# Introduction
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# Second Language Pragmatics

Second language pragmatics (L2 pragmatics) is a field that combines two broader disciplines, second language acquisition (SLA) and pragmatics. It examines the developmental stages of L2 learners in learning pragmatics of their target language. L2 pragmatics primally investigates the intended meaning, interpretations, conversional actions, routinized expressions, social activities, politeness and the negotiations of meaning between interactants. All of these components are not working individually but they are depending on each other. Actions that include both linguistic and non-linguistic signals of speakers and hearers jointly create understanding in the context. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 1-3) Because language is indeterminate, meanings are not simply matched to language forms on a one-to-one basis. To fully understand the meaning of the speech, it is not possible to plainly decode the word meanings. Rather, meanings are generated and understood in the context, and, moreover, those meanings partly create that context as it develops over the course of the interaction. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 27)

An early definition of L2 pragmatics comes from the work by Jenny Thomas in 1983, and Kasper & Dahl in 1991. Thomas (1983) introduces the terms “cross-cultural pragmatics” and “pragmatic competence” referring to the ability to use language efficiently with the purpose to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context. (Thomas 1983: 92) Kasper & Dahl (1991) are using the term “interlanguage pragmatics” which is defined in narrow sense, referring to non-native speakers’ knowledge and production of speech acts, and how their L2 related speech act knowledge is gained. (Kasper & Dahl 1991: 216) Until 1990s the comparative studies of L2 pragmatics dominated the field. Although in principle all aspects of pragmatics could be subject to cross-cultural comparisons, traditionally, two main areas of pragmatic investigation in this period have been politeness and speech acts, therefore it drew heavily from speech act theory by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), and politeness theory by Brown & Levinson (1987). After this comparative phase, research started to focus on whether pragmatics could be taught to L2 learners, and if so, how it should be assessed the best, some of the most important studies were carried out by Takahashi Satomi and Taguchi Naoko. In general, the conclusions drawn from their studies confirmed the pragmatics is teachable. Most of the studies involved teaching English pragmatics, and focused on speech acts, with request being the most popular. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 8-10)

Nowadays, L2 pragmatics researchers have changed their focus from “pragmatics-within-individuals” to pragmatics which is cognitively and socially constructed and situated in context by creating concepts like interactional competence (Young 2008). The impact of globalization and internationalization has also an effect on L2 pragmatics, especially with international trends toward multilingualism and multiculturalism. As a result, reconsideration of the traditional assumptions about language and language use is being made by L2 acquisition researchers. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 17)

## Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a subfield of semiotics and linguistics that studies language from the point of view of the users, especially of the choices they make, the pressure they confront in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication. (Barron 2003: 7) Pragmatics does not focus only on the contextual appropriateness but also on how language can be used to perform actions, and on how the words can express things that diverge from what they superficially appear to mean.

General pragmatics captures comprehensive pragmatic principles and mechanisms and it is often divided into two subcategories: sociopragmatics which express the specific contextual phenomena that shapes pragmatic meanings on a particular occasion of use, and pragmalinguistics which express linguistic phenomena that are imbued with pragmatic meaning. Understanding pragmatics in terms of these two subareas has shaped the nature of L2 pragmatics. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 1-2, 30) There are two particular views of pragmatics. The traditionally *Anglo-American view of pragmatics* defines pragmatics as an area of linguistics that adds context. The traditionally *Continental European view of pragmatics* takes a broad view of pragmatics as a superordinate field with linguistics as one discipline within it, along with the sociology, psychology, and other disciplines. But according to Culpeper, Mackey & Taguchi (2018) is thinking about the distinction between these two views as a dichotomy overly simplistic. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 28-29)

In addition, it should be noted that other two broad areas of pragmatics are distinguished in the literature: micropragmatics which includes the study of such areas in pragmatics as a reference, implicature and speech acts; and macropragmatics which involves discourse analysis and metapragmatics. (Barron 2003: 8)

## Pragmatic Competence

Pragmatic competence refers to the ability to communicate meaning in a socially appropriate manner and to interpret meaning – whether explicit or implicit – according to context. (Taguchi 2008: 424) Barron (2003) presents pragmatic competence as a knowledge of the linguistic resources available in a given language for realising particular illocutions, knowledge of the sequential aspects of speech acts, and finally, knowledge of the appropriate contextual use of the particular languages’ linguistic resources. (Barron 2003: 10) To become pragmatically competent, leaners need not only linguistic resources but also the ability to evaluate layers of contextual information, select from appropriate resources, and then use them effectively. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 12) The term *pragmatic competence* as usedin present thesis refers both to knowledge about pragmatics and to the ability to use it in terms of situational and social context.

According to Ishihara & Cohen (2014), to be pragmatically competent means being able to go beyond the literal meaning of what is said or written, in order to interpret the intended meaning, assumptions, purposes or goals, and the kinds of actions that are being performed. Since speakers do not always communicate directly what they mean and listeners do not always interpret the speakers’ meaning as it was intended, the interpretation can sometimes present a big challenge. Therefore, it is necessary for the speakers and the listeners to collaborate to assure that genuine communication takes place. (Ishihara & Cohen 2014: 5)

Because it was the growing interest in communicative competence which eventually triggered research into pragmatic competence in the first place, it is necessary to briefly go into broader notion of communicative competence, of which pragmatic competence is a sub-concept. (Barron 2003: 8)

### Communicative Competence

Communicative competence combines grammatical knowledge with knowledge about social situations and cultures. This combination thus enables speakers to decide how to use language appropriately and effectively in social context. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 4)

The origins of the concept of communicative competence are typically traced to anthropologist and sociolinguist, Dell Hymes, who proposed a two-sided conceptualization of language knowledge, with grammatical knowledge on one side and sociocultural knowledge on the other. He claimed that these two types of knowledge jointly determinate how one can use language appropriately and effectively in a social context. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 3) Hymes’s concept was born out of a reaction against Chomsky’s notion of competence which surrounded knowledge of the rules of grammar alone and disregarded contextual appropriateness but unlike Chomsky’s, Hymes’s concept of competence not only includes knowledge, but also the ability to use this underlying knowledge. (Barron 2003: 3) Building on Hymes’s framework, theoretical models of L2 communicative competence emerged (Bachman & Palmer, 1996, 2010; Canale & Swain, 1980). (Barron 2003: 3-4)

Canale & Swain (1980) is one of the earliest lines of work in this area and it stress that an efficient integration of four sub-competencies are necessary for successful communicative act. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 3) Here communicative competence consists of grammatical competence which involves the knowledge of linguistic system (i.e., lexis, syntax, semantics, phonology); sociolinguistic competence which refers to the knowledge of socially appropriate language use (i.e., choices of language in use); discourse competence which is concerning coherence in meaning and cohesiveness in form (i.e., links between literal meanings, use of pronouns), and also of strategic competence which involves compensatory strategies that help prevent or manage communication problems (i.e., communication strategies employed to compensate for gaps in the knowledge system or a lack of fluency, or strategies to enhance the effectiveness in communication, e.g., rhetorical strategies). There is an apparent differentiation between communicative competence and actual communication. This model also termed communicative performance, on the basis that actual communication may not reflect a speaker’s communicative competence due to factors, such as nervousness or tiredness. (Barron 2003: 3, Culpeper et al. 2018: 3)

Pragmatic competence was assumed to be part of the sociolinguistic competence in Canale & Swain’s (1980) model, whereas Bachman & Palmer’s (1996, 2010) research developed a model that viewed pragmatic competence in its own right. Their work divided pragmatic knowledge into two dimensions: functional knowledge which allows an interpretation of relationships between utterances and communicative functions (e.g., knowing a variety of forms that perform a speech act of refusal), and sociolinguistic knowledge which allows creation of utterances that are appropriate in context (e.g., knowing which forms to use when refusing a friend’s invitation to a party). Therefore, Bachman & Palmer’s (1996, 2010) work conceptualizes pragmatics within the dynamic relationship that exists among language, language users, and language use settings. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 3-4)

### Interactional Competence

Interactional competence is the knowledge of various language abilities that are necessary for successful interaction in social context. This competence differs from the componential view of communicative competence by conceptualizing competence in a dynamic social interaction. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 5-6) Young (2008) defines interactional competence as follows:

“[A] relationship between the participants’ employment of linguistic and interactional resources and the contexts in which they are employed; the resources that interactional competence highlights are those of identity, language, and interaction … Interactional competence, however, is not the ability of an individual to employ those resources in any and every social interaction; rather, interactional competence is how those resources are employed mutually and reciprocally by all participants in a particular discursive practice.”

(Young 2008: 101)

In other words, interactional competence traits language ability as fundamentally situated within a social context where participants of the discourse can use a variety of resources in interaction, such as speech acts or turn-taking. The communicative act is negotiated and co-constructed mutually by all the participants, and emerges from the communication which occurring in a particular order. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 5-6)

## Speech Act of Refusal

…

### Speech Act Theory

The ways in which people carry out specific social functions in speaking such as apologizing, complaining, making request, promising, refusing things or invitations, complimenting, or thanking have been referred to as speech acts. (Ishihara & Cohen 2014: 6) The theory of speech acts was presented by the language philosopher, John Langshaw Austin, who is probably the most important figure in the rise of modern pragmatics. He introduced this theory in 1962 and it has been widely used and is still being used by many researchers from linguistics to sociologists to philosophers. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 33-4)

Speech acts have a basic meaning as produced by the speaker (“Do you have a watch?” = do you own a watch?) and an illocutionary meaning (e.g., “Can you tell me what time it is?”), as well as the actual illocutionary force on the listener, also referred to as the uptake (e.g., a request to know the time , and hence, a reply like “It’s 10:30 AM right now.”). Many of speech acts tend to follow regular and predictable patterns conventional for members of the given community. The performance of common speech acts commonly includes selecting from a set of possible strategies, some of which may include the use of what could be viewed as other apparent speech acts, and for this reason the term *speech act* *set* has been introduced. The realization of a given speech act in a given context, then, involves the use of a minimum of one strategy from the speech act set to the selection of numerous strategies from that set. (Ishihara & Cohen 2014: 6-8) The question of how many speech acts there are, is one which remains open despite many attempts at classification. After Austin (1975) developed his classification (types of act: locutionary, illocutionary, perlocutionary), numerous alternative classifications have been put forward. Although criticised, classification of Austin’s student John R. Searle (1969, 1985) is the most widely accepted and influential. Searle (1969, 1985) purposed a number of features underpinning speech act variation. Among these, one significant feature is “direction of fit,” or the way in which the words of an utterance orientate to the world. (Barron 2003: 12; Culpeper et al. 2018: 34-8)

 It is also important that the context is appropriate for a speech act to be successfully performed. Appropriate circumstances are known as felicity conditions and apply to all speech acts. (Culpeper et al. 2018: 34)
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