CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A review of relevant literature is presented in this chapter. Several constructs that are of central importance to the present study are discussed. It also gives a brief account of the pragmatic aspects that used for developing pragmatic awareness in learners in an explicit teacher fronted classroom teaching. This chapter also provides a brief account of all the aspects taken as a model for designing the pretest and posttest WDCTs.

2.1 ISSUES AND CONSTRUCTS IN PRAGMATICS

van Dijk (1980) remarks that Pragmatics has been mainly a philosophical and linguistic enterprise. Speech acts are answered for relatively abstract action theoretical terms. The actual production, comprehension and effects of speech acts in communication, however, should be studied in a more empirical perspective. It is a fact that pragmatics has been treated as more of a theory than a practice. van Dijk(1980) further states that the philosophical and linguistic theory of speech acts is of utmost importance among the central tasks of pragmatics and has been concerned with a rather abstract account of the illocutionary aspects of language use.

Even though the influence of the abstract study of pragmatics helped advance the theory of language, there is a need to move the theory to a more empirical based studies of
pragmatics. Raising pragmatic awareness can foster what Kramsch (1993:236) calls *intercultural competence* where speakers of other languages become aware of what she terms, the *third place*.

Yuanshan Chen (2009) referring to very few opportunities learners get in learning in pragmatic development quotes Bardovi-Harlig et al. (1991:4) and remarks, "Language learners interacting with speakers of a target language must be exposed to language samples which observe social, cultural, and discourse conventions- or in other words, they are pragmatically appropriate. Speakers who do not use pragmatically appropriate language run the risk of appearing uncooperative at the least, or, more seriously, rude or insulting. This is particularly true of advanced learners whose high linguistic proficiency leads other speakers to expect concomitantly high pragmatic competence."

Therefore, the framework of the present empirical study seeks to implement sociopragmatic, pragmalinguistic competence and inferencing implicatures in developing pragmatic competence in second language learners by creating suitable learning opportunities by way of providing practical learning experiences.

Unlike the studies which focus either on speech act production or implicatures, the present study combines both Speech act productions and Inferencing Implicatures from the perspective of Cooperative Principles and Politeness Principles. The instructional materials would be designed so as to equip learners with an overall comprehension of language use.
2.1.1 EVOLUTION OF PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE

Background

Second Language researchers and theorists until 1970’s concerned themselves primarily with teaching linguistic structures and linguistic forms based on approaches such as the Grammar-Translation Method. This method was developed in order to provide learners with knowledge in both L1 and L2. Literature based on deductive application of grammar rules through translation exercises learners would become more knowledgeable about grammar of the target language. Therefore, the learners would improve speaking and writing skills in their first Language and target Language. This method aimed at developing grammatical competence by memorizing rules and facts in order to understand the syntax of L2.

However, it was soon realized by educators that attention to other variant pronunciations was missing. Apart from this, the educators did not give any importance to skills of spelling and listening, (Brown 2006). The problem in this method was that it viewed linguistic knowledge and sociocultural features as two separate fields of study. Hence, one can say the Grammar-Translation Method focused greatly on translation by neglecting the role of language functions; its major concern was teaching language form (Larsen Freeman, 2000).
In view of the above mentioned deficiencies in the Grammar-Translation Method, Applied linguistics presented a new method that subsumed pronunciation as an essential component of language learning. This method is known as the Direct Method. In this method, Grammar was taught indirectly and that too only in L2. This method prohibited any form of translation. The teacher was expected to only demonstrate grammatical concepts and vocabulary. This was done by using visual aids or examples with respect to students’ questions. One of the contributions of this Direct Method is that it underscored the importance of the spoken language although written skills were viewed as secondary.

Even though the Direct Method made some notable contributions to language teaching, it also had at least one drawback, i.e., overemphasis on oral communication and pronunciation. Because of the priority it gave to oral communication, the written skills of learners suffered very badly. Teaching language for acquiring the four skills, thus, remained a mirage (Omaggio-Hadley 2000).

The Audio Lingual Method which emerged as a corrective measure to the previously mentioned methods addressed many problematic issues in language pedagogy. This approach drew heavily from Charles Fries’ (1945) Structural Linguistics and Skinner’s (1957) Behavioural Psychology. An important assumption of this method was that the sentence patterns of the target language could be acquired through conditioning developed by providing stimuli. This method is realized in the classroom by recognizing the competence by habit formation, which resulted in ‘over learning’ and producing automatically grammatically correct speech without stopping to think (Larsen Freeman
One of the important features of this approach was that it emphasized the skills of speaking and listening as a means of communication. In other words, this method made an effort to help learners achieve language proficiency and use it to communicate.

This method based on students' ability to successfully produce utterances became increasingly popular in the L2 classrooms. The problem that this method had was that the students were unable to move beyond a certain level. Students were able to produce only those utterances with which they were familiar. When they were faced with unfamiliar utterances the students were unable to respond. Audio-lingual Method started to acknowledge conversations or dialogue as natural and unpredictable and, therefore, it led to impeding language production creatively. Another problem was that this method differed from the other previous methods in neglecting language form.

The shortcomings of the above discussed methods/approaches led to the emerging of the Natural Approach, developed by Terrell (1977) and Krashen (1983). This method focused on the needs of the learners rather than, on a strict adherence to mastering grammatical perfection. For this method, grammatical mastery was not a main objective. Focus on the overall meaning of utterances rather than on grammatical form was emphasized. The classroom activities it devised reflect the tasks in the communicative approach. This method also strived to reduce classroom anxiety by letting learners to speak when they felt comfortable to do so.
It is certain that the Natural Approach made definite advancement as it emphasized the importance of the learners and recognized their needs. However, this method’s main objective was also flawed in that it did not take culture into consideration. Its objective was successful communication in second language learning.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has emerged as the leading current framework and since its evolution it has been readily embraced by language educators (Larsen-Freeman 2000) as a useful pedagogical theory. Also called the Communicative Approach, it emphasizes as its principal objectives, the importance of a combination of linguistic form, meaning and functions. Instead of focusing on the development of flawless grammatical utterances or the acquisition of native-like pronunciation, learners are allowed to recognize that the target language is not another grammar lesson to be studied but rather the actual means to communicate. Thus, students communicate in the L2 through activities that are truly communicative. Morrow and Morrow (1981) define a truly communicative activity as one that includes information gap, choice, and feedback. Larsen-Freeman (2000:129) notes: “In communication, the speaker has a choice of what he/she will say and how he/she will say it. If the exercise is too tightly controlled so that the students can only say something in one way, the speaker has no choice and the exchange, therefore, is not communicative”

Communicative Language Teaching emerged to address many of the shortcomings of the previous teaching methodologies. This approach emphasizes as its major aim the need and importance of bringing together linguistic form, meaning and functions. This
approach focused not on the developing flawless grammatical sentences or native-like pronunciation but on actual means to communicate in target language.

Various approaches to teaching have been developed through continuous theoretical and empirical research. In the initial stages the main approaches to the teaching of English language were introducing linguistic structures to help learners to have a strong grasp of the rules of grammar in order to understand a language. This method of teaching structures of language did not prove to be very useful. Students who went through the above educational processes did understand, and were also able to decode, the grammatical units in sentences but failed to address an important aspect of language learning- communicating. Consequently, their writing skills proved to be effective but not the speaking skills. Hence there was a need for further research and subsequently the focus was on communication skills, technically known as conversational skills.

Generally, in the Communicative Approach, direct utterances are used which hardly have any scope for hidden or implied meanings. But in everyday conversation common experience shows that this is not the case. In any kind of conversation one notices that the speakers convey most of the communicational content by way of implication rather than by explicit statements. In fact it is not possible to maintain a conversation without the use of implicit meaning.

Thus any methodology and material of Communicative Language Teaching which aims to teach English as a second language, must take into account the pragmatic potential or contextually hidden meanings of utterances. There are quite a few definitions of
Pragmatics. One of them that the researcher finds particularly useful here is that which has been proposed by David Crystal (1985:240)

Pragmatics is the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication.

In other words, pragmatics is the study of communicative action in its socio-cultural context. Communicative action includes not only speech acts - such as requesting, greeting, and so on - but also participation in conversation, engaging in different types of discourse, and sustaining interaction in complex speech events. Another definition is from Lycan (1995: 588)

Pragmatics studies the use of language in context, and the context-dependence of various aspects of linguistic interpretation. … [Its branches include the theory of how] one and the same sentence can express different meanings or propositions from context to context, owing to ambiguity or indexicality or both, … speech act theory, and the theory of conversational implicature.

The models used across the world to develop pragmatic competence have been adopted in the present study. Although these studies have universal relevance, not much work has been done. The situation is even more evident in the Indian pedagogical context. Studies concerning the need for teaching and researching the practical usefulness of pragmatics have not been taken up seriously.
Vitale (2009:7) remarks, "recent pedagogical research in the second language learning sphere in the West reflects a multi-faceted exploration of the various second language acquisition theories and their corresponding practices through current teaching methodologies and approaches." While many scholars of language pedagogy continue to recognize the varied limitations regarding specific implementation of these approaches, one component remains the most immanent point of language learning success that is meaningful language use at all stages of the second language acquisition process. Unfortunately in India, the pedagogues have not taken cognizance of these developments. If at all there was any attempt to develop pragmatic competence, the teaching material limited itself to the study of speech acts such as greetings (conversational openings and closings like good morning – good night; hello, how are you – ok see you later, bye and so on which are termed as phatic expressions), requesting (polite imperatives like Please do this) complaining, apologizing (I am sorry, pardon me), in pedagogical efforts. However, this study, unlike the earlier restricted and limited approaches to teaching and developing pragmatic competence the present study seeks to create awareness in the learners that there are a number of forms available and they can use numerous production choices at hand.

Another very important aspect in pragmatic literature that is inferencing implicatures include inferences and implicatures in order to broaden the scope of learning. In everyday social interaction people do speak in indirect ways where, what they say and what they mean can be different or for that matter even the meaning can be opposite to
what is said. Communication can take place effectively only when the speaker's message is interpreted appropriately and understood by the hearer (Savignon 1997). The communicative abilities of the learners can be improved with the help of appropriately designed course materials that deal with real world topics and implementing them through group work and pair work tasks (Larsen-Freeman 2000). Hence, Second language learners need to be exposed to such materials in order to develop their ability to recover/infer the implied meaning of the utterances. Therefore, the present research study included the implicatures which is a very important component in the field of pragmatics which has so far been neglected by the language pedagogues in India.

2.1.2 ORIGIN OF PRAGMATICS

Pragmatics is a comparatively new branch of linguistics. Research in the field dates back to ancient Greece and Rome where the term ‘pragmaticus’ is found in late Latin and ‘pragmaticos’ in Greek, both meaning of being ‘practical’. The pragmatic interpretation of semiotics and verbal communication studies (Morris, 1938), for instance, helped scholars to precisely explain the differences of conventional enterprises in semiotics and linguistics. For Morris (1938), pragmatics studies the relations of signs to interpreters, while semantics studies the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable; and syntactics studies the formal relations of signs to one another. By elaborating the sense of pragmatism in his study of conversational meanings, Grice (1975) attempted modern treatment of meaning by distinguishing two kinds of meaning, natural and non-natural. Grice suggested that pragmatics should centre on the more
practical aspect of meaning, i.e., the conversational meaning which was later formulated in a variety of ways (Leech1983, Levinson1983).

Practical concerns also helped in shifting pragmatics' focus to explaining naturally occurring conversations. This resulted in the characteristic discoveries of the Cooperative Principle by Grice (1975) and the Politeness Principle by Leech (1983). Subsequently, Green (1989) explicitly defined pragmatics as natural language understanding. This was echoed by Blakemore’s (1990) *Understanding Utterances: The Pragmatics of Natural Language* and Grundy’s (1995) *Doing Pragmatics*. The impact of pragmatism has led to cross-linguistic international studies of language use, which has resulted in, among other such endeavours the publication of Sperber and Wilson's (1986) *Relevance Theory*, which convincingly explains how people comprehend and utter a communicative act.

Pragmatics is characterized as dealing with the effects of *context*. This is equivalent to saying that it deals with utterances, if one collectively refers to all the facts that can vary from utterance to utterance as ‘context.’ One must be careful; however, for the term pragmatics is often used with more limited meanings. In Levinson's (1983:9) words, "Pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language."

Thus, pragmatics deals with *utterances*, by which one means specific events, the intentional acts of speakers at times and places, typically involving language. Logic and semantics traditionally deal with properties of *types* of expressions, and not with properties that differ from token to token, or use to use, or, as one can say, from utterance
to utterance, and vary with the particular properties that differentiate them. Leech (1983:6) says about the relation between pragmatics and semantics:

The view that semantics and pragmatics are distinct, though complementary and interrelated fields of study, is easy to appreciate subjectively, but is more difficult to justify in an objective way. It is best supported negatively, by pointing out the failures or weaknesses of alternative views.

To the question why pragmatics is required when conventional linguistics (up to semantics) is already there, Mey (1993:11) remarks while arguing in favour of pragmatics as opposed to that of classical, descriptive linguistics. He states that "the endeavour of linguistics is, to begin with, to develop as science and to establish itself as independent domain, to describe everything."

2.1.3 CRITIQUE OF PRAGMATICS

There have been quite a few criticisms directed at pragmatics. They are:

- it does not have a clear-cut focus
- its principles are vague and fuzzy
- it is redundant - semantics already covers the territory adequately

In defense of pragmatics one can say that:

- the study of speech acts has illuminated social language interactions
- it covers things that semantics (hitherto) has overlooked
• it can help inform strategies for teaching language
• it has given new insights into understanding literature
• the theories of the Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle have provided insights into person-to-person interactions.

Thus as Leech (1983:1) says pragmatics was associated by linguists with the metaphor of a rag-bag. Other complaints were that, unlike grammar which resorts to rules, the vague and fuzzy principles in pragmatics are not adequate in telling people what to choose in when faced with a range of possible meanings for one single utterance in context.

The study of speech acts, for instance, provides illuminating explanation into sociolinguistic conduct. The findings of the Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle also provide insights into person-to-person interactions. The choice of different linguistic means for a communicative act and the various interpretations for the same speech act clarify human mentality in the relevance principle that contributes to the study of communication. Implications of pragmatic studies are also evident in language teaching practices. Deixis, for instance, is important in the teaching of reading. Speech acts are often helpful in improving translation and writing. Pragmatic principles are also finding their way into the study of literary works and into language teaching classrooms.

However, as Leech (1983:3) remarks, "there is a consensus view that pragmatics as a separate study is more than necessary because it handles those meanings that semantics
overlooks." Moreover, Mey (1993:7) also comments, "Pragmatics is needed if we want a fuller, deeper and generally more reasonable account of human language behaviour. Sometimes, even, a pragmatic account is the only possible one..." Thus in spite of the criticisms, the impact of pragmatics has been immense and versatile.

2.1.4 ELEMENTS OF PRAGMATICS

The lack of a clear consensus appears in the way the major concepts in pragmatics are listed by scholars. No two published accounts list the same categories of pragmatics in quite the same order. But among the many concepts in pragmatics one needs to be aware of:

- Speech act theory
- Felicity conditions
- Conversational implicature
- The Cooperative Principle
- Conversational maxims
- Relevance
- Politeness
- Deixis

The researcher would like to explain the above mentioned elements in some detail.
2.1.4.1 COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE

Before describing what is Cooperative Principles a brief survey of Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) concern with the relationship between direct and indirect speech acts and the idea that one could do things with words is necessary, that is to say, actions are performed via words. The proponents of the theory of language use have shifted their concern from sentence meaning to that of meaning of utterances. It is clearly evident that at the discourse level there is no one-to-one relation between linguistic form and utterance meaning. A particular intended meaning (which could be produced via a direct speech act) can in fact be conveyed by any number of indirect speech acts. Grice is concerned with this distinction between saying and meaning. How do speakers know how to generate these implicit meanings, and how can they assume that their addressees will reliably understand their intended meaning? His aim is to discover the mechanism behind this process.

(1) A: Is there another pint of milk?
B: I’m going to the supermarket in five minutes.

In the above example, a competent speaker of English would have little trouble inferring the meaning that there is no more milk at the moment, but that some will be bought from the supermarket shortly.

What a speaker intends to communicate is characteristically far richer than what she directly expresses; linguistic meaning radically underdetermines the message conveyed and understood, opines Horn (2005).
For example, assuming a husband and wife are getting ready to go out for the evening:

1. Husband: How much longer will you be?
2. Wife: Mix yourself a drink.

From the above utterance, the husband must go through a series of inferences based on principles that he knows what the other speaker is saying. The conventional response to the husband's question would be a direct answer where the wife indicated some time frame in which she would get ready. This would be a conventional implicature with a literal answer to a literal question. But the husband assumes that she heard his question, that she believes that he was genuinely asking how long she would be, and that she is capable of indicating when she would be ready. The wife chooses not to extend the topic by ignoring the relevance maxim. The husband then searches for a plausible interpretation of her utterance and concludes that what she intends to tell him that she is not going to offer a particular time, but she will be taking sufficiently long enough time, or at least the amount of time he would take to have his drink.

In social science generally and in linguistics specifically, the cooperative principle describes how people interact with one another. As phrased by Grice (1975: 45), who introduced it, states: "Make your contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." Though phrased as a prescriptive command, the principle is intended as a description of how people normally behave in a conversation.
In everyday conversation people are generally cooperative when they talk to each other, that is to say: speakers (generally) observe cooperative principle and listeners (generally) assume that speakers are observing it. This allows for the possibility of *implicatures*, which are meanings that are not explicitly conveyed in what is said, but that can nonetheless be inferred. A similar example from Levinson (1983:112) provides to explain how implicatures are inferred.

A: *Where's Bill?*

B: *There is a yellow VW outside Sue's house.*

In the above example, one could see that B's response has no relevance to what A wants to know from B. The response of B could have been a straightforward answer like "I think he is at Sue's house, because his car is parked outside her house" But if B answered in a roundabout manner A still assumes that B is cooperative and there must still be information that A wants. Hence with the help of some clues like

1. Bill owns a VW car.

2. He is a friend of Sue.

The above clues provide following information:

- Shared/mutual knowledge or experience
- Belief that the speaker wants to be cooperative
- Belief that the speaker has information that (as far as he/she knows) is valid.
To put more simply, people who obey the cooperative principle in their language use will make sure that what they say in a conversation furthers the purpose of that conversation. Obviously, the requirements of different types of conversations will be different. The cooperative principle can be divided into four maxims, called the *Gricean maxims*, describing specific rational principles observed by people who obey the cooperative principle; these principles enable effective communication.

### 2.1.4.2 CONVERSATIONAL MAXIMS

Grice (1967) outlined an approach to what he termed conversational implicature - how hearers manage to work out the complete message when speakers mean more than what they say. An example of what Grice meant by conversational implicature is the utterance:

“Have you got any cash on you?”

Here the speaker really wants the hearer to understand the meaning:

“Can you lend me some money? I don't have much on me.”

The conversational implicature is a message that is not found in the plain sense of the sentence. The speaker implies it. The hearer is able to infer (work out, read between the lines) this message in the utterance, by appealing to the rules governing successful conversational interaction. Grice proposes that implicatures, like the one in the second example can be calculated from the first, by understanding three things:

- the usual linguistic meaning of what is said.
• contextual information (shared or general knowledge).
• the assumption that the speaker is obeying what Grice calls the cooperative principle.

Grice’s maxim excludes certain conversational moves on the basis of four maxims, which Grice (1975: 45) defines as follows:

1. **Maxim of quantity**

   This maxim relates to the requirement that one should give all the necessary information one has for the present needs of the partner - not too much but not too little, either. That is,
   
   ➢ be as informative as required; and
   ➢ don’t be more informative than required

2. **Maxim of quality**

   Try to make your contribution one that is true

   ➢ The maxim of quality requires that we only give true information for which we have evidence. Cooperative speakers are expected to speak the truth. In other words,
   ➢ do not say what you believe is false
   ➢ do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

3. **Maxim of relation**

   What B says in response to A’s question actually relates to it

   ➢ be relevant (contribution fits the moment)

4. **Maxim of manner**
➢ be perspicuous
➢ avoid obscurity of expression
➢ avoid ambiguity
➢ be brief
➢ be orderly

As Levinson (1983:102) also comments, "In short, these maxims specify what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, co-operative way: they should speak sincerely, relevantly, clearly, while providing sufficient information". Grice (1975) was not acting as a prescriptive pragmatician when he enunciated these maxims, even though they may sound prescriptive. Rather, he was using observations on the difference between "what is said" and "what is meant" to show that people actually do follow these maxims in conversation.

2.1.4.3 POLITENESS

Model of politeness is founded on interpersonal rhetoric and views politeness as conflict avoidance and introduced the Politeness Principle. The function of the Politeness principle as Leech (1983:82) explains is “to maintain the social equilibrium and the friendly relations which enable us to assume that our interlocutors are being cooperative in the first place” Politeness is best expressed as the practical application of good manners or etiquette. It is a culturally defined phenomenon, and, therefore, what is considered polite in one culture can sometimes be quite rude or simply strange in another cultural context.
While the goal of politeness is to make all of the parties relaxed and comfortable with one another, these culturally defined standards at times may be manipulated to inflict shame on a designated party. Brown and Levinson identify two kinds of politeness, deriving from Goffman's(1959) concept of face:

- **Negative politeness**: Making a request less infringing, such as "If you don't mind..." or "If it isn't too much trouble...", respects a person's right to act freely. In other words, the speaker speaks with *deference*. There is a greater use of indirect speech acts.

- **Positive politeness**: Seeks to establish a positive relationship between parties; it respects a person's need to be liked and understood. Direct speech acts, swearing and flouting Grice's maxims can be considered aspects of positive politeness because:

  (i) they show an awareness that the relationship is strong enough to cope with what would normally be considered impolite (in the popular understanding of the term);

  (ii) they articulate an awareness of the other person's values, which fulfils the person's desire to be accepted.

Some cultures seem to prefer one of these kinds of politeness over the other. In this way politeness is culturally-bound.

**2.1.4.4 DEIXIS**
Deixis is reference by means of an expression whose interpretation is relative to the (usually) extralinguistic context of the utterance, according to Levinson (1983: 63, 85) such as:

- who is speaking
- the time or place of speaking
- the gestures of the speaker, or
- the current location in the discourse.

The notion of pragmatic competence is defined through an exploration of the successively more specific constructs of communicative competence, sociolinguistic competence, and pragmatic competence, followed by an examination of the interface of linguistic and pragmatic competence. The chapter continues with a closer look at them.

The term competence is one of the most debatable issues in linguistics. Linguists and scholars have used the term competence in different contexts to refer to different types of knowledge. Noam Chomsky, the father of linguistics, was the first to coin the term 'competence'. In his book Chomsky (1965:3) defines competence as; “Linguistic theory is primarily concerned with an ideal speaker-listener. In completely homogeneous speech community who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance.” Chomsky marked the distinction between competence (the speaker’s or hearer’s knowledge of languages) and performance (the actual use of language in
concrete situations). This study puts forward the distinction between the knowledge on one hand and the use of this knowledge on the other. Chomsky does not state in clear terms if this knowledge encapsulates the notion of ability. It seems Chomsky equates *competence* with *knowledge*. He makes no apparent distinction between *knowledge* and *ability* for the purpose of communication. The idea of competence and performance of Chomsky has limited and restricted view. The strong and weak versions of Chomsky's definition of competence were discussed by Cambell and Wales (1970). In their view, 'knowledge' includes the 'ability' to use language appropriately in a given situation. These concepts were also studied by quite a few linguists in the course of time and the term competence was used pertaining to different concepts in various contexts. During 1980s, the term *pragmatic competence* began to be studied.

Crystal (1985) regarded pragmatics as the study of the communicative action in its sociocultural context. Thus, it can be stated that individuals have some sort of pragmatic competence which allows them to use language in different and concrete situations, in various contexts. Hence, pragmatic competence is mainly studied at the social level within the limits of speech acts and social acts, interactions or at the interactional level.

It is doubtless to say that the development of the different types of competence is related to the teachers’ offering opportunities to the language learners to learn and use language in a variety of contexts.
2. 1.5 SOCIOLINGUISTIC COMPETENCE

The knowledge of the sociocultural rules of language and of discourse is termed as Sociolinguistic competence. This kind of competence demands an understanding of the social context in which language is used: the principles of the participants, their shared information, and the functions of the interaction. In this context an opinion can be made on the rightness of a particular utterance, as mentioned by Brown (2000). Lyie Bachman's (1990) sociolinguistic competence constitutes aspects, which deal with components such as politeness, formality, metaphor, registers, and culturally related aspects of language. Owning a good sociolinguistic competence implies knowing how to give every person his or her due. It means knowing when to be quiet, and when to talk, when to give compliments to others, and when to apologize. It also means being able to study situations and know what is the appropriate thing to say or do. There are an infinite number of combinations of roles, tasks, contexts, and feelings that govern what is appropriate in any given encounter.

As Savignon (1983:37) mentions, “Sociolinguistic competence is the knowledge of socio-cultural rules of discourse and language. It requires ‘an understanding of the social context in which language is used: the roles of participants, the information they share, and the function of interacting.” Here, Savignon conveys that the sociolinguistic competence means more than to use language appropriately in a social setting. In short, the sociolinguistic information which the speakers convey to each other share a pragmatic competence which helps them to interpret and act in different situations by making use of
different contextual hints. It also includes components like; ‘culture’ and ‘interaction’, which reflects the fundamental concepts of spoken and gestural communication.

2.1.6 INTERACTIONAL COMPETENCE

Interactional competence is the ability of a person to communicate which reflects knowledge of the structure; the rules of language and the principles of fundamental interaction in real life situation within a social circumstance and specific culture. Some linguists also study this concept with functional competence which reflects the ability to use the language for different communicative purposes.

Kramsch (1986: 367) in her article defines the term interaction as follows “... interaction entails negotiating intended meanings, i.e., adjusting one’s speech to the effect one intends to have on the listener. It entails anticipating the listener’s response and possible misunderstandings, clarifying one’s own and the other intentions and arriving at the closed possible watch between intended, perceived, and anticipated meanings.” Facing this selective information, it can be said that interactional competence makes the use of structural rules of language, and runs the psycho-linguistic and socio-linguistic functions of language as well, which help to provide accuracy and elucidate the mutual comprehension of the speech acts covered in the course of a conversation.

Hugh Mehan (1982:65) states that, "'Competence’ becomes interactional in two senses of the term. One, it is the competence necessary for effective interaction. Two, it is the
competence that is available in the interaction between people.” Hugh Mehan (1982:65) also states that competence can be found “in the talk, the gestures, and the other interactional work that people use to make sense of one another and to assemble the organized character of social situations” Speakers not only should have knowledge but also should know how to appropriately showcase it. Hugh Mehan (1982:79) comments that “This involves knowing that certain ways of talking and acting are appropriate on some occasions and not others, knowing with whom, when, and where they can speak and act. They also need to provide the speech and behavior appropriate for a given classroom situation, which involves relating behavior to different classroom situations by interpreting classroom rules that are often implicit.”

Therefore, such an ability; called ‘functional competence’, aims at the ability to establish the link between the question and its essential resemblance in particular real life situation, recognizing the speaker’s intention by evaluating his/her body language, awareness of the semiotic symbols used, types of social interaction (i.e. introducing, greeting, farewell, etc.), the communicative functions of language, acting accordingly and appropriately.

2. 1.7 CULTURAL COMPETENCE

*Culture* according to Lyons (1990:302) is, “Culture may be described as socially acquired knowledge: i.e. as the knowledge that someone has by virtue of his being a member of a particular society.” As Lyons points out, culture cannot be separated with its social value, therefore, cultural competence can be defined as the ability to understand and use
language in a way that would be understood by the fellow members of that culture. Misunderstandings may crop up if knowledge of culture (traditions, rituals, conventions, beliefs, etc.) is inappropriate. Le Page (1978:41) remarks,

When we come to the central question of ‘competence’ we have to ask: ‘What is it an individual needs to know, in order to operate as a member of this society?’ A society only exists in the competence of its members to make it work as it does; a language only exists in the competence of those who use and regard themselves as users of that language; and the latter competence is the essential mediating system for the former.

Le Page, here, considers the term competence as a living social concept which paves the way to social behaviour as shared and used by the members of that society.

According to Chamberlain (2005:197), culture represents “the values, norms, and traditions that affect how individuals of a particular group perceive, think, interact, behave, and make judgments about their world.” According to Martin & Vaughn (2007:31-36), the set of four components of cultural competence i.e., awareness, attitude, knowledge and skills, represents the diagnostic and intervention development benefits that make the approach most appealing. The description of each of the component is described by them as follows:

**Awareness** is consciousness of one's personal reactions to people who are different. A police officer who recognizes that he profiles people who look like they are from Mexico as *illegal aliens* has cultural awareness of his reactions to this group of people.
Attitude, Paul Pedersen’s (1988) multicultural competence model emphasized three components: awareness, knowledge and skills. Diversity Training University International added the attitude component in order to emphasize the difference between training that increases awareness of cultural bias and beliefs in general and training that has participants carefully examine their own beliefs and values about cultural differences.

Knowledge, Social science research indicates that our values and beliefs about equality may be inconsistent with our behaviours, and we ironically may be unaware of it. Social psychologist Patricia Devine and her colleagues, for example, showed in their research that many people who score low on a prejudice test tend to do things in cross cultural encounters that exemplify prejudice (e.g., using out-dated labels such as “illegal aliens”, “coloured”, and “homosexual”). This makes the Knowledge component an important part of cultural competence development.

Regardless of whether our attitude towards cultural differences matches our behaviours, we can all benefit by improving our cross-cultural effectiveness. One common goal of diversity professionals is to create inclusive systems that allow members to work at maximum productivity levels.

Skills component focuses on practicing cultural competence to perfection. Communication is the fundamental tool by which people interact in organizations. This includes gestures and other non-verbal communication that tend to vary from culture to culture.
Thus Cultural competence has become increasingly an important component for work, home, community social lives.

2. 1.8 COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

The term was coined by Dell Hymes in 1966, reacting against the perceived inadequacy of Noam Chomsky's (1965) distinction between competence and performance. To address Chomsky's abstract notion of competence, Hymes undertook ethnographic exploration of communicative competence that included "communicative form and function in integral relation to each other" as stated by Leung (2005:119). The approach pioneered by Hymes is now known as the ethnography of communication.

As of late there has already been much debate about linguistic competence and communicative competence in the second and foreign language teaching literature, the outcome has always been the consideration of communicative competence as a superior model of language following Hymes' opposition to Chomsky's linguistic competence. This opposition has been adopted by those who seek new directions toward a communicative era by assuming the basic motives and the appropriacy of this opposition behind the development of communicative competence.

Communicative competence is understood as the ability to put language to communicative purposes. Communicative competence considers language as an instrument used for communication. Widdowson (1989:135) states,
Communicative competence is not a matter of knowing rules for the composition of sentences and being able to employ such rules to assemble expressions from scratch as and when occasion requires. It is much more a matter of knowing a stock of partially pre-assembled patterns, formulaic frameworks, and a kit of rules, so to speak, and being able to apply the rules to make whatever adjustments are necessary according to contextual demands. Communicative competence in this view is essentially a matter of adaptation, and rules are not generative but regulative and subservient.

Therefore, this competence aims to focus on the development of language skills, and depends on the correlation between the skills as well. By exercising so, the language learner will learn how to convey the right message to the audience. According to Canale and Swain (1980:5),

It is common to find the term ‘communicative competence’ used to refer exclusively to knowledge or capability relating to the rules of language use and the term ‘grammatical (or linguistic) competence’ used to refer to the reciprocal rules of grammar.

According to Canale and Swain (1980), the rules of language are useless if the language user is unaware of the rules of language use. In other words, there is reciprocity between the language rules and the rules of language use. In short, Canale and Swain consider the term ‘communicative competence’ as a go-between, which refers to the relationship between grammatical competence (the knowledge of the rules of language) and the sociolinguistic competence (the knowledge of the rules of language use).
2.1.9 STRATEGIC COMPETENCE

Strategic competence grapples with the knowledge of language and the ability to use this knowledge effectively and appropriately in order to take an active part in communicative interaction. Therefore, it is ability to repair breakdowns in communication, using a range of strategies such as repetition, paraphrasing, miming, avoiding problematic concepts and asking for help. Putting differently, the strategic competence is the link that ties *everything* together. A usual example in this case could be; if one is late to a class and if one needs to find a good excuse, the white lie that one utters at that time is a product of one's strategic competence which reflects a criterion of the competence types that the language user has. However, under the term strategic competence, not only the critical aspects but also the creative aspects of the human mind is considered. In an interview with Farrell (1998:95) it is remarked that, “Critical reflection refers to an activity or process in which experience is recalled, considered and evaluated, usually in relation to a broader purpose. It is a response to a past experience and involves conscious recall and examination of the experience as the basis for the evaluation and the decision-making and as a source for planning and action.” In the critical thinking process the questions have to be thought stimulating which would help the learner to generate another critical question. Erton (2007:64) states, "In this process, the questions are more important than the answers. The knowledge of language enables the speaker to combine words to form phrases, sentences, and longer texts. Since the speaker of a foreign language cannot know a dictionary with all the possible sentences in the language, s/he refers to the creative
aspect of the human mind which is able to produce unlimited utterances by making use of what has already been obtained in terms of the knowledge of language." Creating a new utterance for communicative purposes and critical thinking go hand in hand during the speech production phase. In the initial stage, the speaker carefully plans the stages and produces the utterance. Such an utterance might be recalled from the memory or might be created for the very first time. Here, at the preparation stage, both the language and the ability to use this knowledge are no doubt directed by the strategic competence of the language learner for further action.

2.1.10 DISCOURSE COMPETENCE

The Discourse Competence term is coined by Canale and Swain (1980). This refers to a speaker's knowledge of rules governing 'the combination of utterances and communicative functions' in discourse. It is a component of sociolinguistic competence which is, in turn, a part of communicative competence. The term discourse competence applies to studies in Discourse Analysis, confined to conversational interaction where language is regarded as a tool for successful communication. As Akmajian (1997:369) exemplifies, “There are many forms of discourse and many forms of talk-exchange. Letters, jokes, stories, lectures, sermons, speeches, and so on are all categories of discourse; arguments, interviews, business dealings, instruction, and conversations are categories of talk exchanges. Conversations (and talk-exchanges in general) are usually structured consequences of expressions by more than a single speaker.” Therefore,
discourse competence deals with the ability to arrange sentences into united structures. In discourse analysis, Akmajian’s examples are studied in a variety of contexts considering openings, turn taking, closings, speech acts, and in authentic texts. Therefore, the development of discourse competence will not only lead to success in uttering meaningful sentences but also helps the language learner to gain insight by experiencing different interactional patterns in varying socio-cultural and physical contexts. One of the major goals of the language learner is to make the connection between the different types of discourse in such a way to create a meaningful whole by providing accuracy and fluency in the target language.

Furthermore, the researcher would like to give the models of the researches which dealt with the pragmatic aspects that were used for bringing pragmatic awareness in the learners in an explicit teacher fronted classroom teaching.

2.1.10.1 COMPREHENSIBLE INPUT

Stephen Krashen (1981:6-7) describes SLA as, "What theory implies, quite simply, is that language acquisition, first or second, occurs when comprehension of real messages occurs, and when the acquirer is not 'on the defensive'... Language acquisition does not require extensive use of conscious grammatical rules, and does not require tedious drill. It does not occur overnight, however. Real language acquisition develops slowly, and speaking skills emerge significantly later than listening skills, even when conditions are perfect. The best methods are, therefore, those that supply 'comprehensible input' in low
anxiety situations, containing messages that students really want to hear. These methods do not force early production in the second language, but allow students to produce when they are 'ready', recognizing that improvement comes from supplying communicative and comprehensible input, and not from forcing and correcting production." To elaborate further, the input could be through language (e.g., through lexical items, syntax, or discourse), through gestures, or through silence. Whether the input is pragmatically comprehensible to the nonnative depends on various factors, such as:

(a) the functional proficiency of the nonnative in the target language and in other languages,

(b) the age, gender, occupation, social status, and experience of the nonnative in the relevant communities of practice (e.g., talk on the shop floor), and

(c) the nonnative’s previous multilingual/multicultural experiences.

2.1.10.2 THE OUTPUT HYPOTHESIS

The word “output” was used in the 1980s, to show the outcome, or product, of the language acquisition device. Output was substitutable with “what the learner/system has learned”. The output hypothesis claims that the act of producing language (speaking or writing) makes up, under certain circumstances, part of the process of second language learning. In the early 1980’s, the burgeoning field of SLA was dominated by the concept of input. “Second-language acquisition theory provides a very clear explanation as to why immersion works. According to current theory, we acquire language in only one
way: when we understand messages in that language, when we receive comprehensible input.” (Krashen, 1984: 61). These latter findings raised doubts about the validity of the input hypothesis (Swain 1985), most particularly about the argument that comprehensible input was “the only true cause of second-language acquisition” (Krashen 1984: 61). One explanation, based on both informal and formal observations in immersion classrooms, was the output hypothesis (Swain 1985).

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”. The hypothesis, then, does not deny the importance of input, but reacts to some sweeping claims of the Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985) that argued for comprehensible input as the only necessary condition for SLA to occur.

Significantly, the Output Hypothesis argues for a fuller understanding of the SLA process, taking the theoretical burden for acquisition off of input alone and thus allowing a view of acquisition and the developmental process that acknowledges the potential advantage of approaches such as processing instruction (e.g., VanPatten, 2002) and focus on form (FonF; e.g., Doughty & Varela, 1998) for enhancing noticing while recognizing that the acquisition process is complex and that other phases of the process may be targeted for instruction profitably as well. According to the Output Hypothesis, the production of language by a learner is not merely the result of acquisition, but is rather a critical contributor to acquisition. As a matter of fact, research has affirmed the notion
that when L2 learners are exposed to large amounts of input but have inadequate opportunity to produce the target language, acquisition is shortened to some extent in terms of morphosyntactic accuracy (e.g., the French immersion studies; Swain, 1985; Swain & Lapkin, 1986, 1995, 2002).

The three functions proposed for Output in Swain (1995) are:

(i) **Noticing/Triggering**: The claim here is that *while attempting to produce* the target language (vocally or silently), learners may notice that they do not know how to say (or write) precisely the meaning they wish to convey. In other words, 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.

(ii) **Hypothesis Testing**: The claim here is that output may sometimes be, from the learner’s perspective, a “trial run” reflecting their hypothesis of how to say (or write) their intent. In other words, 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.

(iii) **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. In this context, I (Swain 2000; 2002; 2006) have re-labeled “output” as speaking, writing, collaborative dialogue, private speech, verbalizing, and/or languaging – in order to escape the inhibiting effect of the “conduit
metaphor” implied in the use of terms such as input and output (Firth & Wagner 1997; Kramsch 1995; van Lier 2000).

These three functions help learners build an awareness of their own developing systems at a level that bare exposure to input does not allow, moving the learners from semantic level language processing to working on a more syntactic level (Swain & Lapkin, 1995). Significantly, it is also claimed that the functions of Output can operate even without explicit feedback from interlocutors.

Most recent pedagogical research in the L2 learning field reflects a multi-faceted exploration of the various second language acquisition theories as well as their related practices through current teaching methodologies and approaches. While many reformers of language pedagogy go on to recognize various limitations involving specific implementation of these approaches, one component remains the central point of language learning success: use of meaningful language at all stages of the second language acquisition process.

This brief overview of past teaching methodologies reveals that the focal point of language learning has changed substantially. This has led many foreign/second language pedagogues to focus on the significance of pragmatic competence as a component of overall communicative competence. If pragmatic competence is an essential component of communicative classroom teaching, it is surprising, then, to note that not much attention has been paid in studying ways and means for further exploration to advance the
efficacy of the usability and productivity of pragmatic knowledge. Specifically, there is a significant scope for expansion and progress, especially in the field of speech act realization (Klee 1998). Maybe further studies of various speech acts would throw more light on this matter. Therefore, it would be constructive to review past studies that mark the potential risk of a communicative classroom in the absence of pragmatic instruction.

2.1.11 PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE

Chomsky (1980a: 225) accepts that, "Language is used purposefully", in later writings he introduced the term pragmatic competence, i.e., knowledge of how language is related to the situation in which it is used. He also states that pragmatic competence, "places language in the institutional setting of its use, relating intentions and purposes to the linguistic means at hand". Stern (1983:346) summarizes ‘competence’ in language teaching as:

a. The intuitive mastery of the forms of language.

b. The intuitive mastery of the linguistic, cognitive, affective and sociocultural meanings, expressed by the language forms.

c. The capacity to use the language with maximum attention to communication and minimum attention to form.

d. The creativity of language use.

However, the language learners start to achieve the socio-cultural aspects of language in childhood. In this regard Heath (1983:11) claims that, “. . . the different ways children
learned to use language were dependent on the ways which (members of) each community structured their families, defined the roles of that community members could assume, and played out their concepts of childhood that gained child socialization.” Thus, this affirms the idea that the sociolinguistic competence of the language learner not only shapes the ‘ethno-identity’, but also the world view of the individual.

2.11.1 EXPLICIT INTERVENTIONAL TEACHING

Lately, some studies in second language learning have been done to examine the efficacy of pedagogical intervention and its relevance to pragmatic competence. Applied specifically in interventional studies, pedagogical intervention takes place through the explicit teaching of pragmatic themes at hand. In practice session, the teacher focuses on the relationship between the language form and function of the pragmatic feature. These studies differ greatly from experimental studies, where pragmatic awareness is assumed to develop through conventional language teaching focused on distinct aspects of the L2 grammar. Under the latter methodology, any degree of pragmatic competence that is thought of has only been done so incidentally. First of all to this specific topic, the broad attention to the linguistic form and its role in a particular communicative act may facilitate a more prominent degree of pragmatic awareness. While incidental learning of the pragmatic aspect is possible, the explicit teaching of the aspect may be profitable to the learner. According to Schmidt (1993: 35), “consciously paying attention to the
relevant features in the input and attempting to analyze their significance in terms of deeper generalizations are both highly facilitative.”

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

The present study draws from several different areas of linguistics and the varied nature of this chapter reflects this. In this chapter, studies done on such topics as Politeness Theory, Speech Act Theory, SLA, and others have been discussed as they relate to the research assumptions outlined in this study. Many of the ideas presented in this chapter were implemented into methods and procedures that were used to carry out the present study.

Thus, the aim of the practical application of different teaching and learning activities is to help students become more efficient, eloquent and successive communicators in the target language. As Harlow (1990:348) states, “. . . most importantly, both teachers and textbooks alike need to be emphasized to the learner that language is composed of not just linguistic and lexical elements; rather, language reflects also the social context, taking into account situational and social factors in the act of communication.” As White
(1993:193) mentioned, "... although an utterance is grammatically well formed it may be functionally confusing or contextually inappropriate." Thus, conveyed message of the speaker can be grammatically accurate, but contextually might sound inappropriate. The reason of this inappropriateness might result from social factors (customs, values), the lack of social and intrapersonal skills, cultural distinctions, lack of vital and creative thinking, etc..

Therefore, there is a need to keep in mind that developing pragmatic competence in language learning and teaching today is indispensable, because pragmatic competence shapes the world view of the individual through language. It also offers teachers the chance to understand their students in a better way by keeping in mind the requisite interactional, psychological, social and cultural components in language teaching pedagogy. Next section B would be to introduce the framework for the Research Instrument.

2.2 FRAMEWORK FOR THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

For the present study, a Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT) was designed as an instrument for conducting a Pretest and a Posttest for the purpose of measuring pragmatic productive ability of the Select Group. Boxer (2002:15) mentions that "... DCTs may take one of two forms: open-ended questionnaires simply ask for the subject to supply the relevant speech act in response to the stimulus (the first line); closed questionnaires elicit a speech act from the subject, but then follow the blank line with a reply from the first
speaker, so that the response must take into account not only the initial statement, but also the reply to follow.” The researcher constructed the WDCT in line with what Boxer explains in which there is a stated instruction outlining the context within which a dialogue occurs. Next, the first line of the dialogue is presented, and the participant is then given an opportunity to respond in the way that he/she believes most appropriate.

The WDCT (Pretest and Posttest) comprised thirty questions in each of the tests on Speech Acts that deal with questions on Literal/Non Literal Utterances, Inferencing Implicatures, Forming Requests, Complaints, Apologies, Compliments/Compliment Responses, Hedges, Identifying correct Speech Act Functions and Felicity Conditions. After administering the pretest, the Select Group were to be initiated into instruction. It was to be dealt with developing two different kinds of pragmatic abilities in this study. Firstly, for the purpose of raising pragmatic awareness, the Select Group were to be taught material that would explain the realization and interpretation patterns, rules, strategies, and tokens of the four speech acts under study. Secondly, to sensitize insight into reading between the lines, in other words, to enhance the ability to infer the hidden meanings of utterances; the following pragmatic aspects were exposed to them by stages starting with the difference between language and language use, sentence meaning and utterance meaning, role of context, role of background knowledge and indirectness in utterances. Therefore, the selected pragmatic aspects used in the WDCT are described in this section with the objective and rationale behind using them.
2. 2.1 LITERAL/NON LITERAL SPEECH FUNCTION

The objective for using the short examples is to find out if the learners have the ability to identify the functions of the utterances in the following ways:

i) to identify the functions of the given structural forms

ii) to recognize the illocutionary force of the utterances and

2. 2.2 IMPLICATURES

This section would be to sensitize learners' ability to infer the meaning of implicatures. Grounded on Grice's theory of Cooperative Principles and Leech's Politeness Principles and also Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory, it attempts to teach implicatures by sensitizing learners the role context plays, back ground knowledge, shared knowledge of the interlocutors involved that makes successful inferring of an implicature possible. The development of the pragmatic competence with all its aspects, help the language learners to widen their education and determine their world perspectives. If the language learner does not achieve most of these goals through the language learning process, the result will absolutely be a pragmatic failure. So to say, it is the misinterpretation or the inability to understand the message uttered by the speaker.

This would enable learners to make sense of a discourse by inferring the covert propositional constructions from the interpretation of illocutionary act. It would also reveal that implicature is an important pragmatic element in the process of
communication which bridges the gap between what is literally said and what is intentionally meant.

2.2.3 SPEECH ACTS PRODUCTION VIZ., REQUEST, APOLOGY, COMPLAINT, COMPLIMENT AND COMPLIMENT RESPONSES

The objective of using these materials is to investigate the learners' ability in understanding the social distance, power, that interplay with the choice of structures that the speaker has to make keeping in mind the face. Also, these are the components that a speaker needs to use in social and professional day to day real life situations. It is an attempt of the researcher to make the learners able to make the right choice of linguistic forms or non-verbal signals that might help to mitigate the face-threatening effects of this speech act. As many learners lack both the sociocultural and the linguistic competences that may qualify them to perform appropriate speech acts.

2.2.4 HEDGES

A hedge is a mitigating device used to lessen the impact of an utterance. Typically, they are adjectives or adverbs, but can also consist of clauses. It could be regarded as a form of euphemism. Therefore, the objective is to give the learners knowledge of hedges that can soften or strengthen the force of an utterance they would use and save them from being on the wrong foot. This section would be utilized to make the learners use Hedges as an effective strategy to maintain the social relationship and preserve the face of communicators.
2. 2.5 SEARLE'S TYPOLOGY OF SPEECH ACT

This section would be in the type of matching Searle's typology of Speech Acts. Each sentence represents of the types of speech Act. The technical concepts might be differentiating the students in the pretest, therefore, explanation to the function is provided. This test is to find out if the learners have any prior knowledge to these terms and its usability.

2. 2.6 PERFORMATIVES

This section would focus on the way different types of receivers infer pragmatic meaning. This approach could encourage teachers to be more sensitive towards learners’ heritage culture. The learners would be able to understand pragmatics and the need for tolerance by getting a clear but not overly complex demonstration of the difficulties of separating culturally related failure to non-culturally related ones (e.g. pragmalinguistics versus sociolinguistics failure). All this presupposes that the cognitive level and learning levels of the learners are such that they are ready and receptive to such teaching and that the teaching materials and methods avoid pitfalls that some teachers might experience as pointed out by Brislin (1987) and Thomas (1983).

As the study of pragmatics is as vast as the components explained above suggest, the researcher has taken *Speech acts*, and *Implicatures*, as concepts of preliminary study to teach the undergraduate students. He also seeks to illustrate the usability of pragmatic
insights in preparing effective classroom teaching materials, which would cater to the goal of equipping the learners with the skill to understand and respond to direct and indirect speech acts.

Thus, a test on the development in pragmatic competence is intended to be administered on the learners of the Select Group; comprising nine-item pretest and posttest WDCT (see Appendices B and C). A comparison of the test scores of the pretest and the posttest would be interpreted as the performance achieved by the Select Group.