

Pragmatics in English Foreign Language Teaching

SI MERABET MOHAMED LARBI

The English Department
of the University of Tiaret, Algeria

Abstract: Researchers such as Canale and Swain (1980) find that in order to be communicatively efficient, FL learners require more than grammatical competence, they require sociolinguistic and pragmatic competences to understand and being understood in their interactions with native speakers (Nns). According to Hwang (2008): "A successful EFL learner is one who has attained near- native mastery of English pragmatics, at least at the level of comprehension, and who can therefore communicate on an equal footing with native speakers". This article examines the role of Pragmatics in foreign languages classrooms and how can EFL learners acquire pragmatic competence.

Key words: Pragmatics -Pragmatic competence - interlanguage pragmatics - Input - Output - Feedback.

البراغماتية في تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

ملخص: يرى الباحثون مثل Canale و Swain (1980) أن التواصل ذو فعالية إذ يتطلب من المتعلمين للغة الأجنبية أكثر من الكفاءة النحوية، فهو يتطلب الكفاءات اللغوية الاجتماعية والبراغماتية لكي يتم التفاهم الثنائي أثناء التواصل مع أصحاب اللغة الأصليين. ووفقا لهوانج (Hwang) 2008: "إن المتعلم الناجح في اللغة الإنجليزية هو الذي حقق الإتقان شبه الأصلي للبراغماتية الإنجليزية، على الأقل على مستوى الفهم، الذي يستطيع بالتالي التواصل على قدم المساواة مع الناطقين بها". من هنا أتى هذا المقال ليتناول دور البراغماتية في أقسام اللغة الأجنبية وكيف يستطيع متعلمو الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية اكتساب الكفاءة البراغماتية .

الكلمات المفتاحية: البراغماتية، الكفاءة البراغماتية ، البراغماتية بين اللغة، المدخل، المخرج، التغذية الراجعة.

1. Pragmatics and EFL Teaching

English is more than necessary in order to cope with recent developments due to its importance in new technologies, media, teaching and medicine...etc. Algeria for example gives importance to English which is considered as the first foreign language in the country since its independence in 1962. Moreover, the importance of English as the language of communication attracts a great number of educationists and linguists from different fields such as Second Language Acquisition (SLA) Foreign Language Teaching (FLT) ...etc. These scholars make several studies about the English language in order to facilitate its learning and acquisition at the same time. In an attempt to develop learner's communicative competence, the traditional methods that focus on teaching English forms in isolation from their context of use were avoided and new approaches which focus on teaching English from a communicative perspective are used. Such a shift of interest requires a concentration on teaching language functions for the purpose of helping learners to use language in order to express themselves in everyday situations. This change benefits from the introduction of Pragmatics as an area of study within Linguistics. Pragmatics contributes in EFL teaching and learning by shedding light on what pragmatists called *utterance meaning* which refers to what the speaker means by the words he utters. This kind of meaning is different from what the words in the sentence mean by themselves. Thus, a language learner may perform some functions by producing words that have no relationship with the speech act he wants to perform such as the request from a middle school pupil who wants to borrow a pen from his teacher (*Sir, I have not got a blue pen*). In this utterance which is heard in our classrooms, the meaning of the words is different from what the pupil means by using them in the classroom context. Bearing in mind that communication may involve face to face interactions, it can be noticed that Pragmatics contributes in foreign language learning in general and English in particular by highlighting the effect of some variables such as age, status, distance...etc on the choice of the words used to perform different speech acts.

With this in mind, helping learners to become communicatively competent in the English language does not only include grammatical competence but it also includes pragmatic competence. The difference between these two concepts relies in the fact that *grammatical competence* refers to the mastery of the rules that facilitate the interpretation of the meaning of words (i.e. rules of morphology, semantics and phonology...etc). *Pragmatic competence*, on the other hand, is defined by Kasper (1997) as "*Knowledge of communicative action and how to carry it out (illocutionary competence) and as the ability to use language appropriately according to context (sociolinguistic competence)*".

Researchers in the last decade focus on the development of pragmatic competence since it is seen as an essential component of communicative competence. Moreover, they think those learners who do not know where and

when to say what produce a message that may sound inappropriate. White (1993:193) is among the authors who criticise the effect of grammatical competence in achieving successful learning, according to him “... *although an utterance is grammatically well formed it may be functionally confusing or contextually inappropriate*”.

2. Interlanguage Pragmatics

Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP) is related to the concept of communicative competence and specifically to that of pragmatic competence (Bachman 1990 and Celce-Murcia et al 1995). Kasper (1982:110) refers to interlanguage as “*the linguistic system learners activate when trying to communicate in the target language*”. For her this system involves semantic, syntactic, morphological, phonological and pragmatic rules like any other language. This sub discipline of Pragmatics focuses on “*the study of non-native speaker’s use and acquisition of linguistic action patterns in a second language*” Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993:3). In other words, ILP investigates how L2 learners develop the ability to understand and perform action in a target language (Kasper & Rose, 2002). Kasper and Blum-Kulka (ibid: 4) also offer a broader definition of ILP by including into ILP:

“The study of intercultural styles brought about through language contact, the conditions for their emergence and change, the relationship to their substrata, and their communicative effectiveness”.

But most ILP studies focus on the narrow definition. Kasper’s later definition of ILP also focuses on the narrow sense. Kasper (1998:184) defines ILP as:

“The study of nonnative speakers’ comprehension, production, and acquisition of linguistic action in L2, or put briefly, ILP investigates how to do things with words in a second language”.

3. The Textbook and Pragmatics

The textbook plays a crucial role in language teaching particularly in EFL classrooms, it is

thought by many educationists as the primary source and sometimes only provider of reliable linguistic input (Neddar 2008), especially in FL classrooms where it is considered to be the most important tool used in the classroom (Albach 1991). There are, however, different attitudes towards textbooks. Tomlinson (2001) divides the attitudes into two groups: *proponents* and *opponents*. The former group argues that textbooks are the most convenient form of presenting materials because they give consistency, systematicity, cohesion, continuation, and progression. The latter contend that textbooks are inevitably superficial and reductionist in their coverage and are not able to satisfy the diverse and broad needs of all their users. This chief source of input is of great

importance since it is expected to develop EFL learners' linguistic and pragmatic competences. Also, they guide learners to develop a correct attitude toward target culture since speech acts are culture specific. So, if EFL textbooks include speech acts that are transferred from L1; this means that they (textbooks) prevent learners from developing their pragmatic competence, and on the other hand they participate in intercultural miscommunication. Sharifian (2004:119) offers the following example from an Iranian student:

An Iranian student at Shiraz University receives from her American lecturer the recommendation letter that she has asked him to write for her and then turns to him and says, "I'm ashamed". Bewildered by the student's response the lecturer asks, "What have you done".

In this interaction between the Iranian student as a NNS and the American lecturer as a NS, the student transferred an expression of gratitude from her L1 to thank a native speaker. The result is that the American lecturer did not understand the speaker's meaning, because the expression used would be more appropriate when an offence is committed, rather than to show gratitude and appreciation. This example shows that cross-cultural communication varies depending on cultures, which means that speech acts are culture specific. So, spending long hours working to sound like a native speaker thinking that pronunciation might be the reason for the misunderstanding is not a solution to be understood by native speakers.

The importance of pragmatic competence in shaping learners' world views is one of the reasons that motivate me to deal with the development of pragmatic competence in an EFL context.

4. Aspects of pragmatic competence

4.1 The ability to perform speech acts and politeness functions

Over the last three decades educators and language researchers were concerned with how to make learners acquire complex second or foreign language functions and how to use them in accordance with age, gender, status and other information about who they are talking to. These researchers began to argue that teaching learners the formal elements of second and foreign language was insufficient, and that, following the work of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) language teachers should also teach functions because there is a close link between speech acts and language functions. But, I think that it is very important to distinguish between speech acts and acts of speech. A speaker can perform a speech act such as issuing a warning without saying anything: A gesture or even a facial expression will do the trick. So, this speaker can perform an act of speech by uttering words in order to test a microphone, without performing a speech act.

A major focus has been on speech acts especially those which are used to perform a variety of functions such as requesting, refusing, complimenting,

greeting, thanking...etc since Pragmatics is seen as *"the study of speech acts"* according to Rintell (1979) who argues that *"L2 learner pragmatic ability is reflected in how learners produce utterances to communicate "specific intentions" and conversely "how they interpret the intentions which these utterances convey"* Rintell (ibid: 98). This idea is supported by Hollett (1998: 19) who says that *"good communication involves recognizing intentions, and our students need...to know what people really mean"*. So, to the best of my knowledge and in line with and Hollett (ibid) and Rintell (op.cit) I think that it is imperative for EFL learners to possess the ability to perform speech acts and at the same time they have to be aware of the speaker intentions in order to grasp the full meaning behind real-world English expressions because meaning is not constructed from the formal language of the messages alone. The best example which demonstrates the unfortunate consequences that can result when EFL speakers fail to grasp the full meaning behind real-world English expressions is the tragedy, told by Huang (2008) that took place in the U.S. in 1992 when Hattori Yoshihiro, a Japanese exchange student, went to a Halloween party at a friend's house. Yoshihiro, who was wearing a Halloween costume, did not exactly remember his friend's address and approached a neighbouring house. Rodney Pears, the owner of this house, was alarmed when Yoshihiro appeared on his doorstep, and the homeowner pulled out a gun. He yelled "Freeze!" several times. Unfortunately, Mr. Pears was completely unaware that behind the mask was somebody who would only have understood "Stop!" as a command to cease all motion; "Freeze!" was incomprehensible to Yoshihiro. The exchange student kept walking, and Pears fired. Yoshihiro, who had gone through years of English studies, was killed because he did not understand the meaning of the exclamation "Freeze!" which means that he was unaware of the realities of language use.

As a conclusion, the ability to perform speech acts and politeness functions is necessary in the acquisition of pragmatic competence. Consequently, it means that our EFL learners should not only learn the correct words and forms, but also must be aware of the TL sociocultural constraints on speech acts in order to be pragmatically competent. The reason is that successful speaking is not just a matter of using the correct words and forms. Moreover, the inappropriate use of speech acts realisation strategies and politeness functions can certainly give rise to a good number of misunderstandings and communication breakdowns, thus speaking in a polite manner involves being aware of the effect a particular illocutionary force has on one's addressee (Barron 2003).

While these aspects of pragmatic competence are undoubtedly important, they can only be put to use if one has acquired the broader background of cultural knowledge which is the concern of my next sub section.

4.2 The ability to use cultural knowledge

Many researchers have shed light on the importance of cultural information in language teaching. They stress that communication is an interrelationship between a language and its people and if cultural information is not taught as a part of communicative competence, complete communication cannot happen. Jiang (2000:329) gives a metaphor which effectively captures the nature of language and culture as a whole, for him "communication is like transportation: language is the vehicle and culture is the traffic light". In the same line Poole (1999:35) has given an interesting example to illustrate how culture-based schemata affects comprehension:

"We are likely to interpret in two very different ways notices on the door of a butcher's shop which say Sorry, no rabbits and Sorry, no dogs.

As we do not eat dogs we assume that the second of these two notices is telling us that...we are not allowed to take a dog into the shop.

Somebody from a very different cultural background might, however, assume that the butcher was apologizing for having run out of dog meat."

From Jiang's metaphor and Poole's example, one may observe that culture and cultural knowledge are needed in foreign language learning and teaching because culture teaches students to understand and respect people's differences since something good in one's schema can sound like something bad in another's. In this context, foreign language learning is indeed foreign culture learning. Blum-Kulka (1990a:255) places culture at the heart of L2 pragmatic competence by proposing a model of "general pragmatic knowledge (GP)" where an L2 learner's GP for a speech act is organized as schema containing the L2 linguistic forms used for the speech act. This schema, in turn, is governed by a L2 "cultural filter" which decides the situational appropriateness of the L2 linguistic forms. Thus, the acquisition of pragmatic competence calls for a need to possess cultural knowledge.

In order to illustrate the influence of cultural schemata on speakers' speech acts, Wildner-Bassett (1994) advocates a solid connection between culturally bound schema, a specific situation, and an utterance appropriate to that situation:

"If L2 learners acquire L2 cultural knowledge about archetypal structures of speech events, they will not only be able to better understand a given speech event in general, but effectively participate in that given speech event using appropriate speech acts".

Now, if we agree with Halliday (ibid: 46) that *"much of the work of learning a foreign language consists in learning to make the right predictions"*, if the lack of

the relevant schematic knowledge in the L2 is the chief reason for learners' misunderstanding of the inferred meaning or misinterpretation of the background information (Widdowson 1990), and if meaningful communication does in fact require culture (Roberts 1998), then it is imperative that EFL learners realise how culture can and does affect meaning.

Up to this point one may remark that there is an inseparable relationship between foreign language learning and intercultural communication. In other words, there is reciprocity between cultural knowledge and successful communication and this means that EFL learners must be equipped with the ability to use cultural knowledge in order to understand and deal with the dynamics of cultural differences when communicating with native speakers. Also, it is imperative to integrate culture into the teaching of all language skills so that learners can learn to speak, but also to write, in culturally appropriate ways for specific purposes.

5. Conditions for the acquisition of pragmatic competence

It should be borne in mind that the development of the pragmatic competence in language learning and teaching today is very indispensable, because pragmatic competence not only shapes the world view of the individual through language but also provides teachers the opportunity to better understand their students by keeping in mind the necessary interactional, psychological, social and cultural factors in language teaching pedagogy. But what do FL learners need in order to acquire pragmatic competence?

Kasper (2001b) considers the importance of input and practice as the important conditions for the development of learners' pragmatic competence. According to him the development of learners' pragmatic competence includes the following aspects:

"Sustained focused input, both pragmatic and metapragmatic, collaborative practice activities and metapragmatic reflection appear to provide learners with the input and practice they need for developing most aspects of their pragmatic abilities".

These two conditions (i.e. input and output) are explained in the following subsections which also deal with the role of feedback in the process of Pragmatics.

5.1 Input factors

Rod Ellis (1999:127) considers that input is used to refer to language that is addressed to the foreign language learner either by a native speaker or by another foreign language learner. But this issue of input and its contribution to second language acquisition was first addressed by Corder (1967) who distinguished between two types of linguistic data. Learners were exposed to: data prone to be processed (input) and data actually processed (intake) by the

human brain. Later on Krashen (1985) points out that there is no learning without input. According to his hypothesis (*The Input Hypothesis*) the human brain can only process input which is comprehensible; by comprehensible input Krashen (ibid) means those linguistic and meaningful data which are understood by the learner. Gass (1988) in her model of SLA provide a distinction between *comprehensible input* and *comprehended input*. According to her the former is controlled by the learner whereas the latter is controlled by the person providing input.

Krashen's theory is supported by other studies and researchers such as Allwright and Bailey (1991:20) who argue that "*input refers to language which the learners hear or read, that is the language samples to which they are exposed*". Hafiz and Tudor (1989:10) also find that better acquisition of a L2 can be associated with more exposure to comprehensible L2 input outside of the school environment.

Following Krashen's view, one may find that learner's access to comprehensible input causes acquisition. So, if input is not comprehensible, acquisition will never occur. By examining The Input Hypothesis a question comes to mind; how could teachers make their input comprehensible?

As an answer to this question Krashen points out that simplified input can be made available to the learner through *one way interaction* which includes listening to a lecture, watching television and reading or *two way interaction* which occurs in conversations.

In line with Krashen's view that there is no learning without input, input plays an important role in foreign language learning and when it comes to the acquisition of pragmatic competence it becomes even more critical since the language and the data used by FL teachers affects learners acquisition and learners production. By talking about pragmatic competence the term pragmatic input is introduced. Ana Bocanegra Valle (1998) defines pragmatic input as:

"Input containing different aspects of language use or speech acts, thus extending the traditional definition of input as linguistic data learners are exposed to, to that of data, either linguistic or pragmatic, learners are exposed to."

Learners' exposure to the TL input depends on its place in society, thus learners who live in societies where the TL has the place of a second language have sources of input outside the classroom for example newspapers, Radio and also in their leaders' discourse, however in foreign language settings learners' exposure to L2 relevant input is mainly received in the classroom. So the difference between the two settings may affect learners' pragmatic competence and its development.

According to Ellis (1994) the development of pragmatic competence depends on providing learners with sufficient and appropriate input. Input in the

EFL classroom comes mainly through teacher talk and teaching materials (Hill 1997). *Teacher talk* Which is also called teachers' language, teachers' speech or teachers' utterances is of crucial importance. According to Nunan (1991) *"in terms of acquisition teacher talk is important because it is probably the major source of comprehensible target language input the learner is likely to receive"*. It is also an essential source of pragmatic input in the EFL classroom (Martinez Flor 2004) since teachers themselves are considered as the model that provides EFL learners with the appropriate use of formulaic expressions as well as how to employ the proper words in the proper places. With this in mind, it can be noticed that learners are dependent on the teacher as one of the appropriate sources of the TL. Consequently, and especially in contexts such as Algeria, where exposure to the TL is limited; EFL teachers must know the pragmatic functions of different speech acts in order to make learners more aware about pragmatic functions that exist in language. Thus, ungrammatical and inappropriate expressions should not occur in teacher talk since it is regarded as a model for FL learners to imitate. Nation (2005) offers an interesting perspective on the role of the teacher in a classroom context, stating that to teach is only one of the instructor's four main jobs, with the other three being to plan appropriate lessons, to train students in language skills, and to test their progress (i.e. providing feedback). In this sense, EFL teachers must expose their learners to natural and authentic language use because if they do not provide them with sufficient sociocultural and sociolinguistic information they are increasing their difficulty to understand and produce the target language appropriately and efficiently (Safont 2004).

The use of *teaching materials* is another source of pragmatic input in a FL classroom, so due to the fact that exposure to L2 in an EFL context is relatively limited, textbooks become more important in guiding learners to develop a correct attitude toward target culture by exposing them to a variety of authentic input. However, some researchers such as Grant and Starks (2001) claim that:

"Textbooks cannot count on as a reliable source of pragmatic input because students are frequently not given the tools in textbooks to recognize and analyse language in a variety of contexts".

For this reason ELT textbooks should prepare learners to acquire pragmatic competence by providing them with include adequate and comprehensible explanations of how language works according to context.

Apart from teacher talk and teaching materials Locastro (2003) argues that learners are also exposed to another source of input which is *peer interaction and participation*. According to her interactions between learners inside the classroom either in groups or pairs also plays an important role for the development of learners' pragmatic knowledge. Finally, Alcón Soler (2002) has investigated the effect of teacher–students versus learners' interaction on the development of

learners' pragmatic competence in an EFL class in a Spanish University. Results showed that pragmatic knowledge emerged from both types of interactions but peer interaction favours some of the functions of learners' output, such as noticing and hypothesis testing.

These authors show that input is a powerful source for the acquisition of pragmatics in the FL classroom setting. However, Kasper and Roever (2005:318) pointed out that *"the complexity of developing pragmatic competence means that exposure to input alone is insufficient to promote pragmatic development in a new language"*, in line with them Nation (2005, 2007), in his framework for instruction, argues:

"Four strands are necessary, namely meaning-focused input, meaning-focused output, deliberate language study, and fluency development, and each has practical implications in the classroom".

Following this view, providing learners with opportunities for output is also considered as a crucial condition for the acquisition of pragmatic competence. Phuong (2006) argues that:

"To develop pragmatic ability in the FL classroom, language instructors should design contextualized, task-based activities which expose learners to different types of pragmatic input and prompt learners to produce appropriate output".

5.2 Output

Many researchers in second language acquisition argue that successful language learning did not only require comprehensible input, but also comprehensible output. Swain (1985) claims that: *"Learners do not achieve nativelike productive competence not because their comprehensible input is limited but because their comprehensible output is limited"*. In other words, learners are not provided with adequate opportunities to use the target language in the classroom as well as they are not being 'pushed' in their output. For these reasons the Output Hypothesis comes as an objection to Krashen's Input Theory that regards comprehensible input as the only necessary condition for SLA.

Swain's (ibid) Hypothesis which emphasises the role of outcome in SLA; was developed in order to support the claim that input itself is not enough for language learning because understanding is not quite the same as acquiring. The central claim of the Output Hypothesis, as articulated by Swain (2005:471) is that *"the act of producing language (speaking or writing) constitutes, under certain circumstances, part of the process of second language learning"*. Thus, learners can improve their language level through using the language exposed to them to write correct sentences and utter appropriate utterances. Production is regarded as the trigger that forces learners to pay attention to the means of expression; in fact Swain (2000a) argues that *"not only comprehending, but also producing the*

TL, is what makes learners notice how the language is used in order to express their intended meaning". Swain's (1985) Output Hypothesis was supported by other studies which were conducted by some researchers such as Strong (1983) and Peck (1985) who provide evidence that more production and more correct production go hand in hand with target language proficiency. Swain (1995) proposed three functions for output which are: a) the noticing/triggering function, (b) the hypothesis testing function, and (c) the metalinguistic (reflective) function. These three functions work to enable learners to develop an awareness of their own developing systems at a level that mere exposure to input does not permit, moving the learners from language processing on a semantic level to processing on a more syntactic level (Swain & Lapkin, 1995). A summary of the effects of output on developing L2 pragmatic competence in terms of Swain's three proposed functions for SLA is detailed in table 1 below.

Output Function	Proposed Effect on Developing L2 Pragmatics
Noticing/Triggering	As learners attempt to produce pragmalinguistic forms (speech acts), they realize that they cannot accurately convey their intended meaning, which triggers their seeking input from others or searching their own developing systems for more appropriate forms.
Hypothesis Testing	In response to input or feedback that targets their production of speech acts, learners conduct "trial runs" (Swain, 2005) in which they modify their pragmatic output.
Metalinguistic/Reflective	When learners are required to struggle over the production of pragmalinguistic forms, they use language to reflect on the form and function of the speech acts being attempted.

Table 1: Proposed Effects of Output on Developing L2 Pragmatics J. JERNIGAN (2007:38)

Bearing in mind that these three functions contribute in learners' development, Locastro (2003) believes that in order to acquire pragmatic competence learners need to be provided with opportunities for practice. In the same line Trosborg (1995:473) pointed out that involving learners in role interactions is a way of increasing their linguistic output, in fact she mentions that:

"[...] when engaging learners in role playing in pairs or in small groups, they are offered the opportunities of experimenting, of repairing their own utterances when

negotiating the outcome of the conversation, and they engage in communication practice which is very helpful in promoting procedural knowledge”.

Taking into consideration that learners’ output may be erroneous Swain’s Output Hypothesis also emphasized the importance of feedback the third condition that I will examine according to her, learners can improve the accuracy of output if they receive feedback from their teachers. So, language teachers should manage to push learners to produce the TL.

5.3 Feedback

Apart from input and output providing feedback to learners on their performance is another important condition for the development of pragmatic competence in an EFL context because it may not serve only to let learners know how well they have performed utterances but also to increase motivation and build a supportive classroom climate. In language classrooms feedback which is defined by V.Cook (2000) as *“teachers’ evaluation of the student response”* may be a response either to the content of what a learner has produced or to the form of an utterance, thus this response can be given by means of praise, by any relevant comment or action, or by silence. Ellis (2003) identifies two kinds of techniques in providing feedback; *implicit* and *explicit*. Implicit techniques involve providing feedback on learners’ use of a target feature in a way that keeps the primary focus on meaning. In contrast, explicit techniques involve providing learners with explicit information relating to the target feature during the performance of the task. Researchers such as Ur (2000:242) divide feedback into two main components: *Correction* and *assessment*. *Assessment* refers to the tools, techniques and procedures for collecting and interpreting information about what learners can and cannot do. It includes grades, marks and teachers’ responses such as the response “No” to an attempted answer to a question. However, *correction* refers to providing learners with some specific information on aspects of their performance through explanation or provision of other or better alternatives (Ur 2000). Doughty (2004) suggests that *“feedback is necessary in interpretation tasks because the feedback enables learners to adjust whenever they have failed to process specific target features appropriately”*.

To sum up, feedback is as important as input and output for FL learning in general and in developing pragmatic competence in particular because it gives learners the opportunity to notice the differences between their L1 and L2 and at the same time it allows them to discover their correct as well as incorrect use of the TL.

6. Proposals for teaching Pragmatics in the classroom

Since the appearance of Pragmatics as a research area on its own, researchers conducted several studies in both SL and FL settings for the reason of examining its relevance to language teaching as well as finding the best ways to

teaching it. These studies lead to different propositions about its integration in the classroom. Speech acts have received a lot of studies and the first authors who examined their teach-ability were Olshtain and Cohen (1991). These two authors elaborated a framework with different steps that included the three conditions for acquiring the L2 aspects (i.e input, output and feedback) previously discussed in section 5. According to them, learners first need to be exposed to the most typical realization strategies of the particular speech act under study. After this presentation, they should be explained the factors that are involved in selecting one specific form rather than another, and finally they should be provided with opportunities to practice the use of the speech act. They should also be given the opportunity to express the differences noted between their mother tongue and the target language. By applying Olshtain and Cohen's (ibid) steps in teaching speech acts in an EFL classroom, learners will have opportunities to practise the speech acts in real life situations, also they will interpret them in a more appropriate way. In addition, they will be given the chances to produce output. Another Proposal was proposed by Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan Taylor (2003), these authors present a compilation of teaching activities developed by various authors to be employed with learners who do not share the same proficiency levels and cultural backgrounds. The objective of these activities is to raise learners' pragmatic consciousness to become familiar with the different pragmatic features and their appropriate use and interpretation as well pushing them to produce appropriate output. In line with these authors Crandall and Basturkmen (2004) were also interested in raising pragmatic awareness, in that, they propose a type of data-collection activities to actively engage learners in tasks that may promote their pragmatic awareness. A more recent study was conducted by Martínez-Flor and Usó-Juan (2006), in this study they designed an approach (*6Rs Approach*) which consists of six main central steps that they consider essential in designing an L2 lesson in pragmatics (*Researching, Reflecting, Receiving, Reasoning, Rehearsing, Revising*), this approach includes a variety of tailor-made activities based on the speech acts of requesting and suggesting in order to gradually make learners pay attention to the importance of the contextual and sociopragmatic factors that affect which of the two speech acts has to be made and how.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albach, P.G. 1991. "The unchanging variable: Textbooks in comparative perspective" in **Textbooks in American Society: Politics, policy and pedagogy**. ed by Albach et al. . Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Alcón Soler, E. 2002. "Relationship between teacher-led versus learners' interaction and the development of pragmatics in the EFL classroom". **International Journal of Educational Research** 37, 359–377.

- Allwright, D. & Bailey, K.M. 1991. **Classroom: An introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers**. Cambridge: University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S. 1990a. "Interlanguage pragmatics: The case of requests". In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. S. Smith & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/Second language pedagogy research: A commemorative volume for Claus Færch (255-272)*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Canale, M. 1983. "From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy" in **Language and communication**. ed. by Richards, J & Schmidt, R. London: Longman, 2-27.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. 1980. "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing" in **Applied Linguistics**. Vol. 1: 1-47.
- Cook, V. 2000. **Second Language Learning and Language Teaching (2nd Edition)**. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Cook, V. 2001. **Second Language Learning and Language Teaching (3rd Edition)**. OUP Inc. New York.
- Corder, S. P. 1967. "The significance of learner's errors". In: **International Review of Applied Linguistic**, 5, 4, pp. 161-70.
- Doughty, C. J. (2003). *Instructed SLA: Constraints, compensation, and enhancement*. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), **The handbook of second language acquisition** (762- 828). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Ellis, R. 2003. **Task-based language learning and teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 1999. "Input-based approaches to teaching grammar: a review of classroom-oriented research" In **Annual Review of Applied Linguistics**. Vol. 19: 64-80.
- Ellis, R. 1994. **The Study of Second Language Acquisition**. Oxford: University Press.
- Gass, S. 1988. "Integrating Research Areas: A Framework for Second Language Studies". **Applied Linguistics** 9, 198-217.
- Grant, L. & Starks, D. 2001. "Screening appropriate teaching materials: Closing from textbooks and television soap opera" in *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. Vol. 39: 39-50.
- Hafiz, F.M. & Tudor, I. 1989. "Extensive reading and the development of language skills". **ELT Journal**, 43(1), 4-13.
- Hill, T. 1997. **The Development of Pragmatic Competence in an EFL Context**. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University , Tokyo, Japan.
- Hollett, V. (1998). "Effective communication". **English Teaching Professional**, 8,18-19.

- **Hwang, C.** 2008. "Pragmatic convention and intercultural competence" in **Linguistic Journal**. Vol. 3, issue 2 Retrieved August 2nd, 2008 from www.linguistics-journal.com/August_2008_ch.php
- **Jiang, W.** 2000. "The relationship between culture and language". **English Language Teaching Journal**, 54, 328-334.
- **Kasper, G.** 1997a. "*Can pragmatic competence be taught?*" Honolulu: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Centre, University of Hawai'i. Retrieved November 2, 2004 from: <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/>
- **Kasper, G.** 1997b. "The role of pragmatics in language teacher education" in **Beyond Methods: Components of Second Language Teacher Education**. ed. by Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Hartford, B. New York: McGraw- Hill.
- **Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulka, S.** 1993. *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford: University Press.
- **Kasper, G.** 1992. "Pragmatic transfer" in **Second Language Research**. Vol. 8.3: Sage Publications. 203-231.
- **Krashen, S.** 1985. *The Input Hypothesis*. London: Longman.
- **Lo Castro, V.** 2003. *An introduction to pragmatics: Social action for language teachers*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- **Martinez, A.F.** 2004. *The Effect of Instruction on the Development of Pragmatic Competence in the EFL Context : A Study Based on Suggestions*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Universidad Jaume 1, Departament D'Estudis Englesos. Retrieved **from:** http://www.tdx.cesca.es/TESIS_UJI/AVAILABLE/TDX-0126105-123437//martinez2.pdf
- **Nation, I. S. P.** 2005. "*Teaching and learning vocabulary*". In E. Hinkel (Ed.), **Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning** (pp. 581-595). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- **Neddar, B.A.** 2008. "*Discourse Theories and Cross-Cultural Pragmatics Awareness Raising Through Authentic Materials: The Case of Algerian EFL Learners*" Unpublished Doctorate Dissertation. University Abdelhamid ibn Badis- Mostaganem. Algeria
- **Nunan, D.** 1991. **Language Teaching Methodology: a textbook for Teachers**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- **Olshtain, E. and Blum Kulka, S.** 1985. "*Degree of approximation: Nonnative reactions to native speech act behaviour*". In Gass, S and Madden, C (eds) **Input in Second Language Acquisition**. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- **Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D.** 1990. "*The learning of complex speech act behavior*" in **TESL Canada Journal**. Vol. 7: 45-65.
- **Poole, S.** (1999). *An Introduction to linguistics*. London: Macmillan.

- Rintell, E. M. 1979. "Getting your speech act together: The pragmatic ability of second language learners". **Working Papers on Bilingualism**, 17, 98-106.
- Safont, M. P. J. 2004. "An analysis on EAP learners' pragmatic production: a focus on request forms". **IBÉRICA** 8: 23-39
- Searle, J. R. 1976. The classification of illocutionary acts. **Language in Society**, 5, 1-24.
- Searle, J. 1975. "Indirect Speech Acts". In Cole, P. and Morgan, J.L. (eds): **Syntax and Semantics**: vol. 3 Speech Acts: 59-82. New York: Academic Press
- Searle, J.R. 1969. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Sharifian, F. 2004. "Cultural schemas and intercultural communication: A study of Persian". In **Outer limits: A reader in communication across cultures** (119-130). Ed. By Leigh, J & Loo. E. Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Strong, M. 1983. **Motivating Analysis of Exchange Structure**. In M. Coulthard and M.
- Swan, M. 2007. "Grammar, Meaning and Pragmatics: Sorting Out the Muddle". **Teaching English as a second or foreign language** vol.11, number 2.
- Swain, M. 2005. "The output hypothesis: Theory and research". In E. Hinkel (Ed.), **Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning** (471-483). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Swain, M. (2000). "The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue". In J. P. Lantolf (ed.), **Sociocultural theory and second language learning** (97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive process they generate. A step towards second language learning. **Applied Linguistics**, 16, 371-91.
- Swain, M. (1985). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. **Canadian Modern Language Review**, 50, 158-64.
- Trosborg, A. 1995. **Interlanguage Pragmatics. Requests, Complaints and Apologies**. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ur, P. 2000. **A Course in Language Teaching Practice and Theory**. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- White, R. 1993. "Saying please: pragmalinguistic failure in English interaction". *ELT journal*, 47/3, 192-202.
- Wildner-Bassett, Mary E. 1984. *Improving Pragmatic Aspects of Learners' Interlanguage*. **Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag**.