

*Pragmatics in a College-level EFL Curriculum*¹⁾

大学外国語教育における語用能力

Gabriele Kasper

ガブリエル・カスパー

Yuriko Kite

カイト 由利子

第二言語や外国語習得には、発音・語彙・文法等の「言語能力」に加えて、それを実際の場面でいかに運用し、コミュニケーションを達成させるかという「語用能力」の養成が必要である。語用能力とは何か。Crystalを始め、多くの定義があり、中間言語語用論に関して様々な面から研究されている。最近では、語用能力を高めるための学習に関心が寄せられている。例えば外国語のクラスで語用論研究から分かっているルールなどを教えるべきか。もし教えるとすれば、明示的に教えるべきか。この領域での研究は始まったばかりであるが、これまでの研究は有望である。ある大学での「ほめ言葉」に関する授業の例を簡単に紹介し、今後「語用能力」の養成が、大学外国語教育のカリキュラムでどこに位置するのか、また、語用論の領域で課されるべき研究について述べる。

キーワード

語用能力養成 (teaching of pragmatics)、外国語教育としての英語 (English as a Foreign language (EFL))、大学レベル (college level)、ほめ表現 (compliment)、タスク (pedagogical task)

Communicative language teaching has been with us for well over two decades, in theory if not in practice—if such milestones in the history of language teaching as the Threshold Level for English (van Ek, 1975) and Wilkins' Notional Syllabus (1976) are any indication. A strong theoretical impetus for this development came from the social sciences and humanities outside language pedagogy. Different notions of communicative competence proposed by Dell Hymes from the perspective of linguistic anthropology (1971) and Jürgen Habermas from the vantage point of social philosophy (1971) served as guiding constructs for the design of communicative competence as the overall goal of language teaching and assessment. An influential and comprehensive review of communicative competence and related notions was offered by Canale and Swain (1980), who also proposed a widely cited model of communicative competence for language instruction and testing. While pragmatics does not figure as a term in their model,

pragmatic ability is included under 'sociolinguistic competence', called 'rules of use'. Ten years later, Bachman (1990, p. 87ff.) suggested a model of communicative ability that does not only include pragmatic competence as one of the two main components of 'language competence', parallel to 'organizational competence', but subsumes 'sociolinguistic competence' and 'illocutionary competence' under pragmatic competence. The prominence of pragmatic ability has been maintained in a recent revision of this model by Bachman and Palmer (1996, p. 66ff.).

What exactly is the communicative ability that has gained such attention in second language pedagogy? Pragmatics has been defined in various ways, reflecting authors' theoretical orientation and intended audience. A definition that is particularly useful for second language pedagogy has been suggested by David Crystal:

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 (Crystal, 1997, p. 301).

In short, pragmatics is defined as the study of communicative action in its sociocultural 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. Following Geoffrey Leech (1983), pragmatics can be understood as interpersonal rhetoric - the way speakers and writers accomplish goals as social actors who do not just need to get things done but attend to their interpersonal relationships with other participants at the same time.

Leech (1983) and Jenny Thomas (1983) proposed to subdivide pragmatics into a pragmlinguistic and sociopragmatic component. *Pragmlinguistics* refers to the resources for conveying communicative acts and relational or interpersonal meanings. Such resources include pragmatic strategies like directness and indirectness, routines, and a large range of linguistic forms which can intensify or soften communicative acts (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989). *Sociopragmatics* has been described by Leech (1983, p. 10) as 'the sociological interface of pragmatics', referring to the social perceptions underlying participants' interpretation and performance of communicative action. Speech communities differ in their assessment of speaker's and hearer's social distance and social power, their rights and obligations, and the degree of imposition involved in particular communicative acts (Takahashi & Beebe, 1993; Blum-Kulka & House, 1989; Olshtain, 1989). The values of context factors are negotiable: they can

change through the dynamics of conversational interaction, as captured in Fraser's (1990) notion of the 'conversational contract' and Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (1993).

In many second and foreign language teaching contexts, curricula and materials developed in recent years include strong pragmatic components or even adopt a pragmatic approach as their organizing principle. A number of proposals for instruction in different aspects of pragmatic competence are now based on empirical studies of L2 native speaker discourse, on both L2 native speaker and interlanguage material, or on the classic set of comparable interlanguage, L1 and L2 data. Examples of target-based teaching proposals for L2 English are Holmes and Brown (1987) on complimenting, Scotton and Bernsten (1988) on conversational structure and management, and Bardovi-Harlig, Hartford, Mahan-Taylor, Morgan, and Reynolds (1991) on conversational closings. Proposals based on native speaker and interlanguage data include the 'pedagogic interactional grammar' by Edmondson and House (1981), comprising a large number of speech acts and discourse functions, and Rose's (1994) recommendation for consciousness-raising activities on requesting. Bouton (1994) suggests an instructional strategy for improving learners' comprehension of indirect questions, thus far a notable exception in that the instruction is informed by a longitudinal study of learners' implicature comprehension.

The need for instruction in pragmatics has been demonstrated in a comprehensive body of literature, examining second and foreign language learners' comprehension and production of pragmatic information and their development of L2 pragmatic ability (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig, 1996, 2001; Bouton, 1996; Kasper, 1997a, b). Many aspects of L2 pragmatics are not acquired without the benefit of instruction, or they are learnt more slowly. There is thus a strong indication that instructional intervention may be necessary for or facilitative to the acquisition of L2 pragmatic ability. This is particularly true in a *foreign* language context, where students have little access to target language input and even less opportunity for productive L2 use outside the classroom.

Based on the demonstrated need for instruction in pragmatics, a growing research literature examines how effective different instructional approaches are for helping students acquire various aspects of target pragmatics and discourse (Kasper, 2001; Rose & Kasper, 2001). Encouragingly, studies reported thus far strongly suggest that most aspects of L2 pragmatics are teachable. Furthermore, classroom research on the effectiveness of different instructional arrangements indicates that students benefit most from a combination of explicit instruction and student-centered activities which (further) raise students' metapragmatic awareness and provide them with ample opportunity for interactive practice. Such instructional practices are based on general cognitive principles of second language learning (Robinson, 2001). They include the following:

- Activate students' *prior knowledge*.
- Provide ample contextualized *input* of the instructional target.
- Arrange activities that orient students' attentional *focus on the form(s) and function(s)* of the instructional target.
- Thereby, students' will be able to *notice* the target feature.
- *Noticing* is logically and sequentially prior to *understanding*. Noticing can occur without understanding, but no understanding is possible without noticing. Both processes can coincide.
- Provide opportunities for students to increase their metalinguistic or metapragmatic *awareness* of the target feature.
- Provide ample *output* opportunities.
- Provide *feedback*.
- Provide different formats for *interaction* (face-to-face, CMC, telephone, writing).
- Provide opportunities for *proceduralization* (automatization) through skill-specific practice.

In the study reported below, we examined some instructional options for developing Japanese college students' pragmatic ability in EFL. Two curriculum components were specifically addressed: goals and objectives, and implementation through teaching strategies and learning activities (see Brown, 1995, for a comprehensive approach to curriculum development). The specification of goals and objectives was based on the overall goals of the curriculum and on data-based pragmatic research, including studies on native speakers of English and Japanese and on Japanese learners of English. The interlanguage pragmatics literature proved particularly useful in providing pointers to students' learning difficulties. Research on intercultural (mis-) communication was helpful in identifying areas of pragmatics that are particularly prone to 'pragmatic failure' and therefore require special attention.

Obviously, decisions on appropriate teaching strategies and learning activities depend on the formulation of the goals and objectives for the pragmatic component of the curriculum. However, we assumed that the following activities would serve as implementations of the pragmatic curriculum components and the cognitive principles of L2 learning listed above.

Awareness-raising: Through awareness-raising activities, students are helped to notice and understand sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic information (Schmidt, 1993). Students are directed to observe particular pragmatic features in various sources of oral or written 'data', ranging from videos of authentic interaction, feature films (Rose, 1997), other fictional and non-

fictional written and audiovisual sources to native speaker 'classroom guests' (Bardovi-Harlig et al., 1991).

Observation tasks have a prominent role in awareness raising activities.

- A *sociopragmatic observation task* focuses on the context conditions of communicative acts, for instance, under what conditions native speakers of American English express gratitude—when, for what kinds of goods or services, and to whom (cf. Eisenstein & Bodman, 1993). Depending on the student population and available time, such observations may be open or structured. Open observations leave it to the students to detect what the important context factors may be. For structured observations, students are provided with an observation sheet which specifies the categories to look out for - for instance, speaker's and hearer's status and familiarity, the cost of the good or service to the giver, and the degree to which the giver is obliged to provide the good or service. A useful model for such an observation sheet is the one proposed by Rose (1994) for requests.
- A *pragmalinguistic observation task* focuses on the strategies and linguistic forms by which a communicative act is accomplished. In the case of thanking, students will observe what formulae are used and what additional means of expressing appreciation are employed, such as expressing pleasure about the giver's thoughtfulness or the received gift, asking questions about it, and so forth.
- A further task can ask students to examine in which contexts the various ways of expressing gratitude are used; thus sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic aspects are combined. By focusing students' attention on relevant features of the input, such observation tasks help students make connections between linguistic forms, pragmatic functions, their occurrence in different social contexts, and their cultural meanings. Students will compare and discuss their observations and their understanding of them with those of other students, supported by the teacher's comments and explanation.

Practicing L2 pragmatic abilities requires student-student interaction. In their books on tasks for language learning, Nunan (1989) and Crookes and Gass (1993a, b) explain the rationale underlying a task-based approach from the perspectives of second language acquisition and pedagogy. Most small group interaction requires that students take alternating discourse roles as speaker and hearer, yet different types of task may engage students in different speech events and communicative actions. It is therefore important to identify very specifically which pragmatic

abilities are called upon by different tasks. A useful distinction can be made between referential and interpersonal communication tasks. In referential communication tasks (Yule, 1997), students have to refer to concepts for which they lack necessary L2 words. Such tasks expand students' vocabulary and develop their strategic competence. Interpersonal communication tasks are more concerned with participants' social relationships and include such communicative acts as opening and closing conversations, expressing emotive responses as in thanking and apologizing, or influencing the other person's course of action as in requesting, suggesting, inviting, and offering. Activities such as roleplay, simulation, and drama engage students in different social roles and speech events. Such activities provide students with opportunities to develop some of the many pragmatic and sociolinguistic abilities that they need in interpersonal encounters outside the classroom (Crookall & Saunders, 1989; Crookall & Oxford, 1990; Olshtain & Cohen, 1991). Recent research by Ohta (1997, 2001) demonstrates the gains students make through small group interaction in foreign language classrooms.

Learning about compliments

In this section, we will explore how instruction might be incorporated in a college-level curriculum in an EFL context. We first briefly describe the teaching context, why we selected compliments, and then review studies on compliments. Finally, we will describe a number of tasks designed to enhance students' awareness of compliments.

Instructional context

A brief explanation of the teaching context is necessary here. English is a required foreign language at Kansai University. Each student is required to take four units each in the first and second year. Some faculties offer advanced level EFL courses for 3rd and 4th year students. The course under discussion is such an elective course. It is assumed that only those students who show keen interest in continuing English will register. The course is advertised as *Special English II* and extends over one academic year, divided into two semesters. It is up to the instructor to specify its content. The course has three important characteristics that make it particularly suitable for teaching pragmatics. One is students' English proficiency level. Compared with the required English courses for freshman or sophomore students, the students' level of English proficiency in this class appears to be high. Though it was not measured systematically, the amount of students' output in a class indicates that they are at intermediate to high intermediate levels. Second, some students are unique in their backgrounds, and their contributions enrich classroom activities. Every year this course has students who are selected to

go abroad for one year, or who have just returned from a year of study abroad. Some students take the first semester of the course, study abroad for one year, and return to the course for the second semester. Though small in number, three or four at one time, these students contribute a great deal with their language ability, their positive attitude toward learning, and their cross-cultural experiences from their overseas sojourn. Third, the class size is close to ideal, about 20 on average. The course, then, is optimal for content-based instruction that strongly relies on student participation.

Following the curriculum specifications, the course objectives focus on skills rather than content, such as critical reading, class discussion of reading materials in English, and essay writing. The reading materials for the 'compliment' section of the course consisted of academic papers and excerpts from introductory textbooks to interlanguage pragmatics. Classroom activities include lectures, small group discussions, data collection, role-play, video presentation, and group presentation. They will be assessed by four essays in a year, tasks such as data collection, and classroom participation.

Research on compliments

One section of this course focused on compliment and compliment response. There are three reasons for selecting compliments. First, Japanese compliments are reported to be different from American English compliments. According to the few existing studies, Japanese compliments differ rather fundamentally from those in American English (Barnlund & Araki, 1985; Daikuhara, 1986): In Japanese, compliments occur much less frequently; 2) Japanese compliments are implemented with a more restricted adjective repertoire, and 3) Japanese compliments responses tend more strongly towards rejection than acceptance. Second, compliments are readily available for observation (Herbert, 1989). 'Dispreferred' speech acts such as refusals and complaints do not occur as often as requests. Some speech acts, such as apology, are less observable because they are often performed more privately (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996, p. 30). Third, compliments are one speech act which has attracted much attention from researchers, and compliments are well documented both from pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects. Topics and issues addressed in the literature include compliment practices in American English (Manes, 1983; Manes & Wolfson, 1981; Wolfson, 1981a, 1981b, 1983a, 1983b, 1984; Wolfson & Manes, 1981; Knapp, Hopper, & Bell, 1984) and New Zealand English (Holmes, 1988a), gender variation in compliments and compliment responses (Herbert, 1986, 1987; Holmes, 1988b; Miles, 1994), functions of compliments within conversational discourse (Herbert, 1989), conflicting pragmatic goals in compliment responses (Pomerantz, 1978), cross-cultural differences between

American English and South African English (Herbert, 1989) and American English and French (Wieland, 1998), a proposal for an instructional sequence on complimenting (Holmes & Brown, 1987), and effects of instruction (Billmyer, 1990; Rose & Kwai-fun, 2001).

What is known about compliments (C) and compliment responses (CR) in American and New Zealand Englishes is well documented (e.g., Holmes & Brown, 1987; Rose & Kwai-fun, 2001). Therefore we will not go into detail but list the main pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic findings.

Pragmalinguistics

a. C structure is formulaic. The vast majority of syntactic patterns fall into three types:

- (1) NP {be/look} (intensifier) ADJ (e.g., You look really lovely.)
- (2) I (intensifier) {like/love} NP (e.g., I simply love that skirt.)
- (3) PRO be (intensifier) (a) ADJ NP (e.g., That's a really nice coat.)

b. Limited range of adjectives: *nice, good, beautiful, pretty*, and *great* in American English. and *nice, good, beautiful, lovely* and *wonderful* in New Zealand English.

c. Limited range of verbs: *like, love, enjoy, admire, be impressed by*

Sociopragmatics

a. Gender: Compliments are most frequently exchanged between female participants. Compliment exchanges between men are rare.

b. Relative status and age: Compliments are performed most frequently among status equals and people of the same age. Compliments among unequals most often occur downwards (higher status to lower status).

c. Topics: The most common compliment topics are appearance, ability/performance, and possession. Appearance is a gender-preferential topic in compliments addressed to women.

d. Functions: Compliments may be ambiguous in their pragmatic meanings.

e. Discourse position: Many compliments occur in the initial stage of a discourse.

Thus far, two studies have investigated the effect of instruction in compliments. Billmyer (1990) selected 18 female Japanese students who were enrolled in intermediate to advanced ESL courses and had resided in the US for six months or less. Japanese participants were selected because it was assumed that their native 'cultural and linguistic rules for complimenting differ from the target language speech community's rules' (p. 34). The experimental group

received six hours of instruction in compliments whereas the control group did not receive any compliment-related instruction. Billmyer examined the pragmalinguistic gains (e.g., frequency of appropriate compliments, well-formed forms, appropriate lexical choice) as well as gains in sociopragmatics (spontaneity and appropriateness) in students' post-instruction complimenting. In all aspects of compliment giving, the experimental group showed a tendency to approximate native speaker norms more closely than the control group. Their compliment responses were longer, approximating those of native speakers, and featured different types of response. Billmyer comments that the experimental group's responses had 'a salutary effect on sustaining interaction and sharing the conversational burden' (1990, p. 43).

Unlike Billmyer, Rose and Kwai-fun (2001) investigated the effect of instruction in complimenting in the context of teaching English as a *foreign* language to adult L1 speakers of Cantonese in Hong Kong. In addition to examining whether instruction is effective in a foreign language setting, the study aimed to determine whether different teaching approaches, inductive and deductive teaching, are differentially effective. The study adopted a pre-test treatment post-test experimental control group design, with two experimental groups (inductive and deductive). Measurement instruments were a self-assessment questionnaire, a written discourse completion questionnaire, and a metapragmatic assessment questionnaire. According to the self-assessment and metapragmatic assessment, no benefit accrued from the instruction. On the other hand, the discourse completion measure indicated some gains following both types of instruction, with deductive instruction resulting in more improvement than inductive instruction. Rose and Kwai-fun tentatively conclude that instruction in pragmatics makes a difference in an EFL context, but they also point out such limitations to generalizability as the advanced proficiency level of the students and the fact that the measurement instruments were questionnaires, albeit three different types. Furthermore, the teachability of compliments may well be related to their formulaic structure. Less strongly conventionalized speech acts may be more difficult to teach and learn.

An instructional unit on compliments

As stated above, the overall curricular goals of the course are stated broadly and implicitly - to improve students' English skills to an advanced level. More specific objectives in the unit were derived from the pragmatic research mentioned above. It was assumed that students in this course needed to be made aware of differences between C and CR in English and Japanese. Consistent with this assumption, the objectives were (1) to develop students' awareness about compliments in English via Japanese C and CR, and (2) to enhance students' pragmalinguistic and

sociopragmatic skills in comprehension and production of C and CR. These objectives were implemented in the following instructional sequence:

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Type of tasks</u>
Wk 1	Cross-cultural miscommunication	Reading and discussions
	C & CR in Japanese	Discussions
Wk 2	Language and social aspects of C and CR	Reading and discussions
Wk 3	Learning about English/Japanese C and CR	Data collection as assignment
Wk 4	Language of C, functions of C, CR strategies	Analysis of data collection
Wk 5	Japanese C and CR	Presentation to English speaking exchange students
	Essay on compliment exchange	Homework assignment

Holmes and Brown (1987) offer one of the most comprehensive proposals for teaching compliments in a classroom. Since the objectives of this unit fit perfectly with their instructional focus and suggested activities, Holmes and Brown (1987) were adopted as the main text for the students.

Awareness-raising task

Students were first introduced to cross-cultural miscommunication (or pragmatic failure) in compliments (Holmes & Brown, pp. 525-531). In small groups, they chose one episode for their reading comprehension task. Then each group selected a speaker and presented to class the outcomes of their discussion on three issues: 1) The nature of pragmatic failure, 2) possible causes, and 3) personal experiences of similar incidents. Then, we brainstormed on Japanese C and CR. We asked such questions as:

1. Have you given or received compliments in the last week?
2. What was the context of C and CR? (Relationship of the participants, relative status, social distance, topic, discourse position)
3. How did you feel when giving and receiving these compliments? How did you feel when you did not receive an expected compliment?
4. Did you know exactly what to say when you received a compliment?

Observation task

Subsequently the students were asked to collect a minimum of five Cs and CRs by the following week. In order to facilitate and systematize the observation task, a compliment observation sheet was designed, based on Rose (1994) and Holmes and Brown (1987). Students had an option of either observing or they can be either C or CR. Many sociopragmatic factors such as age, role,

and social distance need to be inferred, and the C and CR need to be recorded as accurately as possible. Also, the data need to be recorded in the same language as spoken. The compliment observation sheet is shown in the Appendix I .

Analyzing the Japanese data

We first read about forms of C and CR in American and New Zealand English. Using a worksheet on reading comprehension, the students read in class the sections on pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatics competence. Analysis of C focused on both aspects. Working in small groups of four or five, students analyzed C-CR forms in search for patterns. Later in class, the analysis provided by one group was presented and three to five patterns were reanalyzed in the whole class discussion. Findings regarding the sociopragmatic aspects of the Japanese C-CR sets were presented by each group according to the categories shown on the data collection sheet: relative status of the participants, topic, discourse position, and alternative function.

Developing tasks for teaching Japanese compliments

Based on the series of exercises in Holmes and Brown (1987), the students developed similar tasks in Japanese. One task is to develop pragmalinguistic competence in using appropriate intensifiers, as shown in Figure 1 below. This task was developed for the purpose of teaching Japanese as a second language in Japan. Later, English-speaking exchange students were invited to the class and students presented their research findings on the Japanese compliments.

Figure 1. Collocations of Intensifiers and Adjectives (Holmes and Brown, 1987; 536)

	nice	good	beautiful	pretty	great	lovely	wonderful	kind
very								
really								
just								
absolutely								
pretty								
so								

In this task, students were asked to check which intensifiers on the left column can be preceded by the adjectives in the top row. Another group did a study on *quite*. They reported that *quite* has two meanings, depending on whether it is used as a scalable or non-scalable adverb. This distinction made it possible to understand the difference between *quite beautiful* and *quite good*. Using the example 'Thank you for your quite good speech', this group was able to make

clear why this is not an appropriate compliment. One group produced the following schema (Figure 2), based on their Japanese data and prior knowledge.

Figure 2. Collocations of Intensifiers and Adjectives/Adjectival Nouns in Japanese

	すごい	かわいい	立派な	上手	すばらしい	よい	イケてる	美しい	シブイ
実に									
とても									
本当に									
め(っ)ちゃ									
非常に									
全然									
ブラボーに									
すごく									
すばらしく									

Then this group further analyzed the sample from the task shown in Figure 2. Their claim is that formality plays a role in collocation: formal types (F) of adjectives/adjectival nouns can be preceded by formal adverbs. For example, formal (F) + (F) is an accepted collocation as in *hijyo ni + utuskushii*, (lit. translation: unusually + beautiful), but incongruent (F) + (INF) does not work, as in **hijyo ni + sugoi* (lit. translation: unusually + awful/great). The presentation of students' analysis on Japanese compliments was insightful to both learners of English and Japanese. The students in this class seemed to learn how American or New Zealand English compliments are exchanged and develop their reading, writing, discussion, and presentation skills at the same time. Since their language analysis was presented to English speaking learners of Japanese, both the students in this course and the classroom guests benefited from the presented information.

Reflective writing tasks

The students were asked to write a passage on compliments. They had a choice in their topic selection as seen in Appendix II. The essay was part of the assessment and counted 20% of the grade. Many selected the summary of Holmes and Brown as their topic. The majority of them appeared to have understood the paper.

Questionnaire

Following the essay, students were asked to comment on what they had learned in this unit.

Many students noted that they became aware of differences between English and Japanese speakers. Several students remarked that they became more aware of cultural patterns. To quote from the students' responses:

I think I have learned to be aware of language use both as a speaker and a hearer. And I have begun to pay more attention to differences between Japanese and any other cultures. ... What I have learned so far is to be conscious about languages.

I have learned there are some differences between English speakers and Japanese speakers when they speak English. I had not cared these differences till I found them in this class. I think Japanese speakers need to know these differences and improve how to express in English. For example, teachers in Japan should make students find these appropriate expressions.

Some wrote about 'unexpected' learning:

I have studied only one side of languages, but in this class I could study many different sides of languages. I also discovered something new, not only about English but also about Japanese.

Teaching pragmatics in an EFL curriculum

The study reported above was conducted in a high-intermediate level English class in an EFL context. The major objective of this course is English skill development, as specified in the curriculum. What exactly is the place of pragmatics in EFL teaching in a university context? Students receive little input in the target language, and they rarely have the opportunity to use English in this situation. Why are we teaching pragmatics? As we noted above, the answer depends on the goals and objectives of the program or the course. These goals need to be derived from a needs analysis. The needs of students (e.g., whether they plan to look for a job or seek a graduate degree), the community, and other stakeholders require systematic empirical investigation in order to determine appropriate goals for foreign language instruction.

Different pedagogical options are available, each with a specific focus although differences are more a matter of degree than clear-cut. First, a course may have the objective for students to develop their pragmatic ability in face-to-face interactions. Such courses can focus on different speech acts or talk management strategies. Instructional materials are now available (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, in press), and two such publications were developed specifically

for EFL students in Japan (Kitao & Kitao, 1991; Yoshida, 2000). These materials organize their units by speech acts and provide examples, explanation, and practice activities including audiotapes. Second, rather than directly focusing on pragmatics per se, another option is to incorporate pragmatics into a course on different language skills. The case we reported here is of this type. Since the curriculum specifies language skill development as the overall course goal, the pragmatics component derives from the pedagogical materials. Academic papers in the field of cross-cultural pragmatics and interlanguage pragmatics are useful for advanced students. Alternatively, language skills could be taught with an emphasis on pragmatic aspects, such as pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of listening comprehension. Crucially, such a unit or course requires authentic and contextualized input. One fertile source is different genres of audiovisual material, including feature films. For instance, Rose (1993, 1997) describes how films can be used to develop students' pragmatic awareness in the classroom and suggests pedagogical activities such as analyzing interaction based on an observation sheet as the one in Appendix I.

In conclusion, a range of options for instruction in pragmatics now exists. The classroom research literature on instruction in pragmatics provides ample evidence of classroom arrangements, activities, and materials that are demonstrably effective in *foreign* language classrooms (Rose & Kasper, 2001). A next useful step in classroom research on pragmatics could be to explore how pragmatics can be integrated into content-based foreign language teaching, specific modalities of language use, and other components of communicative language ability, such as grammar and lexis.

- 1) The research reported in this paper was funded through Kansai University's Visiting Professorship program. We gratefully acknowledge the generous support.

References

- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. & Palmer, A. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. In L.F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning vol. 7* (pp. 21-39). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Empirical evidence of the need for instruction in pragmatics. In K.R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Hartford, B.A.S., Mahan-Taylor, R., Morgan, M. J., & Reynolds, D.W. (1991).

- Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversation. *ELT Journal*, 45, 4–15.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Mahan-Taylor, R. (Eds.) (in press). *Teaching pragmatics*. Washington: USIA.
- Barnlund, D., & Araki, S. (1985). Intercultural encounters: The management of compliments by Japanese and Americans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1, 9–26.
- Billmyer, K. (1990). "I really like your lifestyle": ESL learners learning how to compliment. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 6,2, 31–48.
- Blum-Kulka, S. & House, J. (1989). Cross-cultural and situational variation in requestive behavior in five languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics* (pp. 123–154). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.) (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Bouton, L. F. (1994). Conversational implicature in the second language: Learned slowly when not deliberately taught. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 22, 157–67.
- Bouton, L.F. (1996). Pragmatics and language learning. In L.F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning vol. 7* (pp. 1–20). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Brown, J.D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum*. New York: Heinle & Heinle.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1–47.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. 4th. edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Crookall, D., & Oxford, R. (Eds.) (1990). *Simulation, gaming, and language learning*. New York: Newbury House.
- Crookall, D., & Saunders, D. (Eds.) (1988). *Communication and simulation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Crookes, G., & Gass, S.M. (Eds.) (1993a). *Tasks and language learning*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Crookes, G., & Gass, S.M. (Eds.) (1993b). *Tasks in a pedagogical context*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Daikuhara, M. (1986). A study of compliments from a cross-cultural perspective: Japanese vs. American English. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 2(2), 103–134.
- Edmondson, W.J., & House, J. (1981). *Let's talk and talk about it. A pedagogic-interactional grammar of English*. München: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. (1993). Expressing gratitude in American English. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 64–81). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 219–236.
- Habermas, J. (1971). Vorbereitende Bemerkungen zu einer Theorie der kommunikativen Kompetenz. In J. Habermas & N. Luhmann (Eds.), *Theorie der Gesellschaft oder Sozialtechnologie?* (pp. 101–141). Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp.
- Herbert, R. K. (1990). Sex-based differences in compliment behavior. *Language and Society*, 19, 201–224.
- Holmes, J. (1988a). Compliments and compliment responses in New Zealand. *Anthropological linguistics* 28, 485–508.

- Holmes, J. (1988b). Paying compliments: A sex-preferential positive politeness strategy. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12, 445-465.
- Holmes, J., & Brown, D. (1987). Teachers and students learning about compliments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 523-546.
- Hymes, D. (1971). *On communicative competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kasper, G. (1997a). Can pragmatic competence be taught? (Net Work #6) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i. Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center <http://www.lll.hawaii.edu/nflrc/NetWorks/NW6/> [access: 1997 April 10].
- Kasper, G. (1997b). The role of pragmatics in language teacher education. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & B. Hartford (Eds.), *Beyond methods* (pp. 113-136). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K.R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 33-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kitao, S. K. & Kitao, K. (1991). Communicating with Americans: Functions in English. Tokyo: Eichosha.
- Knapp, M., Hopper, R. & Bell, R. (1984). Compliments: A descriptive taxonomy. *Journal of Communication*, 34, 19-31.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Manes, J. (1983). Compliments: A mirror of cultural values. In N. Wolfson and E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 115-132). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Manes, J., & Wolfson, N. (1981). The compliment formula. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine* (pp. 115-132). Mouton: The Hague.
- Miles, P. (1994). Compliments and gender. *University of Hawai'i Occasional Papers Series*, 26, 85-137.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ohta, A. S. (1997). The development of pragmatic competence in learner-learner classroom interaction. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning: Monograph Series, Volume 8* (pp. 223-242). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.
- Ohta, A. S. (2001). From acknowledgment to alignment: A longitudinal study of the development of two classroom learners of Japanese. In K.R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 103-120). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics* (pp. 155-173). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A.D. (1991). Teaching speech act behavior to nonnative speakers. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 154-165). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Robinson, P. (Ed.) (2001). *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, K. R. (1993). Sociolinguistic consciousness-raising through video. *The Language Teacher*, 18, 8-9.
- Rose, K. R. (1994). Pragmatic consciousness-raising in an EFL context. In L.F. Bouton & Y. Kachru

- (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* monograph series, Vol. 5 (pp. 52-63). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Rose, K. R. (1997). Pragmatics in the classroom: Theoretical concerns and practical possibilities. In L.F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning* Vol. 8 (pp. 267-295). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Rose, K.R., & Kasper, G. (Eds.) (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, K. & Kwai-fun, C. (2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment Responses. In K. R. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 145-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savignon, S. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 261-277.
- Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Scotton, C., & Bernsten, J. (1988). Natural conversation as a model for textbook dialogue. *Applied Linguistics*, 9, 372-384.
- Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. M. (1993). Cross-linguistic influence in the speech act of correction. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 138-157). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 91-112.
- van Ek, J.A. (1975). *The threshold level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wieland, M. (1995). Complimenting behavior in French/American cross-cultural dinner conversations. *The French Review*, 68, 796-812.
- Wolfson, N. (1981). Compliments in cross-cultural perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 117-124.
- Wolfson, N. (1983a). An empirically based analysis of complimenting in American English. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 82-95). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Wolfson, N. (1983b). Rules of speaking. In J. C. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 61-87). London: Longman.
- Wolfson, N. (1984). Pretty is as pretty does. *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 236-244.
- Yoshida, K., & Sophia University Applied Linguistics Research Group (2000). *Heart to heart. Overcoming barriers in cross-cultural communication*. Tokyo: Macmillan Languagehouse.
- Yule, G. (1997). *Referential communication tasks*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Appendix I: Compliment observation sheet (actual size A4) (adapted from Rose, 1994 and Holmes & Brown, 1987)

Participants:			
<p style="text-align: center;">Compliment Giver</p> <p>Gender: M / F</p> <p>Age: _____</p> <p>Role: _____</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Compliment Receiver</p> <p>Gender: M / F</p> <p>Age: _____</p> <p>Role: _____</p>		
Relative Status:	S < H	S = H	S > H
Social Distance:	+	+/-	
Context: (When, Where, How)			
Topic:			
Discourse Position:			
Alternative Function:			
Compliment and Compliment Response:			

Appendix II. Writing About Compliments

Pick ONE question below and write an essay. Make sure that you use relevant key words from Holmes and Brown's paper. This assignment is due on May 24.

The essay should be typed, double-spaced on A4 paper. It should be at least three pages.

1. You are teaching English to Japanese adults. What do you teach about English compliments? Use English examples in your lessons.

Pragmatics in a College-level EFL Curriculum (Kasper · Kite)

2. You are teaching Japanese to native speakers of English adults. How do you explain about Japanese compliments? Use your own data in your lessons.
3. Do you think we can teach compliments in our English classes at a college level? How would you teach it? Can you use any of Holmes and Brown's ideas?
4. Critique Holmes and Brown's paper. What are its strengths and weaknesses?