

March 2019

Pragmatics and Pedagogy in University Level Spanish Second Language Textbooks

Vanessa M. Cardenas

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



Part of the [Applied Linguistics Commons](#), [First and Second Language Acquisition Commons](#), [Semantics and Pragmatics Commons](#), and the [Spanish Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cardenas, Vanessa M., "Pragmatics and Pedagogy in University Level Spanish Second Language Textbooks" (2019). *LSU Master's Theses*. 4888.
https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/4888

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Master's Theses by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

**PRAGMATICS AND PEDAGOGY IN UNIVERSITY LEVEL SPANISH
SECOND LANGUAGE TEXTBOOKS**

A Thesis

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

in

The Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures

by
Vanessa Maria Cardenas
B.A., Louisiana State University, 2017
May 2019

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my family for all the unconditional love and support that they provided me through my master's program. Especially my parents Roberto Cárdenas and Lourdes Cárdenas who have always guided me in the right direction and who have always given me everything I need in life. Also, my siblings Roberto M. Cárdenas and María Cárdenas who have looked out for me, who have cared for me, and who have never stopped treating me like their baby sister.

I would also like to thank my all my friends who were always a text message away no matter what and who were always there for the laughs and support. Thank you, Nicole Chung, for always checking up on me and being a great friend. Thank you, Christine Song and María García de la Torre, for being my backbone throughout the program and for being more than just my colleagues, but for becoming my sisters.

I am also highly thankful for all the professors that I have had the privilege to be taught by at Louisiana State University during my undergrad and master's education. I would like to thank the professors who were part of my committee, Dr. Jeremy King, Dr. Jill Brody, and Dr. Rafael Orozco. Thank you all for your time, dedication, and patience with helping my thesis flourish to its best that it could be. Also, thank you Dr. Mattza and Dr. King for always providing me with the necessary advice and wisdom when needed. Each and every one of my professors have enlightened my life whether academically or personally.

Table of Content

Acknowledgements	ii
List of Tables.....	iv
Abstract.....	v
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1.1.Thesis Structure.....	2
Chapter 2. Literature Review.....	3
2.1. Learning versus acquisition.....	3
2.2. Rote learning vs. meaningful learning.....	15
2.3. How a classroom setting affects an L2 learner’s acquisition.....	16
2.4. Materials integrated with acquiring a second language.....	17
2.5. Foreign language textbooks.....	19
2.6. Interaction.....	22
2.7. Linguistics & pragmatics within L2Ts.....	22
2.8. Linguistic concerns within pragmatics.....	27
2.9. Speech acts in L2Ts.....	29
2.10. Address forms.....	34
Chapter 3. Methodology and Data.....	36
3.1. Research questions.....	36
3.2. Materials.....	36
3.3. Standards and the five ‘Cs’: Communication.....	38
3.4. L2Ts selection.....	40
3.5. L2Ts data collection.....	44
Chapter 4. Results and Discussion.....	45
4.1. Issues & L2Ts analysis.....	46
4.2. Comparison between L2Ts speech acts and native speaker productions.....	57
Chapter 5. Conclusion.....	62
5.1. Research questions.....	62
5.2. Summary.....	65
5.3. Limitations.....	66
5.4. Future Studies.....	67
References.....	69
Vita.....	75

List of Tables

3.1. L2Ts used in Investigation.....	42
3.2. L2Ts Centralized Focus.....	42
4.1. Speech act/Address Form Integration in L2Ts.....	45
4.2. Reference of Directives within the L2Ts.....	46
4.3. Reference of Refusals within the L2Ts.....	50
4.4. Reference of Apologies within the L2Ts	52
4.5. Reference of Address Forms within the L2Ts.....	53
4.6. L2T speech act strategies vs. Native speaker production for Directives.....	57
4.7. L2Ts speech act strategies vs. Native speaker production for Commissives.....	59
4.8. L2Ts speech act strategies vs. Native speaker production for Expressives.....	61

Abstract

This pragmatic and pedagogical investigation analyzes six university level Spanish second language textbooks (L2Ts) used in the classroom setting. The materials used in this investigation include three beginning level textbooks *Dicho y Hecho* (2012), *Experience Spanish* (2012), and *Puntos de Partida* (2012), and three intermediate level textbooks *¡Avance!* (2008), *Conexiones* (2010), and *Interacciones* (2013). The purpose of this investigation is to closely examine if the L2Ts communicatively present the speech acts of requesting, refusing, and apologizing, and address forms, with sufficient pragmatic context for the L2 learner to acquire native-like production. The results have shown that the speech acts under study and address forms are included within the L2Ts a majority of the time, but little no metapragmatic information regarding their strategic use is included in the explanations, examples, or activities to provide native-like production of typical native speakers.

Chapter 1. Introduction

This investigation analyzes the speech acts of requesting, refusing, apologizing, and well as address forms implemented within Spanish university level second language textbooks (L2Ts) used in the classroom setting. For a L2 learner to potentially obtain sociopragmatic competence in a classroom setting, the interaction between a second language textbook (L2T) and a student's ability to acquire and perform a target language can heavily rely on how the L2Ts presents the content. The L2Ts can either present the content using only language structure or can present the content pragmatically. To investigate whether L2Ts lack pragmatic knowledge by implicitly teaching the content from a grammar-only perspective, the beginning level L2Ts *Dicho y Hecho* (2012), *Experience Spanish* (2012), and *Puntos de Partida* (2012), and the intermediate level L2Ts *¡Avance!* (2008), *Conexiones* (2010), and *Interacciones* (2013) are analyzed qualitatively by year, publisher, level, and most importantly, by focus. The focus is important to this investigation, as it shows the L2Ts' statement of purpose, in how the L2Ts intend to teach linguistic and cultural information (including speech acts and address forms) to L2 learners. Regulated by the standards and guidelines of ACTFL, the L2Ts in this investigation either declare their focus to be the teaching approach of communication or the teaching approach of communication and culture. Thus, from the stated foci of L2Ts, the textbook should incorporate essential pragmatic concepts, explanations, and activities that prompt L2 learners to acquire an in-depth pragmatic competence of speech acts and address forms being taught in the classroom setting.

The L2Ts in this investigation were chosen due to their foci, date of publication, and level. The foci among the L2Ts were all similar to one another, making the L2Ts equally comparable in the context. The date of publication for the L2Ts are within a 10-year range, which can demonstrate if a significant change has occurred over this period of time. The level in the L2Ts was also an

important factor of the investigation. The content provided within each level, beginning and intermediate, could be compared to notice if either level includes more pragmatic knowledge than the other. Therefore, the tokens collected from the methodology and integrated into the results were meticulously examined, as the investigator explored the L2Ts for speech acts and address forms, within material that included over 300 pages of content per book. All the tokens and data collected from this investigation in the L2Ts were then compared to typical native speaker speech production to observe whether the L2Ts incorporate the speech acts and address forms with pragmatic knowledge on how to use them in Spanish.

1.1. Thesis Structure

This investigation continues with the second chapter which includes theoretical framework and reviews previous studies that are prominent and relate to the fields of pedagogy, applied linguistics, and pragmatics. At the end of chapter two, previous studies are reviewed which analyze speech acts from Spanish native speakers from different countries, that will be incorporated into the results section as a comparison to the L2Ts. The third chapter presents the methodology of this investigation, including three research questions, ACTFL's standards and guidelines, and the material that were comprised into the investigation. The results from the methodology chapter are discussed and described in a qualitative manner in the fourth chapter, along with the page number indicating the location of the speech acts and address forms. Lastly, the fifth chapter and final chapter will discuss the research questions from the methodology section. Then, an amplified summary of the investigation will be provided along with the limitations and goals for possible future studies.

Chapter 2. Literary Review

2.1. Issues in Second Language Acquisition

2.1.1. Learning versus Acquisition

An essential disparity to consider when analyzing a L2 learner's knowledge and ability to communicate in a second language is how the L2 learner has obtained a second language within a classroom setting using a L2T. There are two distinct concepts when it comes down to a achieving a second language as a L2 learner. The two concepts are identified as *learning* a second language and *acquiring* a second language. Krashen (1985) establishes a distinction between *learning* and *acquiring* a second language stating, "...acquisition occurs almost exclusively in 'naturalistic' (non-school) settings and learning in 'formal' (classroom settings), and that 'learned' language is only accessible through conscious use of the 'the monitor,' it will never have the automaticity of acquired language" (Waston-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003, p. 162). Krashen upholds his own hypothesis of *learning* versus *acquiring* by the role of input with the *Monitor Model*, inspired by the U.S. linguist Chomsky, who developed a view on innate second language acquisition. The controversial *Monitor Model* includes the acquisition-learning hypothesis, the monitor hypothesis, the natural-order hypothesis, the input hypothesis, and the affective-filter hypothesis. The acquisition-learning hypothesis defines the crucial difference between *acquisition* and *learning*; a L2 learner who has acquired a second language by *acquisition* has subconsciously picked up rules via a similar L1 acquisition process, while a L2 learner who has *learned* a second language focuses on their knowledge by applying rules consciously (Glisan & Shrum, 2006, p. 6). Krashen's (1982) theory of second language acquisition made the strong claim that comprehensible input results in acquisition (qtd. in Waston-Gegeo & Nielson, 2003, p.123), because of the total input the learner understands (Ellis, 1997, p. 38). As stated in his input hypothesis,

“acquisition occurs only when learners receive an optimal quantity of comprehensible input that is interesting, a little beyond their current level of competence ($i + 1$), and not grammatically sequenced, but understandable using background knowledge, context, and other extralinguistic cues such as gestures and intonation. The ‘ i ’ represents the current level of competence a L2 learner has, and the ‘ $i + 1$ ’ specifies the next level of competence a L2 learner should achieve, that is a little beyond their current level of competence” (Glisan & Shrum, 2006, p.16).

According to Krashen’s input hypothesis, teaching structure is the essential method when trying to reach an L1 level of acquisition for a L2 learner.

2.1.2. SLA Input and Output

From a second language acquisition (SLA) perspective, input can be understood as any specific type of grammar or relevant information a L2 learner will subconsciously comprehend; this information can contain numerous examples of linguistic variables: lexical, phonetic, syntactic, morphological, morphosyntactic, etc., to incite acquisition. Mimicking Krashen’s (1982) theory that input is sufficient for L2 acquisition, François Recanati (2006, p. 44) states, “syntax provides the input to semantics, which provides the input to pragmatics.” Initially, input was the stepping stone believed to aid a L2 learner in acquiring a target language (a language they are trying to learn)” (qtd. in Ellis, 1997, p. 144); grammar was the necessary solution for a being able to communicate in a second language. As research in pragmatics started to unfold, Cook (2003, p.503) agreed that students do not learn a L2 if no set examples are given of the target language to be encountered by the student. The only significant reason as to why input is relevant to an individual learning a second language is that it enables from to create a connection for background information of the target language (Wilson & Sperber, 2006, p. 608). Even though Krashen’s

central claim is that “language acquisition depends solely on ‘comprehensible input’ ... language is acquired through trying to understand what people are saying,” (Cook, 2003, p. 504) based of their production; using both structure and meaning. Fierce criticisms were made of Krashen’s model by McLaughlin (1987) and Cook (1993) including, importantly, that learners need to speak as well as listen (Swain 1986). Incorporation of input within a second language classroom is just the start of a L2 learner achieving acquisition in a target language. Swain’s (1985, 1995) output hypothesis concludes that Krashen’s (1982) input hypothesis is a necessary but insufficient condition for language development because learners need opportunities to produce output and to be able speak at a higher level of competence of the target language (Glisan & Shrum, 2006, 22). The production (output) of a second language and the capability to comprehend what is being said to the L2 learner is fundamental; input conveys linguistic information, while on the other hand, output determines the coherence and informativeness a L2 learner has attained (Butler, 2006, p. 508). Essentially, the output that a L2 learner generates, displays the pragmatic comprehension needed to thoroughly acquire a second language at a higher-level fluency.

Swain has argued that comprehensible output is required for successful second language learning (Gass, 2003, p. 227). Contextually, within SLA, output is defined as, “the language that is produced by the learner” (Hummel, 2014, p. 73). It is perceived not as way of creating knowledge, but as a way of practicing already existing knowledge (Gass, 2013, p. 356-7). For L2 learners within the process of acquiring a second language, input knowledge can be viewed as the underlying representation of the target language, whereas the output knowledge can be noted as a mental surface representation (Cohn, 2001, p. 211) or a behavior of the L2 learner producing a second language. To acquire the state of being able to perform a second language, such as an utterance including a speech act, a L2 learner must “adjust connecting strengths between input,

hidden, and output” (Macwhinney, 2001, p. 485). For example, from a pragmatic perspective, an “algorithm for speech act interpretation is given as input an utterance and produces as output the most probable dialogue act” (Jurafsky, 2006, p. 597) “necessary for a L2 learner to “semantically generate grammar” (Fauconner, 2006, p. 661) fluently in the target language being acquired. As Swain (1995, p. 128) states: “Output may stimulate learners to move from the semantic, open-ended nondeterministic, strategic processing prevalent in comprehension to the complete grammatical processing needed for accurate production. Output thus would seem to have a potentially significant role in the development of syntax and morphology (Gass, 2003, p. 227), pushing learners to their production as a necessary part of making themselves understood to be able to modify an utterance or form a new one. Therefore, “comprehensible output refers to a learner to being ‘pushed toward’ the delivery of a message that is not only conveyed, but that is conveyed precisely, coherently, and appropriately” (Swain, 1985, p. 249). Ultimately, Krashen’s input theory and Swain’s output theory, incorporated within a classroom setting will establish an infrastructure for the L2 learner to acquire a second language.

2.1.3. Interlanguage

Subsequently, once a L2 learner has achieved a consistent process of utilizing input and output simultaneously, a system called interlanguage will be developed for the target language. The term interlanguage reflects a mental system of L2 knowledge produced by a L2 speaker (Ellis, 1997, p. 32); it refers to the nonnative learner’s output and their underlying production (Gass, 2013, p. 526). Selinker (1994) recognized that L2 learners construct a linguistic system that draws not only on L2 knowledge, but also on the learner’s L1 knowledge, creating a unique linguistic system (Ellis, 1997, p. 33). Selinker (1974) also defines interlanguage as the developing language of the L2 learner that is systematic, dynamic, and continuously evolving due to five

cognitive processes: interference from a native language, effect on instruction, overgeneralization of target language rules, strategies involved in second language learning, and strategies involved in second language communication (Glisan & Shrum, 2016, p. 21). This occurs because of the elements in interlanguage that originate neither in the learner's native language or in the L2. Most importantly, the L3 that is shaped by the L2 learner's interpretation of any language can help impose a structure of the available linguistic data of L1 and L2, to formulate an internalized system (Gass, 2013, p. 11) with its own regularities (Hummel, 2013, p. 65). The L2 learners' interlanguage system is reconstructed by the L2 learner's input by concluding new hypotheses conceived from reading or hearing in a classroom setting.

Interlanguage is fundamental for a L2 learner to acquire the knowledge of pragmatics within the L2. The term pragmatics is defined as the study of how context and situation affect meaning; the unspoken implication of communication. The study of pragmatics "includes factors that determine how we choose certain language patterns in social interaction and what effect these choices have on our conversational partners" (Hummel, 2014, p. 154). As a result, interlanguage pragmatics studies the effects of context and situation on meaning across languages. Kasper (1998) defines interlanguage pragmatics as "the study of nonnative speakers' comprehension, production, and acquisition of linguistic action in L2, or put briefly, investigates how to do things with words in a second language, since patterns and structures vary from one language to another" (Hummel, 2014, p. 155). Interlanguage pragmatics is crucial for a L2 learner because it focuses on the acquisition and the use of pragmatic norms in a L2. Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) and Kasper (1998) mention that this is how L2 learners produce and comprehend speech acts, and how their pragmatic competence develops over time (Kecskes, 2014, p. 373). Hence, for L2 learners to be able to acquire their own interlanguage and be able to comprehend interlanguage pragmatics in the

classroom setting, L2T materials being used in the classroom need to implement enough input knowledge concerning the L2 norms of speech acts for L2 learners to understand pragmatically, then produce a target language output that is not significantly different from that of native speakers.

2.1.3.1. Interaction: Input and Output

As L2 learners process input given to them and then produce output, they are beginning to interact with a target language. The approach of interacting with a L2 results in language modification from being able to comprehend meaning to facilitate acquisition (Ellis, 1997, p. 140). Long (1996) claims that interaction facilitates L2 acquisition because it connects input, attention, and output in productive ways (Swain & Suzuki, 2008, p. 558). Interaction and L2 acquisition have been described by Philp (2009, pg.255) as seeking advancement in cognitive process for L2 learners' comprehension, processing, use of language, and how learners make sense of input, by manipulating language to express meaning, noticing form connections with existing explicit and implicit knowledge, and reformulating a L2 grammar system and use (Gass, 2013, p. 348). Correspondingly, there are benefits to interacting with a target language. Essentially, interacting with a L2 can modify input for comprehension, recognize language difficulties which become apparent, and differentiate between L1 and L2 are noticed (Gass, 2013, p. 387). A L2 learner can absorb input and can generate output, but without interaction the learner will not have communication opportunities in the target language (Lee & VanPatten, 2003, p. 16) which push the learner to develop a notion of pragmatics. "There is every reason to try and reconstrue the interaction between semantics and pragmatics" (Recanati, 2006, p. 456-7). Interaction emphasizes the importance of L2 acquisition where the learner becomes the focal point of analysis. Moreover, learning approaches for interaction used within classroom settings and in L2Ts need to be broadly informative to L2 learners since "language education shifts from inputs provided to the learner and

outputs required from the learner” (Lier, 2008, p. 602). More profoundly, this supports that L2 learners in the process of acquiring a target language tend to have different learning approaches as to how they notice knowledge.

2.1.3.2. Implicit and Explicit learning

Among L2 learners, there are two types of learning competences that occur through memory to help interlanguage development of pragmatics. L2 learners undergo implicit learning and explicit learning during the process of acquiring a target language. Implicit learning is a procedural memory enables L2 acquisition to occur. Paradis (2009) describes that throughout implicit learning, a L2 is acquired by focusing one’s attention on something other than what is internalized and is unconscious by being a type of automatic systematic and processing (Glisan& Shrum, 2006, p. 19). DeKeyser (2003, p. 314) defines implicit learning as the learner having no awareness of what is being learned. Gass (2013, p. 525) mentions that a L2 learner is acquiring knowledge of complex structures without noticing. As implicit learning is acquired by the L2 learner, Reber (1976) argues that learning implicitly is encoded in a form of unconscious abstract representations (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993, p. 26). Implicit learning lacks in variance of performance and retrieval for any linguistic context such as linguistic structures, phonology, morphology, syntax and lexical (Paradis, 2009, p.35). In each of these areas a considerable number of studies have shown that subjects can *learn* to use complex knowledge to perform on a variety of tasks without being aware of the exact nature of that knowledge (DeKeyser, 2003, p. 315). Since L2 learners are unaware of what is being learned, implicit learning is difficult to accurately test for any linguistic feature as the learner may not remember the information despite the amount of time exposure (Hummel, 2014, p. 84).

On the contrary, explicit learning is declarative and conscious to the L2 learner as they notice what is being acquired while trying to achieve a higher fluency in a target language. Explicitly, the term noticing is defined as the process by which L2 learners pay conscious attention to linguistic features in the input (Ellis, 1997, p.141); they are aware of L2 features such as vocabulary, grammar, etc. (Hummel, 2014, p. 258). That said, explicit learning takes place learned in a formal L2 classroom setting and memory is processed by being controlled (Glisan & Shrum 2016, p. 19). Explicit learning goes beyond textbooks rules for grammar and usage as it calls upon conceptual knowledge. This knowledge is an important process for a L2 learner as they are not focusing on correct versus incorrect grammar rules, but rather they are trying to include language choices to express an intended meaning; this plays a role in L2 acquisition and performance for the L2 learner (Glisan & Shrum, 2016, p. 19) as they are devising a mental representation, are searching for memory, and are forming and testing hypotheses about the target language (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993, p. 27). Therefore, as an instruction within a classroom setting and L2Ts, L2 learners should be provided with L2 pragmatic information as learners are “encouraged to find rules for themselves by studying examples” (DeKeyser, 2003, p. 314). Given these points, L2 learners would strive to build pragmatic competence with explicit learning in L2Ts, rather than relying solely on implicit learning.

2.1.3.3. Intentional and incidental learning

However, L2 learners do not only rely on memory approaches to acquire a target language. Other learning approaches that L2 learners incorporate are intentional and incidental. These two types of learning show how the L2 learners are acquiring a target language. Intentional learning focuses more on how the L2 learner has “awareness at the point of learning” (Hulstijn, 2003, p. 360). In other words, the L2 learner is deliberately attempting to commit new information to

memory (Hulstijn, 2003, p. 360) about a L2. For example, a L2 learner will deliberately commit themselves to memorizing thousands of words, their meaning, sound, spelling, and dozens of grammar rules (Hulstijn, 2003, p. 349). Specifically, this kind of learning takes place within L2Ts that only include linguistic information instead of pragmatic instruction. On the other hand, incidental learning is where the L2 learner has consciousness as an intent (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993, p. 27) to purposely acquire the L2. Incidental learning is defined as what takes place when “learners are focused on comprehending meaning rather than on the goal of learning new words” (Gass 2013, p. 209). Incidental learning benefits the L2 learner more than intentional learning as their pragmatic knowledge broadens. The process of “incidental” learning, involving the “picking up” of words and structures, can be under taken in a variety of communicative activities, reading and listening activities, during which the learner’s attention is focused on the meaning rather than on the form of language (Hulstijn, 2003, p. 349).

2.1.3.4. Universal Grammar

Another factor that is related to language acquisition pertains to the cognitive side of a learner. This abstract principle of universal grammar “triggers language development” (Hummel, 2014, p. 14). Universal grammar is explained as the set of innate principles and properties that characterize the grammars of all human languages (Hummel, 2014, p. 14). Chomsky (1965), a cognitive theorist and linguist, had initially observed that children are able to produce certain elements of language they know already, before even hearing them (Glisan & Shrum 2016, p. 13). By analogy, universal grammar is postulated as an explanation as to how learners come to know properties of L2 grammar that go far beyond input (White, 2003, p. 20). Chomsky then mentions that abstract principles comprise a child’s innate knowledge of language and guide of L1 acquisition (Ellis, 1997, p. 144). Therefore, Chomsky proposed that all humans are born with an

innate quality called the language acquisition device (LAD) that allows for the language acquisition to process. Chomsky also introduced the idea that the LAD contains abstract principles of language that are universal. Due to Chomsky's conclusions, linguists have referred to universal grammar to resolve what has been called the "logical problem of language acquisition;" for example, language learning would be impossible because the input data are insufficiently rich to allow acquisition to occur (Hummel, 2014, p. 14). In order for a L2 learners to be able to acquire a target language, they need to look beyond the linguistic system and acknowledge language forms that may be used in a given social setting in a L2 (Gass, 2013, p.164). It is possible that L2 learners do not have access to universal grammar because what they know of universal language is restricted to L1, developing a pseudo-universal grammar where L1 mediates knowledge of universal grammar (Gass, 2013, p.165) creating parameters. Chomsky (1986) claims that variable parameters have different settings in different languages (Cook, 2001, p. 500). The underlying theory is that some language input is necessary in acquisition in order to set the parameters that are univariable principles (Gass, 2013, p. 161) a of small set alternatives for a given grammatical feature (Hummel, 2014, p. 68). To explain, a parameter a L2 learner with the native language of English might have while trying to acquire the target language of Spanish, might be null subjects; whereas in English subjects are necessary and expressed to define who is doing the action of the verb, in Spanish, the verb conjugated suffixes define who is the subject of the sentence, omitting the subject pronoun. Therefore, L1 acquisition can hinder universal grammar for a L2 learner (Hummel, 2014, p. 69) which is why L2Ts need pragmatic material to avoid parameters in language acquisition.

2.1.3.5. L1 Transfer

Transfer is characterized as the carrying over of forms and meanings of one language to another. Odlin (1989) defined transfer as the influence resulting from the similarities and

differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously acquired (qtd. in Skehan, 2008, p. 411). Initially, L1 transfer carries characterizes from the L1 over to the L2 (Cook, 2001, p. 489-90), resulting in the process in which the L1 influences the acquisition of the L2 (Ellis, 1997, p. 140) or vice versa (Hummel, 2014, p. 264). Throughout the process of transferring from L1 to L2, interference may result (Skehan, 2008, p. 411) in the L2 of a learner. Interference is defined as the L1 in the L2 when it leads to an error, or vice versa. A L2 learner acquiring a target language can either hinder or help the learning process (Hummel, 2014, p. 21) during the transfer stage by developing products such as positive transfer and negative transfer. Positive transfer is a facilitatory product demonstrating correct, L2-like, output. It is defined as language transfer that that promotes acquisition of the target language (Ellis, 1997, p.142). However, negative transfer is an interference product demonstrating incorrect, non-like L2, output and is defined as language transfer that results in errors (Ellis, 1997, p. 140). Furthermore, during the process of language transfer, the products of omission, overuse, overgeneralization, and avoidance can occur. The production of omission occurs when there is a deviation in usage that arises when L2 learners leave out words or parts of words, such as leaving out articles necessary in the L2. Overuse refers to the over usage of linguistic features where some other feature is preferred in the target language, which may or may not cause errors. Overgeneralization results in errors as the L2 learners apply an interlanguage feature in a context in which it does not occur in the target language use (Ellis, 1997, p. 142). Avoidance may be caused by L1 transfer when specific target language features are under-represented in learner production in comparison to native-speaker production (Ellis, 1997, p. 137). That being said, even if there is full transfer or full access to the L2, learning may still not be successful (Gass, 2013, p. 178). If L1 and L2 represent

different choices from the same possibilities laid down by UG, the question of transfer is whether L1 settings carry over into the L2 knowledge (Cook, 2001, p. 499).

2.1.3.5.1. Cross-linguistic influence

The study of language transfer has been investigated in the field of applied linguistics, as evidenced by Weinreich (1953) who undertook a classic analysis of cross-linguistic influence (qtd. in Skehan, 2008, p. 411). Cross-linguistic influence in most recent literature is known as transfer that considers L3, L4, L5 etc., that might affect the L2 learners' acquisition. Cross-linguistic influence is defined as any language influence from the first to the second language, from one interlanguage to another, or from the second language back to the first language (Gass, 2013, p. 523). This refers to instances of phonological, lexical, grammatical, or other linguistic aspects that transfer from one language to another; more specifically, Odlin (2003, p. 437) points out that language transfer can affect all linguistic subsystems including pragmatics. That being said, cross-linguistic influences can affect comprehension as well as production (Hummel, 2014, p.139) when a L2 learner is trying to acquire a target language.

2.1.4. Fossilization

The phenomenon fossilization is a SLA term coined by Selinker (1972) referring to the aspects of the learner's interlanguage that appear remain permanently fixed as non-native like structures or sounds (Hummel, 2014, p. 259). In other words, it is the cessation of learning. There are permanent plateaus that L2 learners reach, resulting from no adjustment in some or all of their interlanguage forms (Gass, 2013, p. 524) or from negative transfer. Most L2 learners' interlanguages fossilize; many learners end up short of competence in the target language because the learner stops developing. Although some learners succeed in one target language, they may not in others (Ellis, 1997, p. 29, 139). As Selinker (1972, p.215) mentions, age does not matter

when fossilization occurs; there is no explanation or instruction as to why fossilizable structures tend to remain in L2 production; the fossilization can re-emerge in the productive performance of an interlanguage even after eradicated. For a L2 learner's errors to be considered fossilized, the errors would have to persist in the learner's speech for an extended period (two to five years, at the very least) in spite of varied interaction with native speakers in an environment where the target language is spoken as the L1 (Long, 2003, p. 489).

2.2. Rote learning vs. meaningful leaning in a L2 classroom

Rote learning and immersed learning are two types of learning approaches that L2 learners can encounter during the process of acquiring a target language. Rote learning is described as arbitrary and verbatim (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 68), relating to memorization. The material that is being learned for the target language is not being integrated into the cognitive structure of the L2 learner, therefore the material is being isolated into a piece of information without meaning (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 68); for example, learning vocabulary words by just memorization instead of knowing how to use them in context. For Krashen and Scarcella (1978), this means that rote learning involves "prefabricated routines" that are short, fixed-format, and equated with automatic speech (qtd. in Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003, p. 164). Rote learning is memorizing the L1 translation of an L2 word by oral or visual rehearsal, involving very little cognitive processing. Therefore, rote learning requires shallower processing, resulting in lower retention (Sagarra & Alba, 2006, p. 229). Thus, using rote learning as a form of acquiring a target language would be considered the least effective method in language acquisition as there is no pragmatic meaning; the material taught to the L2 learner would be memorized by repetition (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 68). On the other hand, there is meaningful learning, which acknowledges the implication of a target language. Meaningful learning is relating new information to what one already knows and

is integrated into a learners' cognitive system (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 68). A focus on meaningful learning is consistent with the view of learning as knowledge construction. To make sense of the meaningful learning approach, the learners should have a willingness to approach the new information with the intent to relating the content to what was already known. For example, a French L1 learner knows that descriptive adjectives agree in gender and number with the noun they modify so this knowledge could be used as an anchor idea to learn a target language such as Spanish (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 68-9). Therefore, meaningful learning requires instruction that goes beyond a presentation of factual knowledge and assessment tasks to require more of students than simply recalling or recognizing factual knowledge. In other words, when meaningful learning is the goal, then remembering becomes a means to an end, rather than the end itself (Mayer, 2002, p. 227).

2.3. How a classroom setting affects an L2 learner's acquisition

As seen in previous sections, learning approaches can incite or hinder a L2 learner's capability of acquiring a target language within a classroom setting. A classroom setting usually creates a division of acquisition when a target language is instructed because the target language taught to L2 learners may be somewhat modified by the teacher and/or a L2T. The modification that is carried out impacts the language that is available which the learners can understand or use to create hypotheses of the L2 (Gass, 2013, p. 399). It has been found that acquisition orders do not equate to instructional orders. For example, explicit grammar instruction does not follow "natural stages of development." Krashen (1982) mentions that explicit teaching in the classroom only creates a conscious monitor for the L2 learner, such as a "grammar police" (Lee & VanPatten, 2003, p. 129-131) and does not enhance language usage. This leads into Chomsky's distinction between competence and performance that define a learner's acquisition. Competence, according

to Chomsky, means having an intuitive knowledge of grammar, syntax, and how linguistic and language systems operate. This is in contrast with performance, which Chomsky claims is an individual's ability to produce language (Glisan & Shrum, 2016, p. 13). In other words, competence is what one knows, and performance is what one does. However, performance is observable compared to competence; for competence to be developed, maintained, and evaluated in a L2 learner, the process can only occur through performance (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 4) which is needed in the classroom setting. The purpose of communication language ability, or performing a language, is for a learner to express one's self and to understand others. This develops as learners engage in communication and not as a result of habit formation with grammatical items (Lee & VanPatten, 2003, p. 51).

2.4. Materials integrated with acquiring a second language

2.4.1. Authentic versus non-authentic material

Materials that are integrated into a classroom setting for L2 learners play an important role in aiding or hindering acquisition. One way of classifying material that enters the classroom setting focuses on authenticity or non-authenticity. Unauthentic material is defined as texts that tend to be "prepared, scripted out, and recorded by speakers of the target language" (Glisan & Shrum, 2016, p. 85). Since the material is not created by and for speakers of the target language, and only follow the L2Ts, it is viewed as inauthentic. This means the inauthentic material contains mostly grammar structures and is artificial and unnatural compared to the L2; pronunciation is deliberate, exaggerated, and slow (Glisan & Shrum, 2016, p. 85). Therefore, standards have emphasized the need for authenticity and being incorporated as much as possible in the classroom (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p.140, 188). Galloway (1998, p. 133) defines authentic texts as "those written and oral communications produced by members of a language and culture group for members of the

same language and culture group.” The purpose of authentic material is to communicate instead of teaching; how L2 learners achieve outcomes (Tomlinson, 2012, pg.162) using the authentic material. Authentic materials reflect a “naturalness of form and an appropriateness of cultural and situational context” found in the language as used by native speakers (Villegas Rogers & Medley, 1998, p. 468). For example, authentic materials include “realia, magazine and newspaper articles, literary excerpts, poems audio recording, videotapes, satellite broadcasts, radio programs, etc.” (Glisan & Shrum, 2016, p. 84-5). Authentic material provides L2 learners opportunities to see and hear real language and be introduced to the richness of culture (Glisan & Shrum, 2016, p. 85) from the target language, implementing meaningful context to the classroom. Since instruction for a L2 learner usually starts in a classroom setting, Rogers and Medley (1988) mention this is a way for the L2 learner to “experience the language as it is for real communication among native speaker.” Gilman and Moody (1984) support authentic materials being incorporated into the classroom setting for listening comprehension at beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels (qtd. in Karimi & Dowlatabadi, 2014, p. 845). By doing so, it has been shown that L2 learners demonstrate a significantly higher level of comprehension when classroom material is presented in an unedited, authentic form (Glisan & Shrum 2016, p. 189).

2.4.2. L2Ts

Second language textbooks (L2Ts) are intended to facilitate L2 learners’ acquisition when used in a classroom setting. Kramsch (1988, 63) mentions that L2Ts have a purpose of serving as “the bedrock of syllabus design and lesson planning.” More importantly, quoted by Orozco & Thoms (2014, p. 33), Roberts (1996) mentions that L2Ts are “the fundament” of L2 teaching and learning. L2Ts have been investigated to determine whether they are meticulously incorporating native speaker discourse or natural conversation for L2 learner production of native-like speech

(Orozco & Thoms, 2014, p. 28), enhancing pragmatic competence. Recent research shows L2 learners achieve a higher level of acquisition when grammar is integrated with processing and meaning (Aski, 2003, p. 57). Freeman (1995) seconds this argument as she states, “there is a connection between grammar and meaning.” In addition, she emphasizes that “grammar structures are more than forms” (Aski, 2003, p. 59). L2Ts are necessary for instructional planning and L2 learning, but do not hold value when supplying instruction with conversation activities or teaching foreign culture norms (Allen, 2008, p. 5). Bragger and Rice (2000) and Aski (2003) assert that “traditional grammatical considerations” are superior to context, meaning or function when deciding the organization of L2Ts. Bragger and Rice (2000, p. 110) point out that although L2Ts “change in design and format” year to year, there is a lack of “changes or transformations” that are crucial for acquisition foundation. In the same way, Dorwick and Glass (2003, p. 593) conclude that the changes arise on the exterior and name of the L2Ts, but the material content persistently stays the same or changes slightly (Allen, 2008, p. 6). Thus, to conclude the main idea of L2Ts in classroom settings, Aski (2003, p. 63) states the importance of how SLA research demonstrates a fault in L2 learner textbooks as students are continuously provided pattern practice activities (Allen, 2008, p. 7) instead of meaningful grammar use for a target language.

2.5. Foreign Language Textbooks

2.5.1. What is the function of the L2Ts?

It is typical that most second language classroom settings are required by a school’s administration to use a L2T for instruction. Therefore, the textbook is considered one of the most important materials used in the classroom (Altbach, 1991). Woodward (1989, p. 14) mentions that, according to previous studies, “L2Ts structure classroom instruction by 70% to 90%” as it is the main resource provided among instructors and L2 learners. Contextually, L2Ts are used to

implement a classroom syllabus; where teachers are expected to use the L2T ‘faithfully,’ relying on the content within the L2T to teach and assess students (Hardwood, 2014). However, the main function for the L2Ts should be to facilitate a subject matter, such as in a second language L2Ts where L2 learners should be guided into using a target language in a *creative* matter within different situations (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 115). Nevertheless, Bardovi-Harlig (2001) points out that "it is important to recognize, that, in general, textbooks cannot be counted on as a reliable source of pragmatic input for classroom language learners" (p. 25). Surveys have shown that teachers usually include outside material in a classroom setting to provide pragmatic instruction since L2Ts are unlikely to do so (Vellenga, 2004). That being said, college level L2Ts have a reputation for following a structure that are usually based off a grammar focus (Dorwick & Glass, 2003, p. 593). Even though textbooks have a communicative focus, some L2Ts are not providing meaning, form, and authentic language to L2 learners. The L2Ts used in the classroom and the lack of pragmatic input hinder L2 learners in becoming truly proficient in a target language, (Koike, 1989, p. 287) because there is no depth or elaboration being provided to learners (Woodward, 1989, p. 14).

2.5.2. Learners’ perspectives

An important factor regarding L2Ts that should be considered involves the L2 learners’ perspectives. It has been noted that L2 learners’ perspectives on L2Ts have not been widely researched, when in fact they are a valuable resource. Askilson (2009, p.23) quotes Tomlinson, (1998) stating that many L2 learners are dissatisfied with the L2Ts provided within a classroom due to certain limitations. A disadvantage of the L2Ts being used in the classroom relates to the idea of textbooks being “written for everyone and no one” with no actual meaning for what is provided in the content. Similarly, Bragger and Rice (2000) mention that L2Ts do not provide L2

learners with opportunities to discuss subjects of significance or topics that may seem outside of their social norms (Allen, 2008, p. 6) that help comprehend a target language's meaning. That being said, Parry (2000) mentions another drawback that can arise from not including meaning within the content provided to the L2 learner; there is no diverging from the textbook's-imposed control over "correct" utterances or to add new information about the real world (qtd. in Allen, 2008, p.7). For the L2 learner, there is a significance to the L2Ts that are being used within the classroom. Hall (2001) elaborates, "... they do not simply enhance an individual's development, but rather, they fundamentally shape and transform it" (qtd. in Allen, 2008, p.7).

2.5.3. Instructors' perspectives

Richard (2005) states that L2Ts are effective instructional materials that are developed according to certain elements (qtd. in Askildson, 2009, p.18). The most important element taken into consideration while establishing a L2T includes the teacher (Askildson, 2009, p. 19). So how do teachers perceive the L2Ts being used in the classroom? Bell and Gower (1997) mention that some teachers acknowledge that the L2Ts do permit time to facilitate learning for students, but do not incorporate useful production of materials (qtd. in Allen, 2008, p. 5) for communication. The L2Ts are recognized by the teachers as only including "lexical elements and grammar explanations" (Allen, 2008, p. 6) while trying to aid L2 learners in acquiring a target language. In reaction, teachers tend to change plans of action and improvise on the spot while teaching when material in the L2T does not follow a teacher's perspective on the topic (Askildson, 2009, p. 20). In the same way, teachers are provided with an instructor's edition of a L2Ts that includes concrete ideas (Allen, 2008, p. 6) on how to use the material in the classroom, but these typically only include ideas that relate to "saving time, giving directions, guiding discussion, and providing homework" to the L2 learner (Askildson, 2009, p. 21). As noted by the previous studies by Allen

(2008), and Askildson (2009), some L2Ts do not include pragmatic knowledge for L2 learners; instructors typically have to go above and beyond the L2T to incorporate material equipped with pragmatic relevance to the grammar structure being taught.

2.6. Interaction

2.6.1. Impact on L2 learner

Interaction within a classroom setting benefits a L2 learner while acquiring a target language. These benefits impact a L2 learner by conveying meaning and modification for a target language as an output result. This includes the L2 learners coming to differentiate between the target language being learned and their interlanguage, concentrating more on language form (Sydorenki, 2016, p. 235). Pragmatic instruction is effective for a L2 learner. Ren & Han (2016, p. 424) found that explicit pragmatic instruction is more beneficial than implicit pragmatic instruction. Explicit instruction aids the L2 learner in comprehending pragmatic elements and context, while implicit instruction only improves grammar production (Sydorenki, 2016, p. 234). Therefore, it is important for a L2 learner to “interpret and critically evaluate” the pragmatic cogency of a target language by engaging their metapragmatic awareness, (McConachy & Hata, 2013, p. 297) which can be defined as, “an anchoring devices locating linguistic form in relation to context, and a function that signals the language users’ reflexive interpretations of engaged activities” (Verschueren, 2000, p. 439).

2.7. Linguistics & Pragmatics within L2Ts

Hoffman-Hicks (1992, p. 66) states that “while linguistic competence has long been the focus of analyses investigating learners’ developing abilities, research on the acquisition of the socio-cultural aspects of language use has emphasized the crucial role pragmatic competence plays in successful communication.”

2.7.1. Linguistic competence

Linguistic competence, also called grammatical competence, is the ability to make meaning when using knowledge involving the structure of a language, such as the lexis, phonology, morphology, and syntax (Glisan & Shrum, 2016, p.14). L2Ts in the classroom setting rely heavily on linguistic competence, which are often unhelpful to a L2 learner because different speech act rules are not being introduced alongside their communicative intentions. More importantly, L2Ts published for the intended use of teaching a foreign language in a classroom are written with the curriculum writers' intuitions of idealized native speakers' linguistic speech acts (Ishihara, 2010, p.145), instead of providing authentic communication (Nguyen, 2011, p.19). Because of the lack of proper pragmatic knowledge from a L2Ts, a L2 learner must rely heavily on their linguistic competence, such as lexical forms, to mark their pragmatic intent (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p.175). Overall, L2 learners need to know not only linguistic competence to express a target language, but also should know the rules of use in order to produce speech acts suitably in conversation (Nguyen, 2011, p.19). As Hoffman-Hick (1992, p. 66) concurs, a L2 learner must acquire pragmatic competence, in addition to linguistic competence, to be able communicate effectively in a target language.

2.7.2. Pragmatic competence

Pragmatic competence is vital in a L2 learner's second language acquisition. Bardovi-Harlig (2001) mentions that previous research has shown that instruction without any pragmatic content negatively impacts the L2 learner in achieving pragmatic competence in a target language. Kasper and Rose (2002, p. 245) state that this should not be an issue for L2 learners as, "pragmatics can be learned before students begin to develop second language knowledge."

Omaggio Hadley (2001, p. 7) defines pragmatic competence as “the functional use of language (illocutionary competence; functional features of the language; expressing ideas and emotions) and knowledge of its appropriateness to the context in which it is used”. Furthermore, pragmatic competence explains how there is a relation between utterances and the functions that speakers intend to perform (Ren & Han, 2016, p. 424). This means that L2 learners should acquire the pragmatic competence of being able “to express meaning and intention” through speech acts to communicate (Nguyen, 2011, p.17). In doing so, a L2 learner will develop a fuller, deeper, and more reasonable perspective of language behavior in a target language (Mey, 2001, p. 12).

Pragmatic knowledge is under-represented in most L2Ts (Ren & Han, 2016, p.424). The L2Ts tend to not incorporate the necessary pragmatic input needed in a target language (Ren & Han, 2016, p. 435). This is especially the case with speech acts, which lack pragmatic information for their use; they can cause several problematic issues for a L2 learner while trying to acquire a target language (Ren & Han 2013, 424). One issue within a classroom setting, for a L2 learner, includes being provided with insufficient context when introduced to grammar (Hardwood, 2014). This is a serious concern as there is no pragmatic demonstration for a target language which in turn is being decontextualized in L2Ts (McConachy & Hata, 2013, p. 295). Another issue in the L2Ts includes introducing a limited range of speech acts (Vellenga, 2004) causing L2 learners to evaluate grammar knowledge more intensely than pragmatic knowledge (Kasper and Rose, 2002, p. 161). Without pragmatic knowledge, L2 learners do not acquire a target language appropriately with native like norms, and thus significantly from the native speakers in their pragmatic production and comprehension of the target language (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001).

2.7.3. Sociopragmatic vs. pragmalinguistic knowledge

The distinction between sociopragmatic studies and pragmalinguistic studies, for second language learning, is a critical aspect for learners in a classroom setting (Trosborg, 2010). Sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics, which differ from pragmatic comprehension and perception, involve the knowledge of production for pragmatic functions in communication which results in a L2 learner “appropriately performing a speech act with the same pragmatic knowledge as a native speaker would produce” (Trosborg, 2010). Sociopragmatics is defined by van Compernelle as, “the understanding of the conventions of ‘proper’ or ‘appropriate’ social behavior, including what to say to whom and when,” and it meditates the use of linguistic means (Sydorenko & Tuason, 2016, p.240). Sociopragmatics reveals the cultural norms which regulate interaction of a specific social group in a given context, including the ways in which native speakers modify their use of language contextually in communication. Significantly, this is an essential process for a L2 learner as an interaction between the speaker and the hearer is created and the context of an utterance is comprehended within communication (Márquez-Reiter & Placencia, 2005, p.192-3). On the other hand, pragmalinguistics incorporates the knowledge of linguistic means through actions that can be accomplished in communication. This includes strategies and linguistic forms when comprehending speech acts (Sydorenko & Tuason, 2016, p. 240). Through implicit instruction, pragmalinguistics can be taught to L2 learners because language form is not the focus: in comparison, explicit instruction provides metapragmatic information to a L2 learner to connect form to sociopragmatic meaning (van Compernelle et al., 2016, p. 343). If there is neither implicit nor explicit pragmatic instruction in L2T, sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic failure can occur. Sociopragmatic failure arises when a L2 learner has no comprehension of culture-specific aspects in a social context, and pragmalinguistic failure arises

when a L2 learners' L1 transfer is used to perform speech acts inappropriately in a target language (Márquez-Reiter & Placencia, 2005, p.193-4). Therefore, L2Ts should incorporate meaningful context about a target language. Márquez-Reiter & Placencia (2005) state that, "...by nature, pragmalinguistic failure is more noticeable than sociopragmatic failure" (p.195). Hence, it is necessary for L2 learners to obtain both types of pragmatic competence (Hoffman, 1992, p. 66).

2.7.3.1. Metapragmatic knowledge

Metalinguistic knowledge is defined as what a L2 learner knows, or thinks she/he knows, about a language; this relates to metalinguistic awareness, which includes metapragmatic knowledge (Gass, 2013, p. 527). Michael Silverstein (1993) mentions that metapragmatic knowledge is the pragmatic dimension of language (p. 39), which presupposes all linguistic communication that pertains to expressions and context (p.43). For a L2 learner, this indicates a process that assigns ways of interacting within a target language (McConachy & Hata, 2013, p. 298). Metapragmatic competence is necessary for a L2 learner and can be taught explicitly as it encourages communicative interaction (Silverstein, 1993, p.47). L2Ts can incorporate metapragmatic information which would explain pragmatic norms to a L2 learner, but typically, L2Ts do not provide information on how to use an utterance appropriately (McConachy & Hata, 2013, p. 296). Likewise, L2Ts used in a classroom tend to lack metapragmatic information that relates to speech acts; for example, speech acts may be mentioned but there is no discussion or elaboration on the usage in the target language (Vellenga, 2004). More importantly, with no metapragmatic information being implemented in L2Ts relating to discourse, L2 learners do not comprehend or do not clearly see its cultural significance within the target language (McConachy & Hata, 2013, p. 299). Therefore, as Vellenga (2004) mentions, L2 learners in a classroom "only get the opportunity to learn targetlike conversational norms from authentic models that represent

true forms of speaking; there should be a level of awareness in L2Ts that direct metapragmatic awareness of norms within a target language so a L2 learner can make appropriate choices as their level develops.”

2.8. Linguistic concerns within pragmatics

2.8.1. Basic Theory of Speech Acts

Speech acts are defined as actions performed using an utterance, in speech or writing, to communicate (Ellis, 1997, p. 143). This includes what one does with language and its functions (Gass, 2013, p. 530). These functions vary from complaining, thanking, apologizing, refusing, requesting, and inviting. The functions a language includes have a means of performing speech acts and a minimal perspective of performing a linguistic act. Speech acts convey a universality, but the form of the speech acts differ among cultures (Gass, 2013, p. 522). John Searle (1969, pg.16) states, “all linguistic communication involves linguistic acts that have a production or reassurance of a symbol, word, or sentence while performing a speech act.” Four kinds of acts exist, by Searle’s characterization from Austin’s speech act theory, which include an utterance act (uttering of words), a propositional act (referring and predicating), an illocutionary act (stating, questioning, commanding, promising, etc.), and a perlocutionary act (effect or consequence of an illocutionary act) (Searle, 1969, p.24). Therefore, speech acts revolve around the adequate balance of convention and intention between a hearer and speaker (Sadock, 2006, p.53).

Illocutionary acts are speech acts that we accomplish by communicating a speaker’s intent (Sadock, 1974, p.9). In *Principle of Pragmatics*, Leech (1983) mentions, “a performative occurs when a speaker needs to define a speech act as belonging to a particular category (p.181). Leech also states, “... a performative utterance derives its property as a performative from pragmatics...” (p.189). There are several ways in which a speaker may perform an illocutionary act; two of the

ways include performing directly and indirectly. Performing explicitly, or as a performative, is a straightforward method mentioning directly what a speaker is doing in an utterance; such as *I pronounce the defendant guilty* (Sadock, 1974, p.9). Meanwhile, performing a speech act indirectly creates a discrepancy between the utterance form and use creating an illocutionary force (Sadock, 1974, p.73). Searle (1975, p. 64) states, the "requirements of politeness normally make it awkward to issue flat imperative sentences or explicit performatives." Therefore, conventionality, derived from indirectness, refers to social interaction, where practice is based on general consent of behavior and meaning patterns, helping to establish pragmatic functions (Blum-Kulka, 1989, p.38). In brief, Searle (1975, p.76) mentions, "politeness is the most prominent motivation for indirectness in requests, and certain forms tend to become conventionally polite ways of making indirect requests."

Brown and Levinson's studies (1978) have been foundational to linguistic research within the field of politeness regarding rules for maintaining social harmony. Brown and Levinson's politeness theory is "the natural presupposition underlying all communication" and holds importance to the "notion of face within their framework" (Márquez Reiter & Placencia, 2005, p.154-5). The politeness theory of Brown and Levinson "assume that all competent adult members of a society are concerned with their face, the self-image they present to other, and they recognize that other people have similar face wants" (Márquez Reiter & Placencia, 2005, p.154-5). There are two notions of face according to Brown and Levinson's politeness theory; negative face and positive face. Negative face is a person's desire to be unimpeded by others and positive face is a person's wish to be desirable to at least some other person; there is an interest in face value to maintain each other's face. Then again, there are acts that do threaten the notion of negative and positive face that are called face-threatening-acts; these acts include directives and commissives,

which threaten negative face, and expressives, which threaten positive face. Therefore, face can be threatened during social interaction between a speaker and hearer due to social variables such as social distance, social power, and ranking of impositions (Márquez Reiter & Placencia, 2005, p.154-5).

2.9. Speech acts in L2Ts

Speech acts included within L2Ts can be limited or can be presented based on native speakers' intuition; therefore, it is possible that no explicit metapragmatic information on speech acts would be presented in the L2Ts (Ren & Han, 2016, p. 424). The L2Ts that only provide grammar models, associate speech acts with a grammatical form, teaching students there is only one way to construct an utterance. Speech acts can often be produced by several linguistic forms with differing illocutionary force; with no awareness of this information, the L2 learner does not achieve complete target language exposure and is at a disadvantage for acquiring a language pragmatically (Vellenga 2004). Thus, L2Ts should provide learners with an awareness of the pragmatic variation that exists in the target language (Ren & Han, 2016, p.425).

2.9.1. Directives

Directives are speech acts that are attempts by the speaker to get the addressee to do something such as requesting, questioning, ordering, etc. (O'Keeffe & Et. al., 2011, p.86). Requests are defined as pre-events acts; they express the speaker's expectation of the hearer with regards to prospective action (Blulm-Kulka & et. al, 1989, p.11). The main purpose of a request is for the speaker to communicate to the hearer that an action is desired from the addressee (Sadock, 2006, p.74). According to politeness theory, indirectness, in the case of requests, affects the head act of an utterance. On the other hand, tentativeness is applied in peripheral elements by making the utterance less forceful (Márquez Reiter, 2002, p.136). There are two types of indirectness

according to Blum-Kulka (1989, p. 42): conventional indirectness is pragmalinguistic by nature; the conventions include content and a linguistic form to develop a requested force and nonconventional indirectness that is propositional with content and linguistic force, as well as pragmatic force. To analyze the indirectness of a request, Blum-Kulka et. al. (1989, p.11-3) developed the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) to establish patterns and constraints among various languages; the CCSARP establishes cross-cultural variation, sociopragmatic variation, and interlanguage variation. Requests can be identified by their “head acts which is part of a sequence which might serve to realize the act independently of other elements and vary on two dimensions” (Blum-Kulka et. al., 1989, p.17-9). These dimensions include strategy type and perspective; the strategy types are classified on a nine-point scale by the CCSARP and the perspective indicates the role of the agent. The nine strategies are mood derivable (*Leave me alone*), performatives (*I am asking you to clean up the mess*), hedged performatives (*I would like to ask you to give your presentation a week earlier than scheduled.*), obligation statements (*You’ll have to move that car*), want statements (*I really wish you’d stop bothering me.*), suggestory formulae (*How about cleaning up?*), query preparatory (*Could you clear up the kitchen, please?*) strong hints (*You have left the kitchen in a right mess.*), and mild hints (*‘I am a nun’ in response to a persistent hassler*). The perspective can determine whether a request is speaker oriented (requests which emphasize the role of the agent; *Can I eat it?*), hearer oriented (requests which emphasize the role of the recipient; *Can you do that for me?*), inclusive (requests which include the speaker and the hearer; *Can we go now?*), or impersonal (requests which do not mention the speaker or the hearer; *It needs to be cleaned.*) (Blum-Kulka et. al. 1989, p.17-9). Query preparatory and suggestory formulae are strategies of conventional indirectness. Using the

CCSARP and the nine strategies of requests, several studies have been conducted to investigate the most commonly used request form in Spanish.

Márquez Reiter (2002, p.138) claims that, “conventional indirectness has proved to be the most preferred requesting strategy among several related and unrelated languages”. Also, Márquez Reiter (2002, p. 146-7) found that Uruguayan speakers of Spanish were more indirect compared to Spaniards; Uruguayans preferred the request of ‘*no sé si,*’ ‘*quería pedirte,*’ and ‘*quería saber*’; meanwhile, Spaniards preferred ‘*me preguntaba*’ and ‘*me gustaría saber*’ (p.146-7). Another study by J.César Félix-Brasdefer (2005) mentions that “overall, conventional indirectness was often conveyed by query preparatory containing reference to preparatory conditions as conventionalized in the Spanish language, and less frequently by the means of formulae.” The indirect requests were produced by using the conditional form of the verb *poder* to express politeness as in the verb *podría*. Le Pair (1996, p.663) also concurs that conventional indirectness in native Spanish speakers is more prominent with the use of *poder* + *conditional* by 30.8%; such as *podrías ayudarme?* Lastly, Blum-Kulka (1989, p.48-50) explains how Argentinean Spanish native speakers prefer conventional indirectness by the sub category of *can/could* by 68.5%. Hence, making requests can be a difficult speech act for L2 learners to acquire without pragmatic knowledge from an L2T, because both cultural and linguistic expertise are necessary, along with an elevated level of appropriateness in the target language (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984, p. 206).

2.9.2. Commissives: Refusals

Commissives are speech acts that commit the speaker to some future course of action such as promising, offering, threatening, denying, etc. (O’Keeffe & Et. al., 2011, p.86). Searle’s (1975) classification of illocutionary acts states, “commissives tend to be convivial rather than competitive, being performed in the interest of someone other than the speaker” (Leech, 1983, p.

106). Indicating that commissives are positive faced when referring to Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. Therefore, refusals can be achieved by rejecting a request which is usually a marked behavior; rejections are dispreferred responses that are complex (Levinson, 1983, p.308). There appear to be only a few studies on commissives regarding the target language of Spanish (Márquez Reiter & Placencia, 2005, p. 74).

According to Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990), "refusals are a major cross-cultural difficulty point for many nonnative speakers to acquire" (qtd. in Lauper 1997, p.4). The speech act of refusing is important to a L2 learner because the speaker will be declining a wish of the hearer; the L2 learner, while refusing, runs the risk of performing impolitely or offending the requester if not done in a culturally appropriate manner. That being said, a L2 learner should gain the knowledge of pragmatically saying 'no' that is expected in the target language since speech acts differ from culture to culture (Lauper, 1997, p. 4-5).

The study of Lauper (1997, p. 4-5) used the taxonomy of Beebe et al. (1990) to investigate Spanish speakers refusing. According to Lauper, the investigation found that most refusals, depending on a scenario of morality, social, power, education and finance used excuses/explanations (48.5%), stating the alternative (45.7%), criticizing the requester (69.8%), positive feeling (41.9%), acceptance (50%) and gratitude/appreciation (53.6%). Another study by J. César Félix-Brasdefer (2006) investigated a Mexican community in Tlaxcala, Mexico, which examined the linguistic strategies and perceptions of politeness among male university students with refusal interactions. Among the male speakers, negotiation of face is achieved by indirectness by means of (re)negotiating a resolution politely. For example, the indirect strategies collected from the participants included mitigated refusals such as *Creo que no es posible, no podría asistir,* and *no se puede,* and alternative refusals such as *por qué no salimos a comer la próxima semana.*

Overall, from previous investigations, L2 learners need to acquire indirect strategies of refusing in Spanish.

2.9.3. Expressives: Apologizing

Expressives are speech acts that express a psychological state such as thanking, apologizing, welcoming, congratulating, etc. (O’Keeffe & Et. al., 2011, p.86). An apology is defined as “a speech act which is intended to provide support for the hearer who was actually or potentially malaffected by a violation X” (Olshtain,1989, p.156). In an apology the speaker is willing to admit to humiliation, fault, and responsibility for the violation that occurred to the hearer. Therefore, as Brown and Levinson (1978) mention in their politeness theory, apologizing is face-saving for the hearer and face-threatening for the speaker. There are five strategies that can create an apology; two are categorized as general and three depend on situations. The two generalized strategies include using an Illocutionary Indicating Force Device (IFID), which is considered a routine apology, and an apology produced from the speaker’s responsibility admitting fault to the hearer. Olshtain. (1989, p. 168) concludes, “when a speaker chooses to use an IFID in order to realize the speech act of apology, he or she implicitly takes on responsibility for the violation, especially if the speaker’s perspective is expressed, e.g. “I’m sorry” or “I apologize” or “Forgive me”. However, in sincere apologies speakers often add an explicit expression of responsibility...”. The other three apology strategies are the explanation, the offer of repair, and the promise of forbearance that include semantic analysis of apologies. More importantly, apologies can be intensified or downgraded depending on the category performed by the speaker (Olshtain, 1989, p.156-8).

Previous studies have investigated apologies in Spanish, demonstrating a native speaker’s preference on how to perform an apology. Rojo (2005, p.75) concludes in her study that both male

and female participants performed an apology taking on responsibility and offering an apologetic repair in role-plays. Taking responsibility occurred 34.8% of the time within the role-plays, while offering repair occurred 30.4% of the time among the participants (Rojo, 2005, p.71). Another study by González-Cruz (2012, pg. 556), concurs with Rojo (2005) and Blum-Kulka (1989) stating, “the most frequent strategy among our respondents is that of ‘offering to apologize’ (41.5%), with an IFID, i.e., an explicit expression of apology like *Lo siento* (‘I’m sorry’). To conclude, apologies are necessary for a L2 learner to appropriately show wrongdoing on their behalf to a hearer in a target language.

2.10. Address forms

Brown and Gilman (1960, p.254), in their discussion of the European languages, introduced the abbreviations for T and V to distinguish between languages which employ a system of two pronominal address forms. T and V originally had no difference among a power, both abbreviations were singular, until a distinction developed through time where the T came to indicate intimacy and the V to indicate formality (Brown and Gilman, 1960, p.255). B&G (1960) base their address theory off power and solidarity. Power is defined as a relationship between at least two persons which is nonreciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behavior. These areas of address include physical strength; wealth; age; sex; an institutionalized role within the state, the army, or within family. Solidarity is defined as the general relationship between two people and is symmetrical (Brown & Gilman, 1960, p. 257). Address forms can include either a familiar/ intimate pronoun or a distant/polite pronoun; for example, Spanish differentiates between *tú* and *Usted* (Jucker & Tavvitsainen, 2003, p. 1). *Tú* derived into various languages from Latin and addresses a singular interlocutor, and *Usted/ustedes* refers to a form derived from a third person honorific such as *Vuestra(s) Merced(es)* (Mey, 2001, p.272-3).

Additionally, address forms can include a range of forms such as pronouns, nouns, verb forms, and other affixes. There are various nominal address forms such as names, kinship terms, titles, military ranks, and occupational terms. The address forms can vary among languages and even within one language; this occurs with the culture of a language when new address forms replace older forms creating the modern system (Jucker & Tavvitsainen, 2003, p. 1-2). Therefore, it is critical that a L2 learner acquires diverse types of address forms used in the target language to be able to understand the relevance between power and solidarity in cultures.

Chapter 3. Methodology and Data

In this investigation, six second language textbooks (L2Ts) used in a university level classroom are analyzed to determine how speech acts in the target language of Spanish are presented to the L2 learner. This analysis of the L2Ts will investigate and determine whether the Spanish textbooks chosen for the classroom setting have implemented explicit instruction of pragmatic knowledge that would help L2 learners develop a sense of sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competence, therefore, strengthening L2 production to develop near native speech in communication. The following investigation will explore practical information about the L2Ts, from a pragmatic perspective, to evaluate whether the L2Ts are engaging L2 learners in understanding a meaningful and contextual communication in the target language using speech acts appropriately in Spanish.

3.1 Research Questions

The investigation will include the following research questions, which will be elaborated on within the results and conclusion:

1. Do the L2Ts present each speech act for the L2 learner; if so, how?
2. Does a difference exist among the speech acts provided in the L2Ts pertaining to the level, year, publisher, and focus?
3. How do the examples provided for the speech acts within the L2Ts compare to the speech acts of native speaker's production?

3.2. Materials

3.2.1. ACTFL Background

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL) promotes L2 proficiency in the classroom setting for acquiring a foreign language. Founded in 1967 by the

Modern Language Association (MLA), ACTFL focuses on issues of teacher preparation and gauges instruction, and curriculum development (Glisan & Shrum, 2016, p. 2) for foreign languages being taught within the United States. As ACTFL developed through the years, the ACTFL Provisional Proficiency Guidelines were published in November 1982. The ACTFL Provisional Proficiency Guidelines were a step in the right direction towards being able to define and describe levels of functional competence for the academic context within a foreign language classroom (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 9). The proficiency guidelines set by ACTFL establish goals and design outcomes for language learning at various levels, which promotes and integrates better instruction and enhances communication. Within the classroom setting, communicative strategies were enhanced for what was being taught to L2 learners within a classroom regarding what to do with a target language (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 10). As a result, ACTFL has defined and measured speaking, listening, reading and writing abilities for foreign languages. In doing so, these measurements for a L2 learners' abilities ranges from the levels of novice, intermediate, advanced, and superior (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 14). Consequently, as Joiner (1986,1997) states, "ACTFL fosters an interest in authentic material" to promote a higher range of proficiency in the classroom (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 178). ACTFL guidelines are common goals for the foreign language classroom, but most importantly, they incorporate profound outcomes of instruction (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 458) for a L2 learner to measure their acquisition of a target language. Therefore, using the ACTFL Provisional Proficiency Guidelines for foreign language instruction can implement direction and focus for a comprehensive concept of proficiency as an organizing foundation (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 33) for L2Ts in the future.

3.3. Standards and the five ‘Cs’: Communication

In addition to the ACTFL proficiency guidelines, standards for learning a second language are set for classroom activities. On November 18, 1995, during an ACTFL meeting, a standard project introduced the Standard document for foreign languages. This document includes the *Standards for Foreign Language* which develops and envisions “an outline for the content of instruction” (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 35). The *Standards* engage “a set of interconnected goals that emphasize using language for communication with other people, gaining understanding of other cultures, and accessing information in a wide range of disciplines” (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 38), which enhance a L2 learner’s pragmatic competence. The interconnected goals are known as the *Five Cs* of foreign language learning. The *Five Cs* set by the ACTFL *Standards* are *Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities*, which provide a gauge for improvement in education to be able to determine the best approach and reasonable expectations for a L2 learner (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 36). For reference, these are the *standards* provide guidelines for classroom settings for foreign languages:

1. **Communication** – Communicate effectively in more than one language in order to function in a variety of situations and for multiple purposes.
 - a. **Standard 1.1:** Learners interact and negotiate meaning in spoken, signed, or written conversations to share information, reactions, feelings, and opinions.
 - b. **Standard 1.2:** Learners understand, interpret, and analyze what is heard, read, or viewed on a variety of topics.
 - c. **Standard 1.3:** Learners present information, concepts, and ideas to inform, explain, persuade, and narrate on a variety of topics using appropriate media and adapting to various audience of listeners, readers, and viewers.

2. **Cultures** – Interact with cultural competence and understanding.
 - a. **Standard 2.1:** Learners use the language to investigate, explain, and reflect on the relationship between the *practices and perspectives* of the cultures studied.
 - b. **Standard 2.2:** Learners use the language to investigate, explain, and reflect on the relationship between the *practices and products* of the cultures studied.
3. **Connections** - Connect with disciplines and acquire information and diverse perspectives in order to use the language to function in academic and career related situations.
 - a. **Standard 3.1:** Learners build, reinforce, and expand their knowledge of other disciplines while using the language to develop critical thinking and to solve problems creatively.
 - b. **Standard 3.2:** Learners access and evaluate information and diverse perspectives that are available through the language and its cultures.
4. **Comparisons** - Develop insight into the nature of language and culture in order to interact with cultural competence.
 - a. **Standard 4.1:** Learners use the language to investigate, explain, and reflect on the *nature* of language through comparisons of the language studied and their own.
 - b. **Standard 4.2:** Learners use the language to investigate, explain, and reflect on the *concept* of culture through comparisons of the cultures studied and their own.
5. **Communities** - Communicate and interact with cultural competence in order to participate in multilingual communities at home and around the world.
 - a. **Standard 5.1:** learners use language both within and beyond the classroom to interact and collaborate with their community in the globalized world.

- b. **Standard 5.2:** learners set goals and reflect on their progress in using languages for enjoyment, enrichment, and advancement (World-Readiness Standards for Learning Language, 2015, p. 9).

These *Standards* go beyond comprehending “the linguistic system and can establish “subcomponents of language competence” (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 38). Most importantly, the *Five Cs* put forth an accessible approach for teachers and students to obtain proficiency goals when the L2Ts are constructed to “reflect those goals directly” (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 460). Hence, the *Standards* are a source to improve foreign language education and guide the future for development of curricula and material (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 38) for L2 learners to gain a general “awareness of how languages and cultures work and how languages reflect the perspectives and cultural framework” of native speakers who use them (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 39). The ACTFL standards are an important aspect when creating or analyzing a L2T because they provide the foundation of L2 acquisition for the *Five Cs*, such as communication and culture, which the L2Ts in this investigation have as their focal point. Since the national *Standards of Foreign Language Learning* incorporated the modern communicative methods in L2 teaching, most L2Ts have striven to achieve the necessary standards for L2 learners to communicate effectively in a target language.

3.4. L2Ts Selection

The L2Ts investigated in this study include six Spanish university level textbooks used for instruction and L2 guidance in a classroom setting. This investigation focuses on the content intended for English-speaking lower-level learners who are taking Spanish as a second language class at a university. The L2Ts examined follow the ACTFL standards and guidelines discussed above to help L2 learners achieve a higher proficiency of the target language. Each L2T chosen

for a classroom setting is oriented in different language approaches for enhancing L2 learners' skills; some have an approach of more than one focus, such as grammar, writing, reading, listening, culture, or communication. The foci of the L2Ts are used as a strategy to integrate goals and objectives within the classroom setting. Therefore, a learning environment is established by the L2Ts used in the classroom, which provides instruction methods to aid L2 learners' acquisition of a target language.

In this investigation, the books *¡Avance!* (2nd edition), *Conexiones* (4th edition), *Dicho y hecho* (brief-edition), *Experience Spanish* (1st edition), *Interacciones* (7th edition), and *Puntos de Partida* (9th edition) are analyzed from a pedagogical and pragmatic perspective. The factors that will be explored within the L2Ts from the pedagogical stance include the year of publication, the publisher, the level, and the focus. From the pragmatic approach, the focus of the L2Ts and the speech acts implemented within the content will be analyzed to determine whether the L2 learners are receiving enough pragmatic knowledge to be able communicate proficiently in the Spanish target language.

The factors analyzed in Table 1 distribute three main ideas significant to this investigation:

1. The year of publication includes a five-year range difference between the oldest and the most recent L2Ts.
2. The publishers observed from the L2Ts include Pearson Education, John Wiley & Sons, McGraw-Hill Education and Heinle Cengage Learning.
3. The levels within this investigation will be categorized at the novice and intermediate range of the L2Ts, using three L2Ts from each level. The L2Ts *Dicho y hecho*, *Experience Spanish*, and *Puntos de Partida* are within the novice range. The L2Ts *¡Avance!*, *Conexiones*, and *Interacciones* are within the intermediate range. The novice range indicates that a L2 learner

can communicate information on very familiar topics using a variety of words, phrases, and sentences that have been practiced and memorized. The intermediate range indicates that a L2 learner can communicate information and express their own thoughts about familiar topics using sentence and series of sentences (World-Readiness Standards for Learning Language, 2015, 60).

Table 3.1. L2Ts used in Investigation

L2Ts (edition)	Year of Publication	Publisher	Level
¡Avance! (2e)	2008	McGraw-Hill Education	Intermediate Spanish
Conexiones (4e)	2010	Pearson Education	Intermediate Spanish
Dicho y hecho (brief-e)	2012	John Wiley & Sons	Beginning Spanish
Experience Spanish (1e)	2012	McGraw-Hill Education	Beginning Spanish
Puntos de Partida (9e)	2012	McGraw-Hill Education	Beginning Spanish
Interacciones (7e)	2013	Heinle Cengage Learning	Intermediate Spanish

Table 3.2. L2Ts Centralized Focus

L2Ts (edition)	Focus
¡Avance! (2e)	Communication
Conexiones (4e)	Communication and Culture
Dicho y hecho (brief-e)	Communication
Experience Spanish (1e)	Communication
Interacciones (7e)	Communication
Puntos de Partida (9e)	Communication

Table 2 demonstrates the orientation of the L2Ts. The focus of the L2Ts are found and justified within the preface section of the textbook. Five out of six L2Ts purport to have a focus on

communication, while *Conexiones* has a focus of communication and culture. These commonalities of focus and level make the six textbooks highly comparable. Each L2T provides a statement of purpose as to why their book is considered either a communication focus or a communication and culture focus.

1. *¡Avance! (2e)*: “The overall goal of *¡Avance!* is the development of functional, communicative language ability, accomplished through reinforcement, expansion, and synthesis (p.xiii).
2. *Conexiones (4e)*: “...retains all the hallmarks of the title; a unique and thorough grammar scope and sequence; careful progression of activities for all skills, and a focus on student involvement, participation, and exchange. The new edition, however, introduces exciting new chapter themes and new takes on familiar themes, a new Conéctate section focusing on the 5 C's of the *National Standards...*” (p. xii). This statement of purpose incorporates the 5 C's of the national Standards, which seen above, includes communication and culture.
3. *Dicho y hecho (brief-e)*: “Provide students with abundant input of new forms and structures before moving them smoothly through guided practice to output. This empirically proven language teaching methodology informs activity sequences through the entire program” (p. xii). This statement of purpose mentions the L2T will guide students to practice output, which is the L2 learner producing or communicating within the target language.
4. *Experience Spanish (1e)*: “Experience a program that motivates students to develop their communication skills” (p.vi).
5. *Interacciones (7e)*: “Is a complete intermediate Spanish program that emphasizes an interactive, communicative approach to the teaching of language and culture. The *Interacciones* program adheres to the goals of the national *Standards of Foreign Language Learning* and stresses the teaching of the 4 skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing

within the interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational modes of communication” (p. AIE-9).

6. *Puntos de Partida (9e)*: “*Puntos* motivates students to develop their communication skills” (p. vi.)

Both focal points observed within this investigation shadow the ACTFL standards which mention L2 learners will be able to communicate effectively while interacting with cultural competence.

3.5. L2Ts Data Collection

After being chosen, all the L2Ts were examined for pragmatic information about speech acts and address forms within the content. These speech acts included: directives (specifically, requests), commissives (specifically, refusals), and expressives (specifically, apologies). The address forms analyzed are the formal and informal use of pronouns (*tú, Usted, vos, etc.*) and other address forms that the L2Ts introduce as titles (*señor, señora, señorita, etc.*). These speech acts and address forms were chosen for this investigation because the L2Ts’ design typically does not provide information on how to use an utterance appropriately or in a native like scenario (McConachy & Hata, 2013, p. 296). The speech acts and address forms were approached with the intent of investigating whether explicit instruction and pragmatic knowledge were provided within the L2Ts content. The purpose of the L2T analysis was to collect tokens, examples, and data which may or may not have included pragmatic features for classroom instruction provided to L2 learners. These tokens, examples, and data were collected from the L2Ts, by searching the content of each textbook to ensure that all mentions of the speech acts and address forms in question were taken into consideration.

Chapter 4. Results

This section of the investigation will demonstrate the tokens found and then discuss the tokens in relation to the information discovered in the L2Ts: *¡Avance!* (2e), *Conexiones* (4e), *Dicho y hecho* (brief-e), *Experience Spanish* (1e), *Interacciones* (7e), and *Puntos de Partida* (9e). Firstly, the tokens accumulated will exhibit which L2Ts include the speech acts and the address forms being investigated. Then, there will a discussion of the speech acts and address forms pertaining to their location within the L2Ts and pragmatic analyses on how the material is introduced within the content. Lastly, there will a sociopragmatic examination of how the content of the speech acts and the address forms provided in the L2Ts compare to authentic production of those pragmatic elements from Spanish native speaker from previous pragmatic investigations.

Table 4.1. Speech act/Address Form Integration in L2Ts

L2Ts (edition)	Speech Acts			Address Forms	
	Directives:	Commissive: Refusal	Expressive: Apologies	Pronouns	Other Forms
<i>¡Avance!</i> (2e)	✓	-	-	✓	-
<i>Conexiones</i> (4e)	✓	-	-	✓	-
<i>Dicho y hecho</i> (brief-e)	✓	-	✓	✓	✓
<i>Experience Spanish</i> (1e)	✓	-	-	✓	-
<i>Interacciones</i> (7e)	✓	✓	-	✓	✓
<i>Puntos de Partida</i> (9e)	✓	-	✓	✓	✓
Total	6	1	2	6	3

Table 3 Key:

✓ : Mentioned within the L2Ts

- : No mention within the L2Ts

After the textbooks had been selected and investigated, the total tokens of the speech acts and the address forms were collected to authenticate whether the material was integrated within the L2Ts' content. As table 3 shows, the speech act of directives and pronominal address forms were all included among the six L2Ts. On the other hand, the speech acts of refusing and apologizing, as well as other address forms, were not as frequently incorporated for the L2 learners' L2Ts. Although directives are included within all L2Ts, only 1 out of the 6 textbooks incorporated the speech act of refusing, which is one possible response to a request. Only 2 out of the 6 L2Ts included the speech act of apologizing, even though it is essential for the L2 learner to know how to show fault within the culture of a target language. The distinction between the address forms of the formal and informal pronouns were provided within all of the L2Ts context, but only 3 out of the 6 textbooks incorporated other address forms for the L2 learners to use when addressing a person by titles, occupations, etc. Each speech act and address form categories within the L2Ts were analyzed from a pragmatic perspective to describe how each context is presented for the L2 learner.

4.1. Issues and L2Ts Analysis

4.1.1. Directives

Table 4.2. Reference of Directives within the L2Ts

Directives	
L2Ts (edition)	Page #s
¡Avance! (2e)	311
Conexiones (4e)	259
Dicho y hecho (brief-e)	382
Experience Spanish (1e)	205, 341, 484
Interacciones (7e)	287
Puntos de Partida (9e)	368, 531

Directives among all the L2Ts were integrated at least once within the content provided to the L2 learners. Within the L2Ts, the directives were either introduced in a similar or contrasting matter. A crucial aspect that was examined among the L2Ts was how the context included the speech act pragmatically. Overall, only 2 out of the 6 books instructed the directives via direct forms instead of using conventional indirectness, which is the most common native speaker formulation of the speech act. For the majority of the books, the directives were taught implicitly and linguistically to the L2 learners by only including grammar equations for structuring, charts with the conjugations, brief or no explanations, and few to no activities that supported the speech act with meaningful pragmatic knowledge for communication.

Although each L2T was similar to a certain extent, the directives introduced within the content had a few differences due to the grammar structure, the explanations with examples, and activities provided to reinforce and produce the speech act. In the L2T *¡Avance!*, the conditional mood (*hablaría*) and future tense (*hablaré*) were introduced on page 310, but there was no information regarding forming a request until page 311 where a side note called *A Propósito* briefly introduced polite requests equivalent to *would* in English. *¡Avance!* (2008: xvi) states in the preface of the L2T, “A Propósito boxes in lengua sections that point out important aspects of the Spanish grammar that will be helpful to the students not only as they work through intercambios activities but throughout their study of Spanish.” Despite the explanation of purpose for *A Propósito*, the request speech act was only mentioned once, providing two conjugations, such as the conditional (*Podrías*) and the past subjunctive (*Pudieras*), that only provided one example for each with no background or meaningful content for the L2 learner acquire. The *A Propósito* side bar provided a rapid and implicit insight in forming a request; specifically, with no elaborated content or examples, and no practice of production.

The L2T *Conexiones: Comunicación y cultura* introduced requests via the conditional mood. On page 259, there is chart layout of the verb conjugations (-ar, -er, -ir) for the conditional and the five brief explanations for its appropriate use; one of them explicitly stating how ‘to express a request in a courteous manner’. The strategy of an indirect want and query preparatory is provided to the L2 learner and there is only one sentence as an example in Spanish (*Me gustaría, podría*) with a translation in English. Following the speech act, throughout the rest of the chapter, no sections further elaborated on the conditional to form requests. Although the L2T examples implemented the conditional mood as a native speaker would, there were no activities involving communication production, no expansion of the example within the explanation, and no content relating to the request speech act for a deeper comprehension.

In the L2T *Dicho y hecho*, the speech act of formulating a request is implicitly instructed within the discussion of the subjunctive mood. On page 382, the subjunctive mood provides an instruction of the direct use of a mitigated want statement such as (*Yo*) *Quiero que vayas a la fiesta* which lessen the directness of stating a speaker’s desire towards the hearer. The section of the L2T provides the L2 learner with a brief and implicit explanation that follows with an example that mentions how ‘to express someone’s wish, desire, preference, recommendation, request, or suggestion.’ The example given is translated in English, but only a grammar structure showing the linguistic equation of ‘*request + que + subjunctive form*’ is provided with no activities or dialog to follow within the chapter to integrate production for communication.

The L2T *Experience Spanish: Un mundo sin límites* (2012), mentions the request form on 3 different pages throughout the material. The first mention of a request form in this L2T is on page 205, where a *nota comunicativa* is included after the formal commands. The L2T states in the preface that section of *nota comunicativa* provides the “learners to have the opportunity to use

Spanish to communicate their own ideas, as they are more motivated to excel” (p.vii) in communication. The *nota comunicativa* briefly introduces the conditional (*Me gustaría*) and the imperfect subjunctive (*quisiera*) to make a polite request while ordering in a restaurant. These two forms provide indirect want statements instead of a query preparatory strategy like common native speakers use in speech. Furthermore, the examples do not present explicit instruction for practicing communication among the L2 learners. The second page that includes the request form is page 341 where it is introduced with the present mood of the subjunctive. Only a grammar structure of ‘*querer + que + the present*’ and two examples are provided with no context. In this implicit instruction, requesting with ‘I want’ is considered a want statement with a desire, which is not typical native-like speech. Although the pragmatic knowledge is missing, the book does include three activities (reading, writing, speaking) to practice the usage of this form of requesting on pages 342 and 343. In addition, on page 483, there is a discussion of the conditional mood that includes a brief explanation of ‘would do’ and conjugation charts, and, on pg. 484, there is an explicit section for the conditional used in conjunction with the verbs *poder* and *gustar* which are mentioned as being used to soften requests and making suggestions politely. Even though an example is given for the L2 learner, there is no practice from activities or dialogs to aid comprehension and production of the request.

In the L2T *Interacciones*, the request speech act is mentioned on page 287. On this page, the L2T proposes the conditional mood with the grammar structure of adding the -er and -ir endings of the imperfect aspect to a regular infinitive verb. There is a grammar explanation and conjugation charts for the -ar, -er, -ir, and stem changing verbs, which leads into an introduction of the request form stating, “the conditional can also be used to soften a request or criticism.” Preceding the brief explanation, there is an example (*Podría Ud. decirme...*) translated in English

and a section on the side with certain words that can be used with making a request such as *me gustaría, querría Ud., podría Ud., debería* and *sería mejor*. The example of *sería mejor* is the only one of a suggestory formula which is the other strategy for a the conventionally indirect method. Even though this L2T includes conventional indirectness as the method of forming a request, there are no explicit explanations or activities that follow the introduction of the speech act to help students acquire pragmatic knowledge of how native speakers request.

The L2T *Puntos de Partida* includes two references of the request form on pages 368 and 531. On page 368, the chapter introduces expressing desires and requests with the present subjunctive mood. There are explanations, examples, and grammar structures such as the ‘*indicative + que + subjunctive*’ (*prefiere + que + lleguen*) to produce the speech act. There are explicit activities with meaningful content that helps students further comprehend requesting, but there is no mention of conventional indirectness in which includes the two forms of query preparatory and suggestory formulae. Then on page 531, requesting is again briefly introduced with a small explanation and two examples that use the past subjunctive mood of *querer* as ‘*Quisiéramos*’ and ‘*Quisiera*’ to express the speech act. A few communication activities are provided along with the grammar point, but the strategy presented to the L2 learner for requesting is considered to be a direct method in a native speaker’s speech.

4.1.2. Refusals

Table 4.3. Reference of Refusals within the L2Ts

Commissive: Refusals	
L2Ts (edition)	Page #s
¡Avance! (2e)	-
Conexiones (4e)	-

(table cont’d)

Dicho y hecho (brief-e)	-
Experience Spanish (1e)	-
Interacciones (7e)	85, 172
Puntos de Partida (9e)	-

The speech act of refusals was only included in one out of the six textbooks investigated. The intermediate level L2T, *Interacciones*, was the only book that included the commissive of refusing for the L2 learner. The content that included refusals within the L2T included ‘phrases to decline an invitation’ on page 85 and ‘phrases to refuse a request’ on page 172. Page 85 of the L2T includes refusal phrases that use excuses and mitigate the force of denying; these refusals being taught to the L2 learner include *me encantaría, pero....., qué lástima, pero....., Cuánto lo lamento / lo siento, pero....., en otra ocasión será*, and *Quizás la próxima vez*. This section within the chapter includes contextual information as the speech act is being introduced along with extending and accepting invitations. There is a model dialog provided before the reference of the invitations and two communication activities that help deepen the comprehension of the L2 learner. Then, on page 172, the phrases being taught also teach the L2 learners to use an excuse or mitigating effect while refusing with phrases such as *¡ay, qué pena! pero....., Creo que me va a ser difícil porque...., Cuánto lo lamento, pero creo que no voy a poder... porque....., and a ver si puedo*. These refusal phrases also include a model dialog before being introduced and then have two communication activities afterwards for the L2 learners to try and produce the speech acts within a given scenario. The L2T *Interacciones* was able to, more or less, explicitly, unveil the speech act for refusing in Spanish. Since it has been mentioned that refusing can be difficult for a L2 learner to acquire, L2Ts should introduce the speech act to promote sociopragmatic knowledge that varies along the lines of refusing in a target language’s culture. Especially since the speech act of requesting is introduced within the L2Ts, L2 learners, as the speakers of the target language, should learn how to respond

appropriately whenever they want to say ‘no’ without exacerbating the rejection towards the hearer which is not common or courteous in Spanish.

4.1.3. Apologies

Table 4.4. Reference of Apologies within the L2Ts

Expressives: Apologies	
L2Ts (edition)	Page #s
¡Avance! (2e)	-
Conexiones (4e)	-
Dicho y hecho (brief-e)	9
Experience Spanish (1e)	-
Interacciones (7e)	-
Puntos de Partida (9e)	5

An apology is a significant speech act that is necessary and impactful in communication in various languages. This expressive speech act is vital for a L2 learner as it can indicate regret, sympathy, and respect to a hearer during an appropriate situation. The L2Ts *¡Avance!*, *Conexiones*, *Experience Spanish*, and *Interacciones* do not include any instruction of indicating apologies. The only two L2Ts that include a mention of apologies are *Dicho y hecho* on page 9 and *Puntos de Partida* on page 5. The section in *Dicho y hecho* called ‘Expresiones de cortesía’ provides six expressions such as *con permiso*, *perdón/discuple*, *lo siento (mucho)*, *por favor*, *(muchas) gracias*, and *de nada*. Each expression has its own explanation translated in English, but no explicit communication activities follow the expressions to provide the L2 learner with more input for comprehension. The L2T *Puntos de Partida* presents a section called *nota comunicativa* within the section of ‘Saludos y expresiones de cortesía’ that includes more courteous expressions. One of the expressions implemented within *nota comunicativa* is *perdón*, which is translated to mean

‘pardon me’, and ‘excuse me’ (to ask forgiveness or to get someone’s attention). Although both L2Ts present explicit apologies which are deemed to be more native-like, neither section of the L2Ts contribute any explicit instruction, explanation, or activities of the expressions presented for the L2 learners acquire.

4.1.4. Address Forms

Table 4.5. Reference of Address Forms within the L2Ts

Address Forms		
L2Ts (edition)	Informal vs Formal: Page #s	Others: Page #s
¡Avance! (2e)	23, 112	-
Conexiones (4e)	191, 193	-
Dicho y hecho (brief-e)	12	6
Experience Spanish (1e)	5, 15	-
Interacciones (7e)	A-14	A-14
Puntos de Partida (9e)	5	5

This section will analyze and explain which L2Ts include an interpretation of the formal and the informal address pronouns *tú* and *Usted*, and whether the explanations are explicit for better comprehension. Also, within this examination of the L2Ts, other address forms such as titles or professions have been investigated to observe whether they are presented to the L2 learner. The distinction between *tú* and *Usted* is essential for a L2 learner as it shows sociopragmatic awareness/knowledge of being polite and comprehending the cultural difference of addressing in Spanish.

In the L2T *¡Avance!*, an explicit explanation on page 23 presents the difference between *tú*, *Usted*, and *ustedes*. This information is provided with the subject pronouns as they are being introduced with the present indicative. The information presents a clear elaboration of *tú* and *Ud/s*.

(or spelled traditionally as *vd/s*). There is also the section called ‘A Propósito’ that further explains the distinction between *tú* and *vos* as they are being compared to one another. Then, on page 112 indications can be found within the formal commands that explain that *Ud./uds.* makes the command more formal or more polite. Although the address forms are included in two sections, only the discussion of subject pronouns provided a meaningful pragmatic explanation with examples.

The L2T *Conexiones* presents two sections within the grammar content of the ‘formal and informal commands’ and the ‘informal commands.’ Pages 191 and 193 provide a brief explanation for the address forms. The section on page 191 presents the L2 learner with simple information stating that, the commands in Spanish “have different forms for the formal (*Usted/ustedes*) and informal (*tú/vosotros/as*).” This information does not explicitly elaborate as to why the different forms exist. But on page 193, the information provided goes into further detail of how *ustedes* versus *vosotros/vosotras* commands vary among Latin countries and Spain. Besides this small focal point on these two pages, this L2T does not provide any other content about the address forms explaining the difference among the subject pronouns.

The L2T *Dicho y hecho*, on page 6, briefly introduces other address forms such as *señora* and *señorita*. This information is included in the section of ‘nota de lengua’ where the explanation specifies that there is no equivalent to *Ms.* in Spanish; only the titles of *señora* and *señorita* exist. There is no other reference or further explanation that mentions when either title is used. Secondly, on pg. 12, the subject pronouns are discussed and charted, along with an explanation of the verb *ser* and a translation to go along with it. The L2T directs attention to how *vosotros/as* is only used in Spain and *ustedes* is formal in Spain, but how *ustedes* is both formal and informal in Hispanic America. The interesting observation within this L2T focuses on how the further elaboration of *tú*

and *Usted*, and *vos* and *tú* are only provided within the side notes of the teacher's edition and not included within the content for the L2 learner. This indicates that the information needs to be specified by the teacher; if this is not done, the students do not become aware of the differences that exist between the subject pronouns *tú*, *Usted*, and *vos*.

The subject pronouns in the L2T *Experience Spanish* begin on page 5 of the first chapter. There is a section called '*nota cultural*' titled *addressing people in formal and familiar situations* that is included with '*los saludos, las presentaciones y las despedidas*' that goes into explicit elaboration of the subject pronouns *tú* and *Usted*. Unlike the majority of the L2Ts, this section provides context with the explanation and includes a brief activity, with scenarios, for L2 learner to practice differentiating between the pronouns. Then on page 15, all the subject pronouns are introduced with a chart with the verb *ser* and their translated meaning in English. Although this section does not explain elaborate details of each subject pronoun, it does include examples of address forms for a group of all women, a mixed gender group, and the difference between *ustedes* and *vosotros/vosotras*.

The intermediate level L2T *Interacciones* does not include a section of the subject pronouns with the chapters to be taught, but it does present an extended explanation of the pronouns in the Appendix section. On page A-14, the appendix includes a page called 'Addressing other people in the Spanish speaking world,' where explicit elaborations of English examples, Spanish examples, and the pronouns *tú*, *Usted*, *ustedes*, *vosotros/as*, and *vos* (only mentioned within *Interacciones*) are deeply explained for the L2 learner; although there are no activities for communication, this is the only L2T which includes a section in the appendix explaining the pragmatic knowledge behind the pronouns, which the beginning level L2Ts should include when first observing the subject pronouns.

In *Puntos de Partida*, both subject pronouns *tú* and *Usted*, as well as other address forms are presented within the content. On page 5, a chart is provided analyzing the formal and informal concepts of *títulos*, *saludos*, and *preguntas*. In the chart, within the section of *títulos*, five titles are introduced to the L2 learner; the titles include *señor*, *señora*, *señorita*, *profesor* and *profesora*. Each title has an English translation and an ‘¡*ojo!*’ box includes that there is no equivalent of the English use of Ms. in Spanish. Two rows down within the charts, after the *saludos*, the *preguntas* section includes two conversations which are formal and informal respectively. The formal conversation includes *Usted* being used and the informal conversation includes *tú*. The difference between the conversations are color coded in red; this highlights the uses of the subject pronouns and how they are conjugated. The chart is good visual reference for the students, but there is no explicit explanation that differentiates the use of the formal and the informal. Only a side note in the teacher’s edition suggests that the instructor mention to the L2 learners that the titles presented should not be capitalized and that it is optional to introduce to the L2 learners that the titles *don* and *doña* can also be used in a formal situation. While the L2T does include an explicit example of when to use the subject pronouns and the titles, there is no explanation of the sociolinguistic aspect of how the subject pronouns can vary in different countries.

4.2. Comparison between L2Ts speech acts and Native Speaker Production

This section of the results will pragmatically analyze and discuss how the L2Ts introduced each speech act for the L2 learners and how native speakers of Spanish perform the speech act for the intention of communicating appropriately within their language and culture. Each chart provides the indicated strategy used within the L2Ts and the native-like production that previous studies have investigated; to thoroughly understand each example of the charts, the examples provided within the L2Ts have been included, along with an example of the native-like speech.

Table 4.6. L2T speech act strategies vs. Native speaker production for Directives

Speech Act: Directives		
	L2Ts Content	Spanish Native Speaker Production
Requests	<p><u>¡Avance! (2e):</u> Indirect Query Preparatory: the conditional</p> <p>Indirect mitigated want: the imperfect subjunctive</p> <p>i.e. ¿Podrías dejar de fumar?</p> <p>i.e. ¿Pudieras dejar de fumar?</p>	<p>Indirect Query Preparatory:</p> <p>(typically used with the conditional in native-like speech)</p> <p>i.e. ¿Podrías ayudarme a limpiar la cocina?</p>
	<p><u>Conexiones (4e):</u> Indirect mitigated want: the conditional</p> <p>Indirect Query Preparatory: the conditional</p> <p>i.e. Me gustaría tomar un vaso de agua.</p> <p>i.e. ¿Podría pasarme la sal?</p>	
	<p><u>Dicho y hecho (brief-e):</u> Direct using the structure of <i>request + que + subjunctive</i></p> <p>i.e. Quiero que vayas a la fiesta.</p> <p>Desean que Eva cante una canción.</p> <p>Piden que traigas el coche.</p>	

(table cont'd)

Requests	<p><u>Experience Spanish (1e):</u> Pg.205: Indirect Query Preparatory: the conditional</p> <p>Indirect mitigated want: the imperfect subjunctive</p> <p>i.e. Quisiera la sopa de pollo, una ensalada y los camarones.</p> <p>i.e. De postre, me gustaría el pastel de chocolate con una taza de café.</p> <p><u>Pg. 341:</u> Direct using the structure of <i>querer + que + present subjunctive</i></p> <p>i.e. Quiero que me hagas un favor.</p> <p>i.e. Mi madre quiere que mi hermano la lleve al mercado.</p> <p><u>Pg. 484:</u> Indirect Query Preparatory: the conditional</p> <p>Indirect mitigated want: the conditional</p> <p>i.e. ¿Podría decirme cuánto cuesta esta impresora?</p> <p>Nos gustaría usar la computadora.</p>	<p>Indirect Query Preparatory:</p> <p>(typically used with the conditional in native-like speech)</p> <p>i.e. ¿Podrías ayudarme a limpiar la cocina?</p>
	<p><u>Interacciones (7e):</u> Indirect Query Preparatory: the conditional</p> <p>i.e. Perdone, señor. ¿Podría ud. decirme dónde se encuentra la Compañía Suárez?</p>	

(table cont'd)

<p style="text-align: center;">Requests</p>	<p><u>Puntos de Partida (9e):</u> Pg. 368: Direct using the structure <i>indicative + que + subjunctive</i></p> <p>i.e. Yo quiero que pagues la cuenta.</p> <p>La profesora prefiere que los estudiantes no lleguen tarde.</p> <p><u>Pg. 531:</u> Direct using the past subjunctive of <i>querer</i></p> <p>i.e. Quisiéramos hablar con Ud. en seguida.</p> <p>Quisiera un café, por favor.</p>	<p>Indirect Query Preparatory:</p> <p>(typically used with the conditional in native-like speech)</p> <p>i.e. ¿Podrías ayudarme a limpiar la cocina?</p>
--	---	--

All of the L2Ts that were investigated for the speech act of requesting used different grammar structure to introduce the speech act. Out of the six L2Ts analyzed, four out of the six textbooks included indirect query preparatory conditions as native speakers would have performed in the studies of Márquez Reiter (2002), J.César Félix-Brasdefer (2005), Le Pair (1996), and Blum-Kulka (1989). Two of the L2Ts did not present the act of requesting with conventional indirectness with preparatory conditions. Instead, the strategy of directness was used along with the subjunctive mood in the present. Overall, the L2Ts did present the most native-like production of the speech act of requesting but did not include enough explicit contextual information to provide a meaningful acquisition of the conditional. The two L2Ts that did not include the most native-like production of requesting presented the direct strategy of a performative which can be considered impolite to native speakers.

Table 4.7. L2Ts speech act strategies vs. Native speaker production for Commissives

Speech Act: Commissives		
	L2Ts Content	Spanish Native Speaker Production
Refusals	<p><i>Interacciones</i> (7e): Pg. 85: Indirect mitigation</p> <p>i.e. Me encantaría, pero...</p> <p>Qué lástima, pero...</p> <p>Cuánto lo lamento/ lo siento, pero...</p> <p>En otra ocasión será.</p> <p>Quizás la próxima vez.</p> <p>Pg.172: Indirect mitigation</p> <p>i.e. ¡Ay, qué pena! Pero...</p> <p>Creo que me va a ser difícil porque....</p> <p>Cuánto lo lamento, pero creo que no voy a poder.... porque...</p> <p>A ver si puedo.</p>	<p>Indirect mitigation: Excuses or renegotiation</p> <p>i.e. Creo que no puedo porque tengo clase ese día.</p> <p>No sé si podría ir al juego, pero me dices para la próxima.</p>

The act of refusing for a L2 learner can be a difficult communicative performance to acquire due to cultural differences. Within Spanish speaking culture, refusals that are performed as direct rejections are generally considered to be impolite. Therefore, the native-like approach to the speech act requires L2 learners to refuse indirectly with a mitigating strategy towards their hearer who is requesting. This strategy includes refusals that integrate excuses or renegotiating of the requested. There was only one L2T, *Interacciones* that incorporated refusing for L2 learners. Refusing is an essential speech act that should be included within L2Ts, as it is the response to the request which develops pragmatic knowledge of a back and forth negotiation between the speaker

and the hearer. The L2T did include the native-like speech that has been investigated in previous studies by Lauper (1997) and Félix-Brasdefer (2006) and the L2T did include contextual communicative activities for L2 learners to practice the speech act.

Table 4.8. L2Ts speech act strategies vs. Native speaker production for Expressives

Speech Act: Expressives		
	L2Ts Content	Spanish Native Speaker Production
Apologies	<u>Dicho y hecho (brief-e):</u> Explicit Expressions i.e. Perdón Lo siento (mucho)	Explicit Expressions: i.e. Lo siento, Perdón
	<u>Puntos de Partida (9e):</u> Explicit Expressions i.e. Perdón	

Apologies are a vital speech act that L2 learners need to acquire because the speech act shows the speaker taking responsibility for their faults to a violation towards the hearer. In the investigation, although this speech act is important communicative strategy to acquire, only two out of the six L2Ts presented the act of apologizing. The information provided within the content for the L2 learners did exemplify native-like speech found within the studies of Laura Rojo (2005), González-Cruz (2012), and Blum-Kulka (1989). The L2Ts did demonstrate the explicit expression for apologizing but did provide sufficient explicit instruction for acquiring apologies by communication and context. After analyzing the L2Ts, further discussion and elaboration of the speech acts and address forms will be integrated within the conclusion.

Chapter 5. Conclusion

5.1. Research questions

This chapter will discuss into further detail the tokens analyzed within the results section. The purpose of this investigation was to analyze the speech acts (requesting, refusing, apologizing) and the address forms (*tú*, *Usted*, and other forms) presented within the Spanish L2Ts used in a university level classroom. The analysis of the L2Ts focused on obtaining qualitative data to gain insight on whether the L2 learners can acquire pragmatic knowledge, to become sociopragmatically competent, through the content that L2Ts are providing for beginning and intermediate level classrooms. The discussion in this chapter will add to the field of pragmatics and education, to potentially bring pragmatic awareness to the L2Ts being used in the classroom setting. The following research questions are addressed according to the results in this section.

5.1.2. Do the L2Ts present each speech act or address forms for the L2 learner; if so, how?

Overall, there was no L2T that included all speech acts and address forms in the content provided for the L2 learners. The directives and the address forms (*tú* and *Usted*) investigated within the study were the only communication forms that were implemented in all six L2Ts. The other address forms that were investigated were included in three L2Ts (*Dicho y hecho*, *Puntos de Partida* and *Interacciones*). While the speech act of apologizing was only included in two L2Ts (*Dicho y hecho* and *Puntos de Partida*) and the speech act of refusing was only included in one L2T (*Interacciones*). When a speech act was introduced to the L2 learner, all L2Ts included an implicit grammar explanation, a visual (a chart conjugation or sentence structure), an example, and a few practice activities. The address forms presented within 5 out of the 6 L2Ts were provided in a chart visual demonstrating the difference between the formal and informal distinction. The majority of the address forms were only briefly introduced and textual material explained the idea

of the variation among the pronouns. Only one L2T – *Interacciones* - explicitly explained the cultural meaning of the pronouns regarding formality and dialect variations.

5.1.3. Does a difference exist among the speech acts provided in the L2Ts pertaining to the level, year, publisher, and focus?

Out of the six L2Ts analyzed, a difference exists between the factors of the year, focus, and level; the publisher was not a factor when comparing the L2Ts. When the year of publication was compared among the L2Ts, the oldest L2T, ¡*Avance!*, that was published in 2008, included the least tokens of the speech acts and address forms; only 2 were included in the content (directives and address pronouns). Meanwhile, the two most recently published L2Ts, out of the 6 L2Ts analyzed, were from the years 2012 and 2013, which included four out of five tokens being investigated; *Interacciones* published in 2013 included the speech act of requesting, refusing, and both types of address forms, and *Puntos de Partida* included requesting, apologies, and both types of address forms. The fact that there was a 5-year range of publication dates among the L2Ts, helped observe a moment of progression that was able to be captured. The most recent textbooks published included a bit more pragmatic insight when presented. For example, *Interacciones* was the only L2T that included a refusal as an option for replying to a request. It is vital for the L2Ts to always provide a strategy of saying ‘no’ as an indirect mitigation with excuses or renegotiation, because rejections are dispreferred responses that can be complex for L2 learners. The foci of the L2Ts did not create a difference but represented a similarity among the L2Ts when the focus was analyzed. Although all L2Ts all included communication as their focus, the L2Ts did not include explicit information and/or activities pertaining to the speech acts and address forms. Then, the level difference among the books showed a significant aspect pertaining to the investigation. The beginner level L2Ts introduced more speech acts and address forms compared to the intermediate level L2Ts; indicating that the structure of the language is included, but there is no pragmatic

support, which could impact the L2 learner as certain speech acts or address forms are not viewed within the higher levels of Spanish L2Ts.

5.1.4. How do the examples provided for the speech acts within the L2Ts compare to the speech acts of native speakers' production?

Overall, the majority of the speech acts that were investigated in this study were introduced to the L2 learner with an example that resembled a native speaker's production. Out of the six L2Ts, four of the textbooks (*¡Avance!*, *Conexiones*, *Experience Spanish*, and *Interacciones*) included an indirect query preparatory example using the conditional mood that resembled a native speaker's production of conventional indirectness according to studies of Márquez Reiter (2002); Félix-Brasdefer (2005); Le Pair (1996); and Blum-Kulka (1989). The two other L2Ts (*Dicho y hecho* and *Puntos de Partida*), provided the L2 learners with a direct example of the directives that used the present tense of the subjunctive. Also, the L2Ts (*Conexiones* and *Experience Spanish*) provide examples for a mitigated want statement using the imperfect subjunctive. The L2T *Interacciones* was the only textbook that included the speech act of refusing. The examples provided within the L2T include indirect mitigation where the refusal is mitigated by using excuses or renegotiation; the examples analyzed were resonant with a typical native speaker's speech such as Lauper (1997) and Félix-Brasdefer (2006) investigated in their studies. Lastly, the apologies analyzed within the investigation also concurred with a native speaker's speech mentioned in the previous studies of Rojo (2005); González-Cruz (2012); and Blum-Kulka (1989). The L2Ts *Dicho y hecho* and *Puntos de Partida* introduce the speech act of apologizing as explicit expressions such as *perdón* or *lo siento*. Although each speech act, to a certain extent represented a native speaker's production, the L2Ts did not provide explicit contextual and meaningful information that help to comprehend and gain pragmatic knowledge of how they are use culturally.

5.2. Summary

After delving into six Spanish collegiate level L2Ts, there is evidence that not all L2Ts instruct from a pragmatic perspective or thoroughly implement the communicative standards of ACTFL for the speech acts and address forms investigated. The input that the L2Ts provide such as explanations and examples are barely sufficient when it comes down to explicitly instructing culture and communication differences in Spanish. Specifically, the instructor using the L2Ts in the classroom setting have mentioned that the L2Ts typically only include “lexical elements and grammar explanations” (Allen, 2008, p. 6) with no pragmatic guidance. For example, the majority of the L2Ts’ grammar activities that follow the introduction of the speech acts do not contribute to incorporating pragmatic knowledge and competence of the L2 learner. An aspect that is flawed among the L2Ts is the fact that all explicit information or knowledge is encouraged to be taught by the L2 instructor and their teaching methods; more insight of the language should be provided within the content to assure it is being provided among the L2 learners, due to the fact that the instructors themselves may not have metapragmatic awareness of how speech acts or address forms are used in the language, especially since the L2Ts tend to only provide a standard instruction of the language presented in the material. Comparing the six L2Ts, only the grammatical structures of address forms include some pragmatic knowledge, compared to the speech acts of requesting, refusing, and apologizing which do not implement any pragmatic background regarding strategy use. When it is narrowed down to promoting native-like communication while requesting indirectly, refusing a request with an excuse or solution, or providing a direct apology, there is no pragmatic awareness regarding the information of speech acts provided within the L2Ts.

This investigation has presented an analysis of L2Ts' content of speech acts and address forms, and has pragmatically compared the examples from the content to a typical native speaker's speech. This accomplishment has now raised the question of whether the L2Ts used in the classroom setting provide sufficient input pragmatic knowledge for a L2 learner to become sociopragmatically competent to produce native-like speech without using any other materials besides the L2Ts for a course. The fields of pragmatics and pedagogy have now broadened their knowledge of L2Ts used in the classroom setting. There is an insight of the results from the L2Ts that demonstrate that how the content does or does not pragmatically implement speech acts and address forms for L2 learners; L2Ts published in the future should intentionally include more pragmatic awareness of the target languages taught within a classroom for communicative purposes.

5.3. Limitations

The first limitation within this investigation relates to the native speaker's speech. The results from the L2Ts that were compared to studies that included the examples of the typical native speech, were not from every Spanish-speaking country. Although this could be a limitation, it is understood that the native speech examples focus more on strategies used within the language as a whole rather than dialectal speech among the Spanish speaking community.

The second limitation within this study pertains to level and year range of the L2Ts. The levels within this investigation were limited as there were only two levels included: beginner and intermediate. Another level of the L2Ts that could have been incorporated within the study was the level advanced; including another level would have expanded the analysis of the possible pragmatic knowledge included throughout all levels used to teach grammar structure. Also, the 5-year publication range was limited as well. If more recent L2Ts had been incorporated within the

investigation, a more distinct progression of pragmatic knowledge being used within the content could have been observed.

The investigation includes the limitation of the instructor's edition with the annotated notes in the L2Ts. Not all of the L2Ts investigated were an instructor's edition of the textbooks which meant this topic could not be analyzed closely. The L2Ts, even if they included the annotated notes for the instructors, did not include any pragmatic knowledge for the speech acts that were elaborated furthermore on what was already mentioned in the textbooks for the L2 learners. Due to this reason, instructors have voiced their opinions of how they have to incorporate their own pragmatic explanations, instruction, and examples that the L2Ts do not provide. Allen (2008, p. 5) supports these instructors' voices in stating "that some teachers acknowledge that the L2Ts do permit time to facilitate learning for students, but do not incorporate useful production of materials."

5.4. Future Studies

In theory, any second language textbook needs to be able to provide an authentic representation of native use among speakers. As Ishihara & Cohen (2010, p. x) state, "Speech acts are only one component of pragmatics, and much of our discussion applies to the pragmatics of written language as well to spoken discourse. Because speech acts have been well-studied, research findings about them are readily applicable to instruction." Implementing pragmatic knowledge with the L2Ts can be done by raising pragmatic awareness in the textbooks that used in the classroom setting; "it would be convenient to use textbooks that offer material on pragmatics ready to be taught without the need for modification" (Ishihara, 2010, p.145). Future studies to help raise awareness of the L2Ts that do not include pragmatic knowledge should investigate the ACFTL

standards more thoroughly within the activities, to evaluate whether communication is implemented for the L2 learner to appropriately practice performing speech acts.

References

- ¡Avance!* (2nd ed) (2008). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.
- Allen, H. W. (2008). Textbook Materials and Foreign Language Teaching: Perspectives from the Classroom. *NECTFL Review*, 62, 5–28.
- Altbach, P.G. (1991). The unchanging variable: Textbooks in comparative perspective. In P.G. Altbach, G.P. Kelly, H.G. Petrie and L. Weis (Eds.), *Textbooks in American society: Politics, policy and pedagogy* (pp. 237-254). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Aronoff, M., & Rees-Miller, J. (2003). *The handbook of linguistics*. [electronic resource]. Oxford; Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 2003.
- Aski, J. M. (2003). Foreign Language Textbook Activities: Keeping Pace with Second Language Acquisition Research. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36(1), 57–65.
- Askildson, V. (2008). What Do Teachers and Students Want from a Foreign Language Textbook? *Dissertation Abstracts International, Section A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*, 69(3), 850–851.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996) *Pragmatics and Language Teaching*. [microform]: Bringing Pragmatics and Pedagogy Together. [S.l.]: Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 13-32). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Félix-Brasdefer, J. C., & University of Hawai'i at Manoa, N. F. L. R. C. (2016). *Pragmatics & Language Learning. Volume 14*. National Foreign Language Resource Center at University of Hawaii.
- Bardovi-Harlig. (2001). Empirical evidence of the need for instruction in pragmatics. In: Rose, K.R; Kasper, G. *Pragmatics in language teaching* (13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blum-Kulka S, Olshain E. Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*. 1984;5(3):196-213.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1989). Playing It Safe: The Role of Conventionality in Indirectness. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, G. Kasper, & R. O. Freedle (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies* (pp. 37–70). Norwood, NJ: Ablex
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Pub. Corp.

- Brown, R. & Gilman, A., (1960) The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In Sebok, Thomas A. (ed.) *Style in Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 253-277.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Conexiones: Comunicación y Cultura* (4th ed). (2010). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Dicho y hecho* (brief-ed). (2012). Danvers, MA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- DeKeyser, R. (2003). Implicit and Explicit learning. In C.J. Doughty & M.H. Long (eds), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp.314-348). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dorwick, T., & Glass, W. R. (2003). Language Education Policies: One Publisher's Perspective. *Modern Language Journal*, 87(4), 593–94.
- Doughty, C., & Long, M. H. (2003). *The handbook of second language acquisition*. [electronic resource]. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 2003.
- Ellis, Rod (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Experience Spanish* (1st ed) (2012). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2005). Indirectness and Politeness in Mexican Requests. In D. Eddington (Ed.), *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 66–78). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Galloway, V.B. (1988). Constructing cultural realities “Facts” and frameworks of association. In Harper, M. Lively, & M. Williams (eds.), *The coming of age of the profession* (pp.129-140). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Gass, Susan M. (2013). *Second Language Acquisition an Introductory Course*. New York, New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Glisan, E., & Shrum, J., (2006). *Teacher's Handbook Contextualized Language Instruction*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- González-Cruz, M.-I. (2012). Apologizing in Spanish: A Study of the Strategies Used by University Students in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. *Pragmatics: Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association*, 22(4), 543–565.
- Harwood, N. (2014). Content, Consumption, and Production: Three Levels of Textbook Research. *English Language Teaching Textbooks*, 1.

- Hoffman-Hicks, S. (1992). *Linguistic and Pragmatic Competence. [microform]: Their Relationship in the Overall Competence of the Language Learner*. [S.l.]: Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse, 1992.
- Horn, L. R., & Ward, G. L. (2006). *The handbook of pragmatics. [electronic resource]*. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell, c2006.
- Hummel, Kristin M. (2014). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition Perspectives and Practices*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Interacciones* (7th ed) (2013). Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Karimi, M., & Dowlatabadi, H. R. (2014). Authenticity vs. Practicality: Metacognitive Awareness through Authentic Materials in EFL Classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 844–851.
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). Interlanguage pragmatics: an introduction. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 3-17). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic Development in a Second Language. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 52.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Theories of Second Language Pragmatic Development. *Language Learning*, 52, 13-62.
- Kasper, G., Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). Interlanguage pragmatics: an introduction. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 3-17). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kecskés, I. (2014). *Intercultural pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Koike, D. A. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts in interlanguage. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 279-289.
- Krashen (1982). *Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Lauper, J. A. (1997). *Refusal Strategies of Native Spanish Speakers in Spanish and in English and of Native English Speakers in English. [microform]*. [S.l.]: Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse.
- Le Pair, R. (1996). Spanish Request Strategies: A Cross-Cultural Analysis from an Intercultural Perspective. *Language Sciences*, 18(3–4), 651–70.

- Lee, James F., VanPattern, Bill (2003) *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London; New York: Longman, 1983.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press
- Márquez Reiter R. A Contrastive Study of Conventional Indirectness in Spanish: Evidence from Peninsular and Uruguayan Spanish. *Pragmatics: Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association*. 2002;12(2):135-151.
- Márquez-Reiter, R., & Placencia, M. E. (2005). *Spanish pragmatics*. Basingstoke, Hampshire [England]; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mayer, Richard E. (2002). Rote versus Meaningful Learning. *Theory into Practice*, (4), 226.
- McConachy, T., & Hata, K. (2013). Addressing Textbook Representations of Pragmatics and Culture. *ELT Journal*,67(3), 294–301.
- Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics an Introduction*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Milleret, M. (2007). Teaching Speech Acts. *Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages*,4, 29–43.
- Nguyen, M. T. T. (2011). Learning to Communicate in a Globalized World: To What Extent Do School Textbooks Facilitate the Development of Intercultural Pragmatic Competence? *RELC Journal: A Journal of Language Teaching and Research*,42(1), 17–30.
- O’Keeffe, A., Clancy, B. & Adolphs, S. (2011). *Introducing Pragmatics in Use*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Odlin, T. (2003). *Language Transfer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies Across Languages. In Blum-Kulka & Et. al., *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. (pp.155-173), New Jersey: Ablex Pub. Corp.
- Omaggio Hadley, Alice. (2001). *Teaching Language in Context*. Boston, MA: Heinle, Cengage Learning.
- Orozco, R., & Thoms, J. J. (2014). The Future Tense in Spanish L2 Textbooks. *Spanish in Context*,11(1), 27–49.
- Paradis, M. (2009). *Declarative and procedural determinants of second languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Puntos de Partida* (9th ed). (2012). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Ren, W., & Han, Z. (2016). The Representation of Pragmatic Knowledge in Recent ELT Textbooks. *ELT Journal*, 70(4), 424–434.
- Rojo, L. (2005). “Te quería comentar un problemilla ...”: The Speech Act of Apologies in Peninsular Spanish, a Pilot Study. *Hipertexto*, 1, 63–80.
- Sadock, J. M. (2006). Speech Acts. In Laurence R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 53-73). Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Sadock, J. M. (1974). *Toward a linguistic theory of speech acts*. New York, Academic Press.
- Sagarra, N., & Alba, M. (2006). The Key Is in the Keyword: L2 Vocabulary Learning Methods with Beginning Learners of Spanish. *Modern Language Journal*, 90(2), 228–243.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. London, Cambridge U.P.
- Searle, John. (1975). Indirect speech acts. *Syntax and Semantics Speech Acts*. by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, 59-82. New York: NY: Academic Press.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 219-31.
- Silverstein, M. (1993). Metapragmatic Discourse and Metapragmatic Function. In J. A. Lucy (Ed.), *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics* (pp. 33–58).
- Taavitsainen, I., & Jucker, A. H. (2003). *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Tomlinson, C. A., & McTighe, J. (2006). *Integrating differentiated instruction & understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Trosborg, A. (Ed.) (2010). *Pragmatics across languages and cultures (Vol. 7 of Handbooks of pragmatics)*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tyson, H., & Woodward, A. (1989). Why Students Aren’t Learning Very Much from Textbooks. *Educational Leadership*, 47(3), 14.
- Van Compernelle, R. A., Gomez-Laich, M. P., & Weber, A. (2016). Teaching L2 Spanish Sociopragmatics through Concepts: A Classroom-Based Study. *Modern Language Journal*, 100(1), 341–361.
- Vance, N. (2013). Inter-language Pragmatics. Research Starters: Education (Online Edition).
- Vellenga, H. (2004). Learning Pragmatics from ESL and EFL Textbooks: How Likely? *TESL-EJ: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 8(2).

- Verschueren, J. (2000). Notes on the Role of Metapragmatic Awareness in Language Use. *Pragmatics: Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association*, 10(4), 439–56.
- Villegas Rogers, C., & Medley, F.W., Jr. (1988). Language with a purpose: Using authentic materials in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 21, 467-478.
- Wagner, L. C., & Roebuck, R. (2010). Apologizing in Cuernavaca, Mexico and Panama City, Panama: A cross-cultural comparison of positive- and negative-politeness strategies. *Spanish in Context*, 7(2), 254.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- World-readiness standards for learning languages* (4th ed.). (2015). Alexandria, VA: National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project.

Vita

Vanessa Maria Cardenas, born in New Orleans, Louisiana and raised by Mexican parents, graduated from Louisiana State University in 2017 with a B.A. in Spanish Secondary Education. After she graduated, her interest in Spanish continued. She decided to pursue a 2-year program for a M.A. in Hispanic Studies at Louisiana State University to further expand her knowledge in linguistics, literature, and culture. During her last two semesters, she gained experience by teaching university level elementary Spanish classes. Upon fulfilling her master's degree, she expects to begin her teaching career.