.1   Intermediate Learners (ILs)

First and foremost, it is important to note that the terms *intermediate* and *advanced* (discussed in the following section) refer to the class level of the learners and are not necessarily indicative of their level of proficiency. As such, the first set of L2 intermediate learners were 27 students enrolled in two separate sections of second-year Spanish courses at a large state university. These learners were from two separate sections, each taught by different instructors. Fifteen of the learners were enrolled in the first section (Int 1) and twelve learners were enrolled in the remaining section (Int 2). Two sections were selected to participate in the study to obtain a greater quantity of data.

3.3.1.1.2 Advanced Learners (ALs)

The second set of L2 learners were enrolled in a third-year Spanish course at a large state university. A total of 17 learners from one section (A) were evaluated. This was the only advanced course included in this study because there was only one section at this particular course level. This course is considered to be an advanced-level course as it is not considered a requisite pertaining to university requirements concerning any field of study other than Spanish.

3.3.1.2 Methods

The methods employed in the large-scale study were similar to those outlined for the pilot study. The amended DCT (with the modifications noted in the results of the pilot study) was administered to all participants discussed in the previous section. Due to the fact that the format of the DCT elicited responses in the form of requests, students in the intermediate courses were not given the DCTs until the conditional form had been presented in their classes. Since the conditional mood is one common way to express a request in Spanish and a wide array of variables were being assessed at the time, the researcher did not choose to distribute the DCTs until students had been exposed to this particular form at the university at which this study was conducted. Each instructor distributed the DCTs during a 50-minute class. In all three classes, instructors distributed the DCTs during the last 20 minutes of class. Students were not allowed to interact with one another while completing the task and did not receive feedback from the instructor.

3.3.1.3 Hypothesis

At the outset of this study, I posited that there would be a difference between the performance of the advanced learners and the intermediate learners. More specifically, I predicted that the advanced learners would possess a higher degree of pragmatic

50

competence than intermediate learners. Observing grammatical topics outlined in the course syllabus of this course level at this particular university reveals that intermediate learners were recently exposed to grammatical topics such as the subjunctive and conditional moods. As the other grammatical forms have already been covered in prior class levels, these are the final linguistic variations that pertain to the hierarchy. While this may seem to be an advantage, observing the course syllabus of advanced learners reveals that they are not only presumably reviewing all of these grammatical forms but also observing these linguistic forms in an authentic context through literary works. Due to the fact that the dimensions of this research encompass the pragmatic as well as linguistic aspects of speech act production, this factor would seem to support my initial hypothesis that advanced learners would outperform intermediate learners.

3.3.2 Pedagogical Intervention

3.3.2.1 Participants

The participants in this section of the study included a total of 57 students between the ages of 18 and 27 and were enrolled in intermediate-level Spanish courses at a large university in the United States. As mentioned in the previous section, learners in this class level have been exposed to address forms as well as all verb forms presented in the pragmatic hierarchy of politeness. Four classes taught by two different instructors participated in this portion of the study, where each instructor gave explicit instruction to one class and not the other. These particular classes were chosen on the basis of consistency as only two instructors at the university where this study was conducted taught two separate sections of the same intermediate level course. Of the 57 learners, 27

of the learners received no explicit instruction. The data from the latter 27 learners was the same data mentioned regarding the ILs in the previous section.

3.3.2.2 Methods

While the testing evaluations and timeline of their distribution paralleled those outlined in the methods section for advanced and intermediate learners, the procedural design was quite different. This research design type was set up as a control group design, where the experimental group received some type of additional input that the control group did not have access to. In the case of the experimental group, the instructor served as the principal source of input as s/he provided explicit instruction pertaining to both aspects of politeness examined in this study. Learners in the experimental group received the following treatment, all of which falls under the classification of metapragmatic instruction (Félix Brasdefer 2008: 57). First, the learners completed the pre-test. Second, the instructor reviewed each communicative situation and asked to students to share how they responded to each scenario. Third, the instructor led a class to discussion as to why a certain address form and verb form are considered more/less appropriate over another. Finally, the instructor introduced the pragmatic hierarchy of politeness to the learners, clearly labeling the ranges of the verb forms from more polite to less polite. Both instructors involved with this part of the study gave the same instruction as provided by the researcher for consistency and data triangulation.

3.3.2.3 Hypothesis

I predicted that there would be a difference between the requests produced by the learners who had received explicit instruction and the requests of those who had received no instruction. Based on the principles outlined in section 2.12, I posited that learners

who receive specific pedagogical treatment would select the most suitable politeness strategy according to each context. My hypothesis was that the learners who had received explicit instruction would be more likely to use native-like address forms and verb forms based on a given context.

3.3.3 Study Abroad

3.3.3.1 Participants

The participants of this segment of the study consisted of all learners who participated in the previous portions of the study as laid out in sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2. There were a total of 74 informants, the sum of the 57 ILs as well as the 17 ALs. These learners were ideal candidates for this study based on their course levels. At this particular university, the lowest course level at which the learners were given the opportunity to study abroad was one course level below that of the ILs presented in this study. As learners enrolled in the intermediate and advanced course levels had the opportunity to go abroad, an anticipated higher number of students who had participated in a study abroad program were expected to be found within this group. In sum, there were 8 participants who had studied abroad.

3.3.3.2 Methods

The instruments and procedure employed in this segment of the study were equivalent to the methods employed in the primary portion of this study pertaining to advanced versus intermediate learners.

3.3.3.3 Hypothesis

My hypothesis was that there would be a positive correlation between the variable of study abroad and the learners' pragmatic abilities according to their responses on the

DCT. The study abroad setting provides the L2 learner with an opportunity to observe utterances in a native context and therefore is widely considered an ideal environment for the learner. For the purposes of this thesis, study abroad can be broadly defined as "…a particular set of established arrangements for foreign study between institutions of higher education, namely an ongoing, regular exchange of students…" (Teichler & Steube 1991: 325). Generally, language researchers have recognized that these immersion programs are one of the more successful ways for students to experience the dynamic relationship between language and culture (Gorka & Niesenbaum 2001: 101), where one entity is a direct reflection of the other. Freed (1995) contends that the combination of classroom instruction with extended practice in an immersion setting is considered one of the foremost methods to achieve communicative competence. Particularly, study abroad programs increase cultural awareness in addition to mastery of grammatical form.

3.3.4 Results of Large-scale Study

The results of this study were coded and classified by the researcher based on results that appeared in data by NSs as well as L2 learners.

3.3.4.1 Coding and Classification of Data

To assess whether the student demonstrated pragmatic awareness pertaining to each scenario, the following grammatical features were evaluated to indicate the participant's choice of a level of formality: pronominal address form, second-person verb form, object pronouns (*te, le, lo, la* ['you']), and possessives (*su, tu, suyo/a/os/as tuyo/a/os/as* ['your']). If none of these grammatical forms was present in the response, the question was added to the category labeled Other (O), indicating the lack of an address form in the response. Responses were also classified into this category for one of

54

the following reasons: the presence of two conflicting grammatical forms, the lack of any grammatical form, or an unintelligible response based on the perception of the researcher. Coding and classification were also verified by two other language instructors at the researcher's university to increase interrater reliability.

To evaluate the learner's pragmatic competence regarding choice of verb form in making a request, the following categories and their corresponding abbreviations were established as the classification system that was to be designated for this study: Conditional mood with modal verb (CM), Conditional mood (C), Present tense with modal verb (PM), Present tense (P), and Other (O). These forms are listed in order ranging from the most polite to the least polite based on the findings of Koike's (1992) study as discussed in section 2.11. The three modal verbs that were observed in this study were the following: *querer* ('to want'), *necesitar* ('to need'), and *poder* 'to be able to; can')*. This hierarchy of verb forms was established based on the greater patterns of NSs responses that were observed on the DCTs. While the primary four linguistic forms (C, CM, P, and PM) are self-explanatory and were recognized and classified with relative ease, other responses were more difficult to determine and were categorized into the final category (O). The responses tabulated into this category will be examined further in the discussion of results[2].

3.3.4.2 Variables

3.3.4.2.1 Course Level

---

[2] Results in Koike's (1992) study indicate that the subjunctive mood was also a verb form that appeared to convey a comparable degree of politeness to the conditional mood. Expressed, for example, as *quisiera* ('I would like'), this form was not included in the politeness hierarchy for the present study as it very rarely appeared in each of the scenarios, if at all. As such, the subjunctive mood was categorized as 'Other'; however, its instances will be discussed in the upcoming results sections.

Participants in this portion of the study were enrolled in 2000 (intermediate) and 3000 (advanced) courses at this particular university.

Table 3.4: Pronominal Address Forms - Course Level

	Intermediate (ILs) (27)		Advanced (ALs) (17)	
Pronominal Address Forms	I	T – 51.9% (14)	I	T – 76.5% (13)
		V – 30% (7)		V – 11.8% (2)
		O – 22.2% (6)		O – 11.8% (2)
	II	T –63% (17)	II	T – 88.2% (15)
		V – 22.2% (6)		V – 6.9% (1)
		O –14.8% (4)		O – 6.9% (1)
	III	T – 66.6% (18)	III	T – 94.1% (16)
		V – 22.2% (6)		V – 0% (0)
		O – 11.1% (3)		O – 6.9% (1)
	IV	T – 37% (10)	IV	T – 41.2% (7)
		V – 37% (10)		V – 47.1% (8)
		O – 30% (7)		O – 11.8% (2)
	V	T – 55.6% (15)	V	T – 88.2% (15)
		V – 30% (7)		V – 6.9% (1)
		O – 18.5% (5)		O – 6.9% (1)

Table 3.4 indicates that the ILs responded to the scenarios by using the *T* form more often than the *V* form pertaining to every scenario except for Scenario IV. Both the *T* and *V* address forms were employed equally in this scenario amongst the ILs. While the ALs also chose *T* as their preferred address form in all but Scenario IV, there was not an equal distribution between the two forms. Instead, a greater number of ALs chose to respond using the *V* form. Although the variation amongst the ALs is only the difference of one AL as compared to those who chose this form over the *T* form, it is clear that Scenario IV exhibited the greatest amount of variation amongst both groups.

Scenario IV is also a point of interest in that the highest percentage of responses categorized as "O" were observed amongst both ALs and ILs. 28% of all requests in category O were found in this particular scenario. In addition, it is important to note that

not one set of responses of the final results could be categorized as only *T* or only *V* for any one scenario. As such, there was at least one such response in each scenario that was calculated into the O category.

Though Scenario IV has already been discussed regarding the comparison of the IL and AL learners' responses as they pertain specifically to the *T* and *V* address forms, it is also significant to state that there was a greater number of ALs that responded to the situations by using the *T* form in every one of the remaining scenarios. This may be attributed to various factors and influences. However, this supports my initial hypothesis that learners who have received more exposure to grammatical forms as well as how they function in their appropriate context will be able communicate in ways that are more native-like and therefore appropriate to the context. Below, Table 3.5 demonstrates similarities in the way learners responded to the scenarios on the DCT chosen for the present study.

Table 3.5: Hierarchy of Politeness - Course Level *(continued on pg. 58)*

		Intermediate (ILs) (27)		Advanced (ALs) (17)
Hierarchy of Politeness	I	CM – 33.3% (9)	I	CM – 11.8% (2)
		C – 14.8% (4)		C – 0% (0)
		PM – 22.2% (6)		PM – 70.6% (12)
		P – 14.8% (4)		P – 6.9% (1)
		O – 14.8% (4)		O – 11.8% (2)
	II	CM – 14.8% (4)	II	CM – 0% (0)
		C – 25.9% (7)		C – 35.3% (6)
		PM – 14.8% (4)		PM – 0% (0)
		P – 29.6% (8)		P – 58.8% (10)
		O – 14.8% (4)		O – 6.9% (1)
	III	CM – 25.9% (7)	III	CM – 0% (0)
		C – 25.9% (7)		C – 6.9% (1)
		PM – 14.8% (4)		PM – 52.9% (9)
		P – 18.5% (5)		P – 29.4% (5)
		O – 14.8% (4)		O – 11.8% (2)
	IV	CM – 11.1% (3)	IV	CM – 0% (0)
		C – 25.9% (7)		C – 29.4% (5)

		PM – 7.4% (2)		PM – 11.8% (2)
		P – 44.4% (12)		P – 52.9% (9)
		O – 11.1% (3)		O – 6.9% (1)
		CM – 29.6% (8)		CM – 6.9% (1)
		C – 29.6% (8)		C – 0% (0)
	V	PM – 22.2% (6)	V	PM – 76.5% (13)
		P – 7.4% (2)		P – 6.9% (1)
		O – 11.1% (3)		O – 11.8% (2)

Table 3.5 displays the verb forms that ALs and ILs chose to employ in response to each of the scenarios presented on the DCT. One noteworthy observation is the tendency of ILs to use the conditional mood (C&CM) regardless of what degree of politeness is appropriate to the context. Perhaps the fact that these learners had recently been exposed to the conditional mood weighs heavily in this matter. This is further justified by the ALs' tendency to not use conditional verb forms (C&CM). Overall, ALs only chose to make a request using the conditional form 17% of the time. This varies greatly from the requests made by the ILs in their choice to use the conditional mood 47% of the time.

Another unique element that emerged was observed in the scenarios in which the ILs chose to use the present tense verb forms (P&PM). Scenario IV is distinguished from the other scenarios on the DCT in that its contextual features would be expected to elicit a verb form that denotes a higher degree of politeness than the other scenarios. This expectation is borne out in the native speaker control data. However, a large number of ILs chose present tense verb forms for this scenario as opposed to trying to convey a higher degree of politeness evinced in the conditional forms. Specifically, this scenario yielded the highest percentage (51%) of present tense verb forms used by ILs than any other scenario. Perhaps this observation indicates that the learners recognized that the contextual features in this scenario were different than those of the other scenarios but

could still not produce linguistic forms to appropriately convey the pragmatic aspects of the language. On the other hand, ALs displayed higher percentages of usage of the conditional mood in this scenario than in all but one other scenario. This supports my hypothesis that ALs will be more able to make a request appropriate to a specific context.

3.3.4.2.2 Pedagogical Intervention

Table 3.6: Pronominal Address Forms-Explicit Instruction

		Without Instruction (27)		With Instruction (30)
Pronominal Address Forms	I	T – 51.9% (14)	I	T – 56.7% (17)
		V – 25.9% (7)		V – 26.7% (8)
		O – 22.2% (6)		O – 16.7% (5)
	II	T – 63% (17)	II	T – 60% (18)
		V – 22.2% (6)		V – 26.7% (8)
		O – 14.8% (4)		O – 13.3% (4)
	III	T – 66.7% (18)	III	T – 70% (21)
		V – 22.2% (6)		V – 16.7% (5)
		O – 11.1% (3)		O – 13.3% (4)
	IV	T – 37% (10)	IV	T – 40% (12)
		V – 37% (10)		V – 40% (12)
		O – 25.9% (7)		O – 20% (6)
	V	T – 55.6% (15)	V	T – 43.3% (13)
		V – 25.9% (7)		V – 36.7% (11)
		O – 18.5% (5)		O – 20% (6)

Table 3.6 shows that all learners considered Scenarios I, II, III, and V more informal contexts regardless of whether explicit instruction was given on this issue. However, Scenario IV produced similar results to those discussed in the previous section in that there was a significant variation compared to that of the other scenarios. In this case, both the control and experimental groups produced an equal number of *T* and *V* address forms.

By combining the total number of learners from both groups in the "O" category, Scenario IV was again the scenario that yielded the highest overall percentage (26%) of

learners who did not produce either of the address forms. As stated above, this issue will be examined more in depth in the final discussions of the results.

Also notable are the results that were derived from Scenario V within the group of learners that received instruction. Almost the same number of learners produced the *T* form as the *V* form. This data may potentially lend itself to the level of imposition (Brown & Levinson 1987), where the hearer may have to go out of his/her way to act on the request. In this case, it may depend on the distance that the hearer must travel to comply with the request.

My hypothesis was that the learners who had received explicit instruction would be more likely to use pragmatically appropriate address forms and verb forms based on a given context. In this case, the learners would be culturally knowledgeable about the formality of a context and represent this through the use of the appropriate address form. The data results demonstrate, however, that there appears to be no substantial difference between the groups.

Table 3.7: Pragmatic Hierarchy-Explicit Instruction *(continued on pg. 61)*

		Without Instruction (27)		With Instruction (30)	
Hierarchy of Politeness	I	CM – 33.3% (9)	I	CM – 30% (9)	
		C – 14.8% (4)		C – 13.3% (4)	
		PM – 22.2% (6)		PM – 20% (6)	
		P – 14.8% (4)		P – 13.3% (4)	
		O – 14.8% (4)		O – 20% (6)	
	II	CM – 14.8% (4)	II	CM – 13.3% (4)	
		C – 25.9% (7)		C – 23.3% (7)	
		PM – 14.8% (4)		PM – 13.3% (4)	
		P – 29.6% (8)		P – 30% (9)	
		O – 14.8% (4)		O – 20% (6)	
	III	CM – 25.9% (7)	III	CM – 23.3% (7)	
		C – 25.9% (7)		C – 26.7% (8)	
		PM – 14.8% (4)		PM – 16.7% (5)	
		P – 18.5% (5)		P – 20% (6)	
		O – 14.8% (4)		O – 13.3% (4)	

	IV	CM – 11.1% (3)	IV	CM – 10% (3)
		C – 25.9% (7)		C – 23.3% (7)
		PM – 7.4% (2)		PM – 10% (3)
		P – 44.4% (12)		P – 40% (12)
		O – 11.1% (3)		O – 16.7% (5)
	V	CM – 29.6% (8)	V	CM – 26.7% (8)
		C – 29.6% (8)		C – 26.7% (8)
		PM – 22.2% (6)		PM – 23.3% (7)
		P – 7.4% (2)		P – 10% (3)
		O – 11.1% (3)		O – 13.3% (4)

The results in Table 3.7 give insight as to whether explicit classroom instruction affects the politeness strategies learners employ through the particular verb forms under examination in this study. Perhaps one first interesting observation can be seen in the variation of responses in Scenario II. As noted in the results above, ILs tended to make heavy use of the conditional form (C & CM), likely due to the fact that it was a recent grammatical topic presented in their classes. While this may be one explanation as to why the conditional mood was chosen as the preferred verb form for this scenario, what is also notable is the difference between learners who received treatment and those who did not regarding this choice. As this group of learners had just reviewed all the verb forms presented in the hierarchy, it was surprising to find that the learners who received the pragmatic input did not take the opportunity to use the verb forms conveying a lesser degree of politeness. In this particular scenario illustrating two classmates of equal power in the classroom setting, one may have expected the learner to use either P or PM.

One salient observation that emerged supporting my hypothesis, however, was encountered in Scenario IV. Considered a situation that would call for verb forms reflecting a higher degree of politeness based on the variable of age, a higher percentage (74%) of learners who had received pragmatic training did predictably use these forms, as

compared to the proportion of those who had not (44%). These percentages derived from the number of times a learner chose to employ the three verb forms considered more polite (CM, C, and PM) versus the remaining 'bare' verb form (P).

3.3.4.2.3 Study Abroad

Table 3.8: Pronominal Address Forms: Study Abroad

	Participants (8)			Non-Participants (66)	
Pronominal Address Forms	I	T – 75% (6)	I		T – 57.6% (38)
		V – 12.5% (1)			V – 24.2% (16)
		O – 12.5% (1)			O – 18.2% (12)
	II	T – 75% (6)	II		T – 66.7% (44)
		V – 0% (0)			V – 22.7% (15)
		O – 25% (2)			O – 10.6% (7)
	III	T – 87.5% (7)	III		T – 72.7% (48)
		V – 0% (0)			V – 16.7% (11)
		O – 12.5% (1)			O – 10.6% (7)
	IV	T – 25% (2)	IV		T – 33.3% (22)
		V – 50% (4)			V – 47% (31)
		O – 25% (2)			O – 19.7% (13)
	V	T – 62.5% (5)	V		T – 57.6% (38)
		V – 12.5% (1)			V – 28.8% (19)
		O – 25% (2)			O – 13.6% (9)

Table 3.8 reveals that L2 learners who have spent time abroad produced more informal than formal grammatical forms for Scenarios I, II, III, and V. A greater quantity of formal grammatical forms was elicited in Scenario IV. Also, this graph indicates that overall, a greater percentage of grammar forms that were classified into the "Other" category were expressed by students who had not spent time abroad. This finding applies to all scenarios with the exception of Scenario I.

The results of the responses also show that a greater percentage of the *T* form was used over the *V* form in every scenario except Scenario IV. Excluding the data that was classified into the 'Other' category, the majority of learners who had spent time abroad

and as well as those who had not spent time abroad preferred the *V* form. These results suggest that learners who have participated in study abroad programs may not have an advantage over learners who have not regarding the acquisition of pragmatic competence.

These results are not in accord with my initial hypothesis that learners who have experience abroad will be more pragmatically competent than learners who have not. Perhaps a possible explanation is that these results were based on only a small sample of participants who had studied abroad. Therefore, one participant's responses had a great bearing on the final results and calculations in this process. Other factors that may have influenced this variable include the amount of time the learner has spent abroad, the purposes for which s/he traveled broad, and the amount of exposure the learner had in the L2 community. Knowledge of these factors may greatly affect the final results of studies similar to these. For this reason, these factors are discussed in depth in the review of literature.

Table 3.9: Hierarchy of Politeness- Study Abroad *(continued on pg. 64)*

		Participants (8)		Non-Participants (66)
Hierarchy of Politeness	I	CM – 0% (0)	I	CM – 27.2% (18)
		C – 0% (0)		C – 16.7% (11)
		PM – 75% (6)		PM – 22.7% (15)
		P – 12.5% (1)		P – 15.2% (10)
		O – 12.5% (1)		O – 18.2% (12)
	II	CM – 0% (0)	II	CM – 18.2% (12)
		C – 25% (2)		C – 25.8% (17)
		PM – 12.5% (1)		PM – 13.6% (9)
		P – 50% (4)		P – 28.8% (19)
		O – 12.5% (1)		O – 13.6% (9)
	III	CM – 0% (0)	III	CM – 15.2% (10)
		C – 0% (0)		C – 21.2% (14)
		PM – 50% (4)		PM – 28.8% (19)
		P – 37.5% (3)		P – 22.7% (15)
		O – 12.5% (1)		O – 12.1% (8)
	IV	CM – 0% (0)	IV	CM – 18.2% (12)
		C – 25% (2)		C – 21.2% (14)

		PM – 25% (2)		PM – 13.6% (9)
		P – 37.5% (3)		P – 36.4% (24)
		O – 12.5% (1)		O – 10.6% (7)
	V	CM – 0% (0)	V	CM – 22.7% (15)
		C – 0% (0)		C – 16.7% (11)
		PM – 62.5% (5)		PM – 33.3% (22)
		P – 12.5% (1)		P – 12.1% (8)
		O – 25% (2)		O – 15.2% (10)

Table 3.9 illustrates whether or not a learner's experience abroad affects the verb form s/he will choose to convey a certain degree of politeness when issuing a request. Observation of the data reveals that several patterns emerged. One striking recurring element that appeared in the data was that none of learners who had spent time abroad used the verb form considered the most polite in the hierarchy (CM), even though these learners had all had access to this form through their classroom language learning experiences. Furthermore, neither CM nor C was the preferred verb form of learners who had been abroad pertaining to any of the scenarios. One factor that may have influence in this matter is the location of the learner's experience. While there are trends that emerge regarding politeness norms within Spanish-speaking communities, it is clear that the range of these norms will vary from location to location (Schwenter 1993).

Also notable in this section is the use of *quisiera* as the selected verb form found in one of the responses of the participants in Scenario IV. As the only response classified in the category labeled 'O' for this scenario, it is noteworthy not because of the scenario in which it appeared (as Scenario IV has been notably mentioned pertaining to all the variables in this study) but because it was found in the response of one of the learners who had studied abroad. Perhaps this observation points to a correlation between a learner's experience in the L2 environment and his/her ability to perform a speech act, or

at the very least make a request, through a wide array of grammatical forms other than those to which s/he was exposed in the L2 classroom. This finding is perhaps a noteworthy observation in that this particular form was not chosen as a preferred verb form in any other scenario by any other participant. In addition, and of equal importance, is the ability of the learner to use this form as it relates to this particular scenario. As indicated based on the responses given by NSs in the pilot study, Scenario IV is a context that requires a verb form conveying a high degree of politeness. It may be assumed that the speaker is cognizant of this notion through his/her use of the subjunctive mood. Therefore, the aforementioned postulation, though based on only one portion of the data in this study, at the very least is left open to possibility.

Based on the data from the native speaker control group, these findings support my initial hypothesis that learners who have studied abroad have a higher degree of pragmatic awareness than learners who have not. However, (and noted above as well in the discussion of address forms), this section of the study, though significant, is relatively limited in that only 10% of the total participants in this study have experience in a study abroad setting.

3.3.4.3 Discussion of Results

Overall, there were several salient patterns and observations that emerged in this study. These results give insight into the ways that requests are made by learners with varying types of experience with the Spanish language. While some salient results emerged regarding the principal variables examined in this study, perhaps it would be inaccurate to conclude that, for example, the learner in the more advanced class level that receives explicit classroom instruction as well as spent time abroad possesses a higher

degree of pragmatic competence than the learner who has not had this experience. In any case, though, the results of this study do support that the acquisition of both linguistic and pragmatic competence are necessary to be a well-rounded speaker of Spanish. This can be observed by the inclusion of the "Others" category as part of the classification system in this study. Responses that were tabulated into this category do not necessarily indicate that a learner is not pragmatically competent. Perhaps the learner was aware of the general trends regarding politeness in Spanish-speaking communities but could not successfully communicate this knowledge by producing the "correct", or preferred grammatical forms. Perhaps the learner understands that s/he is able to convey a higher degree of politeness by using the conditional mood rather than the present tense, for example, but cannot necessarily produce its grammatically-correct form.

Discussion of grammatical forms perhaps leads to one other considerable element worth noting based on the results of this study. As noted in the coding and classification system in this chapter, there were several reasons as to why a response was placed into the Others (O) category. One grammatical feature that occasionally appeared pertaining to the verb forms were imperatives. Depending on what a speaker deems appropriate to a particular context, s/he may use an imperative as a request to get the hearer to do something. However, imperatives were not included in the classification system established in this study. This decision was made for the following reasons: First, the placement of question marks on the DCT's may have inhibited learners from using the imperative form; second, according to Koike's (1992) classification system, imperatives fall into the category of orders and not requests. Although they may be used to make a

request, they are still considered to be a separate subdivision within grouping of directive forms.

In this chapter, results of this study have been discussed in detail. However, just as significant and of particular interest to foreign language instructors are the inferences that can be made based on these results. In the following chapter, general conclusions will be drawn as they relate to the principal elements examined in the review of literature. In addition, the pedagogical implications and limitations of this study will be discussed.

CHAPTER 4. CONCLUSIONS

As goals of traditional language teaching approaches tend to emphasize learners'
mastery of the grammatical features of a language, the pragmatic aspects of the language
are frequently overlooked. The effects of this can be observed when language learners are
unable to successfully communicate in their L2 without cultural knowledge of what is
considered appropriate according to a particular context in the target language. They may
learn the hard way that complete mastery of the grammatical aspects of the language then
will not necessarily suffice for a successful communicative process to take place.

As a result, it is becoming increasingly difficult for language instructors as well as
L2 learners to ignore the dynamic and significant relationship between these pragmatic
aspects of language and their role in the acquisition of overall communicative
competence. For this reason, this topic receives a more considerable amount of attention
in current research regarding foreign language teaching and SLA. Many of the findings
that have emerged in the research have led researchers to look further into the learner's
varying levels of experience with the L2 and its degree of influence as it relates to the
pragmatic elements of the language. Focal points of these studies (and that which this
study has also explored) are the learner's experience as it relates to class level, his/her
study abroad experience, and the greater amount of exposure that contributes to the
experience of the learner by receiving explicit pragmatic input through pedagogical
intervention.

This study assessed the influence of learners' experience with the language by
looking at the learners' pragmatic abilities based on two aspects of politeness:
pronominal address forms and verb forms. Politeness is particularly relevant to this study

in that it is a socially-constructed phenomenon and can be expressed in a variety of ways. Requests, then, were a fitting speech act of choice as both aspects of politeness can be easily observed in the various linguistic forms used in forming requests by which the learner chooses to make them. By choosing one particular grammatical form, the learner can convey a degree of politeness that may or may not be appropriate to a social context. Whether or not the appropriate form is used may determine whether or not another interlocutor acts on the request. With regards to all of the complex factors surrounding pragmatic competence noted above, the issue of conveying a degree of politeness when making a request is not easy to explore fully.

By studying the requests made by students of Spanish, the complexities of this issue have been exposed and more completely understood. With regard to the initial research questions, the results of the study carried out in this thesis demonstrate that any one of these variables in question may lead to higher degrees of pragmatic competence. Though no conclusive results can be drawn, there was at least one scenario where the more experienced learner produced a more appropriate form according to the context. Pertaining to the variable of class level, ALs produced an address form more appropriate to the context in scenario IV. Observation of the data from the section examining pedagogical intervention as a variable reveals that the learners who received instruction responded to Scenario IV by using verb forms considered to be more polite, or pragmatically appropriate according to the NSs in this study. Lastly, results pertaining to the variable of study abroad reveal that more learners who had spent time abroad used a verb form (C) appropriate to Scenario IV.

In sum, there were no strong correlations between the independent and dependent variables as noted in the review of literature (chapter 2). As the results of this study differ compared to results of similar studies, perhaps further research regarding instruction versus experience in foreign language teaching is needed. Results of this study show that perhaps grammatical competence and pragmatic competence may develop separately and at differing rates. If this is the case, a starting point may be to examine other variables that influence the development of pragmatic competence.

While these results did not produce any substantial patterns pertaining to any of the specific variables examined, they will certainly aid in our understanding of pragmatic competence and the various factors that surround it. In addition, the findings of the study contribute to certain pedagogical implications that may be of significance pertaining to the classroom context. These implications are based on the findings of the study and the researcher's own personal language teaching experience.

A first implication of this study is that attention to pragmatic cues is necessary throughout the language learning process. Although the results in this study did not produce substantial evidence regarding pedagogical intervention, it must be noted that learners cannot be expected to grasp the pragmatic concepts behind grammatical forms based on one class period of explicit instruction. In this case, pragmatic instruction should be given beginning in lower class levels and should continue through advanced courses. Perhaps this aspect of language teaching is overlooked as language instructors seem to emphasize learning advanced grammar forms as the learner progresses to more advanced levels. Instead, instructors should provide learners with pragmatic input. More specific to this study, learners will be able to successfully make a request in a way that is

considered appropriate in the Spanish language. If instructors want learners to progress to higher levels of language proficiency, attention to linguistic as well as pragmatic forms is necessary.

While these implications pertain to what occurs within the classroom, a final implication is concerned with the aspect of this study that pertains to language acquisition outside of the classroom. If study abroad is considered to be an ideal context for language acquisition, instructors should encourage students by informing them of opportunities and advantages to participating in these programs. However, many students are unable to participate in these programs for a variety of reasons and may therefore feel that are thus at a disadvantage. As such, it is the instructor's responsibility to create a classroom environment that most closely resembles that of the L2. One suggestion may be to engage learners in cultural discussions pertaining to the socio-cultural norms of the L2. Afterwards, the instructor may create activities that require learners to communicate in ways that reflects the L2 norms. One common way of doing this can be an activity that requires learners to choose from certain linguistic forms that are used for certain speech acts.

4.1 Limitations

As with any study, there are always factors which limit the validity of the results obtained. A pilot study was conducted before the current study which led to a number of changes in the way the data for this study was collected and analyzed. However, even after pilot studies and data triangulation, limitations are many times unavoidable. In the present investigation, there are certain factors may have inhibited the overall success of the study.

71

The DCT used in this study proved to be a valuable tool in assessing the politeness strategies to make requests used by American learners of Spanish from a large number of participants. As discussed in Chapter 3, the DCT was a conducive to this study in consideration of the large quantity of participants. Despite its advantages, using a questionnaire to collect data has its limitations. The data collected using a DCT, as that which is gathered through any data collection procedure, can never be completely natural since it was elicited outside of context. In this way, the authenticity of the responses can never fully be verified. In addition, the format of the DCT may have caused confusion. In some cases, though they were few, participants seemed to misunderstand the goal of the DCT and left portions of the survey blank, perhaps due to oversight or unwillingness to disclose certain information. Perhaps if the information elicited in the DCT were collected in another way, there might have been less confusion and lack of response. Also significant is the uneven distribution of formal/informal contexts presented on the DCTs. Based on the NSs responses, four out the five scenarios elicited an informal response while only one question provided the student with the opportunity to apply the appropriate use of the *V* address form. As mentioned in section 3.2.4, two of the scenarios were excluded as they failed to produce results related to the two variables under examination in the study. Perhaps unfortunate to the circumstances of this study, one of the scenarios (Scenario VI) was intended to be another opportunity for learners to make a request appropriate to a formal context. On one hand, perhaps the DCT did not accurately assess the aspect of formality due to the lack of scenarios pertaining to the *V* form. On the other hand, however, choosing these scenarios may have aided in the assessment process as the learners may have recognized a pattern and become aware of the research

objectives. Finally, results may have been affected by the observer's paradox, where the NSs in this study are all living in the US and are involved in higher education. As such, they may have chosen forms they believed to be the most appropriate based on their experience with "textbook norms" rather than submitting responses that seemed natural in their individual dialects of the language.

Another limitation may be observed in the smaller sample of learners that had studied abroad. In general, only 10% of the total number of L2 learners had participated in a study abroad program. In addition, the background information of these learners did not reveal the motivational factors to spend time abroad (travel, immersion, etc.). Relevant factors in this matter such as the quantity of time the learner spent immersed in the language, then, could not be assessed.

4.2 Future Research

Suggestions for future research regarding the pragmatic competence of L2 learners include an analysis of the various factors surrounding pragmatic input in the classroom. One way to do this is through an evaluation of textbooks and the manner in which pragmatic material is presented. Textbooks, however, are not the only source of pragmatic input for the L2 learner in the classroom. The instructor's role and what s/he considers his/her role to be pertaining to pragmatic input would be of particular interest to this study. Future research may entail an examination of instructors' perceptions on explicit pragmatic teaching in the classroom setting.

Collectively, these future research suggestions will aid in understanding the various factors that facilitate pragmatic competence. Further research of these issues as well as those that have been examined in this study will bring us one step closer to

73

understanding all of the complex processes involved in SLA. These will be of great value

to language learners and instructors in their efforts to effectively teach and learn the

Spanish language.

REFERENCES

Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics. In G. Kasper, & K. Rose (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Dörnvei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*, 233-262.

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

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Hartford, B.S. Mahan-Taylor, R., Morgan, M. J., & Reynolds, D.W. (1991). Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversation. *ELT Journal, 45*, 4-15.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Hartford, B.S. (1993). Learning the rules of academic talk: A longitudinal study of pragmatic development. *Second Language Acquisition, 15*, 279-304.

Billmyer, K. (1990b). "I really like your lifestyle": ESL learners learning how to complement. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *6*, 31-48.

Braun, F. (1988). *Terms of Address: Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Brown, H. (2006). *Principles of Foreign Teaching and Learning* (5th Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Brown, J.D. (1988). *Understanding Research in Second Language Learning.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S.C. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1983). "From communicative competence to communicativelanguage pedagogy." In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication*. London: Longman.

Félix-Brasdefer, J.C. (2008). Teaching Spanish pragmatics in the classroom: Explicit instruction of mitigation. *Hispania, 91*(2), 477-492.

Fraser, B. (1975). Hedged performatives. In P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press. 187-210.

Fraser, B. (1978). Acquiring social competence in a second language. *RELC Journal*, *9*, 1-21.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *14*, 219-236.

Fraser, B. & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *27*, 93-109.

Freed, B. (1995). *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Fries, C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Golato, A. (2003). Studying Compliment Responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics*, *24*(1), 90-121.

Gorka, B. & Niesenbaum, R. (2001). Beyond the language requirement: interdisciplinary short-term study-abroad programs in Spanish. *American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese*, *84*, 100-109.

Grice, P. (1975). Logic in conversation. In P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts 3* (pp.41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Grimshaw, A. & Holden, I. (1976). Postchildhood modifications of linguistic and social competence. *Social Science Research Council*, *30*(3), 33-41.

Huth, T. (2006). Negotiation structure and culture: L2 learners' realization of L2 compliment–response sequences in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *38*, 2025-2050.

Hymes, D. (1971). On communicative competence. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. In C.J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.) (1979), *The communicative approach to language teaching* (pp. 5-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness, *Multilingua*, *12*, 13-50.

Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

King, J. (2009). Societal change and language history in Cervantes' *entremeses*: The status of the Golden Age *vos*. *Cervantes*, *29*(1), 167-196.

Klee, C. (1988). A discourse analysis of the oral language interactions of Spanish-English bilingual children in three environments. In R. Benya & K. E. Müller (Eds.), *Children and languages: Research, practice, and rationale for the Early Grades* (pp.142-154). New York: National Council on and International Foreign Language Studies.

Koike, D.A. (1992). *Language and Social Relationship in Brazilian Portuguese*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Koike, D.A. (1996). Transfer of pragmatic competence and suggestions in Spanish foreign language learning. In S. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language* (pp. 257-281). New York: de Gruyter.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Lafford, B. (2006). *The effects of study abroad vs. classroom contexts on Spanish SLA: Old assumptions, new insights and future research directions*. Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's. *Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 292-305). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Márquez Reiter, R. & Placencia, M.E. (2005). *Spanish Pragmatics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *12*, 403-426.

Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. London: Blackwell.

Morrow, K. (1981). Principles of communicative methodology. In K. Johnson & K. Morrow (Eds.), *Communication in the Classroom*. Longman.

Mühlhäusler, P. & Harré, R. (1990). *Pronouns and People: The Linguistic Construction of Social and Personal Identity*. Cambridge, England: Blackwell.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology*. London: Prentice Hall International.

Omaggio-Hadley, A. (2000). *Teaching Language in Context: Proficiency-Oriented Instruction*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Rintell, E. (1981). Sociolinguistic variation and pragmatic ability: A look at learners. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, *27*, 11-34.

Savignon, S. (1997). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice* (2nd Ed.), McGraw Hill.

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

Schwenter, S. (1993). Diferenciación dialectal por medio de pronombres: una comparación del uso de tú y usted en España y México. *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, *41*(1), 127-149.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J.R. (1977). A classification of illocutionary acts. In A. Rogers, B. Wall & J.P. Murphy (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Texas Conference on Performatives, Presuppositions and Implicatures* (pp. 27-45). Washington D.C.:Center for Applied Linguistics.

Skinner, B.F. (1957). *Verbal Learning*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Teichler, U. & Steube, W. (1991). The logics of study abroad programmes and their impacts. *Higher Education*, *21*(3), 325-349.

Terrell, T.D. (1977). A natural approach to the acquisition and learning of a language. *Modern Language Journal, 61*, 325-336.

Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. London: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX

DISCOURSE COMPLETION TASK

Instructions: Please read the following scenarios and write what you believe you would say in each scenario if you were faced with this situation in real life. Please write your responses **in Spanish**.

I.   En la universidad: Eres estudiante en la universidad y has perdido tus apuntes para el examen. Sabes que Evan, otro estudiante en la clase, siempre toma buenos apuntes. ¿Qué le dices?

Tú:

¿————————————————————————————?

Evan: Claro que sí. Aquí los tienes.

————————————————————————————————

II.   En la clase: El primer día de clase, el profesor quiere que todos los estudiantes elijan un compañero de clase con quien trabajar como pareja para todo el semestre. Te parece muy simpático el chico que se sienta al lado de ti. ¿Qué le dices?

Tú:

¿————————————————————————————?

Otro estudiante: ¡Por supuesto! ¿Intercambiamos correos electrónicos?

————————————————————————————————

III.   En casa: Te toca a ti lavar los platos. Sabes bien que tu madre se va a enfadar si no lo haces. Sin embargo, tu programa favorito en la televisión empieza en cinco minutos. De repente, recuerdas que lavaste los platos por tu hermana la noche antes. ¿Qué le dices?

Tú:

¿————————————————————————————?

Tu hermana: ¡Ni soñarlo! Ya tengo planes con mis amigos.

————————————————————————————————

IV.   En una casa de ancianos: Tú decides ser voluntario en una casa de ancianos. Para el Día de San Valentín, hay un banquete especial y decides ayudar con las bebidas. Te das cuenta que María, una vieja de ochenta años, necesita más agua. ¿Qué le dices?

Tú:
¿_____?

María: No, pero gracias, cariño. No tengo sed en este momento.

_____

V.   Por teléfono: Tú quieres ir a una fiesta esta noche pero tu madre no va a dejarte usar su coche. Sabes que Telba, tu mejor amiga, tiene espacio en su coche. Decides llamarla. ¿Qué le dices?

Tú:
¿_____?

Telba: ¡Claro que sí! ¿Te recojo a las diez?

_____

Please fill out the following information:

Age: _____

Sex: M   F

Birthplace (city and country) _____

Is Spanish the primary language spoken in your home?   Yes   No

Have you ever lived in a Spanish-speaking country?   Yes   No

If so, please indicate where you have lived how long you lived in this country.

_____   _____
Place   Duration of Time

VITA

Sarah Vitale is a native of Slidell, Louisiana, but currently resides in Madrid, Spain. She

obtained her Bachelor of Arts in Spanish from Southeastern Louisiana University in

August of 2006. Sarah began pursuing the Master of Arts in Hispanic studies in August

of 2006 at Louisiana State University, where she taught Spanish as a graduate assistant.

Her research interests are applied linguistics, second language acquisition, pragmatics,

and service-learning. Sarah will graduate in December 2009 with a Master of Arts in

Hispanic studies with a concentration in linguistics.