

## Developing Communicative Competence: An Evaluative Study of Request and Apology in English Language Textbooks in China

WANG Kelu<sup>[a],\*</sup>

<sup>[a]</sup> Associate professor. School of Foreign Languages, Leshan Normal University, Leshan, China.

\*Corresponding author.

Received 7 April 2019; accepted 4 July 2019

Published online 26 August 2019

### Abstract

China's modernization and sustained economic development have made increasing demands on English language education to produce English learners who can function adequately in all sectors of cross-cultural communication. English major students who are immersed in intensive English programs in institutions of higher education are nurtured to meet this need. English language textbooks, as the main source of language input for English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners in China, play a critical role in developing learners' communicative competence. Therefore, it is significant to examine to what extent the textbooks currently used by English major students facilitate their acquisition of communicative competence.

To evaluate pragmatic teaching in the textbooks, this study focuses on five speech acts and surveys the relevant pragmatic input and pragmatic tasks available for these speech acts in four sets of textbooks that are widely used by English majors in China. Both oral-English textbooks and integrated-skills textbooks have been selected to explore if there are skill-based differences in pragmatic teaching. Content analysis has been employed to scrutinize pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic input as well as pragmatic tasks provided in the focal textbooks.

The quantitative and qualitative results show that the textbooks do not provide sufficient conditions for the development of communicative competence. The analysis of pragmalinguistic input, which focuses on the speech act strategies and modification devices included in the textbooks, reveals that the distribution and presentation of these strategies and devices do not reflect naturally

occurring speech. As for sociopragmatic input, the textbooks present inadequate contextual information and give little attention to sociocultural norms for speech act performance. Finally, the oral-English textbooks and integrated-skills textbooks do not differ systematically in their treatment of pragmatics in terms of pragmalinguistic input, sociopragmatic input, and pragmatic tasks.

The findings of the present study not only provide useful information for further textbook development but also have important implications for textbook use in the classroom.

**Key words:** Communicative competence; Speech acts; Pragmalinguistic input; Sociopragmatic input; English language textbooks

Wang, K. L. (2019). Developing Communicative Competence: An Evaluative Study of Request and Apology in English Language Textbooks in China. *Canadian Social Science*, 15(8), 1-14. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/10988>  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/10988>

### INTRODUCTION

The past 30 years or so has seen a tremendous growth in English language education in China. To produce personnel with strong English competence, English major students are educated in intensive English programs to become interpreters, translators, teachers, managers, and researchers in sectors of foreign affairs, education, business and trade, culture, science and technology, and the army (The English Division of Tertiary Foreign Language Instruction Guidance Committee, 2000). They are expected to have very high linguistic proficiency, profound language and cultural knowledge, and strong communicative competence (The English Division, 2000). Communicative competence is explicitly made one of the top goals of English language teaching (ELT) for English

major students in China. Pragmatic competence has been widely acknowledged as an essential component of all major models of communicative competence (Bachman, 1990; Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia, 2007; Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell, 1995), and appropriate realization of speech acts is seen as an indicator of language learners' pragmatic competence.

Most aspects of pragmatics are amenable to instruction (Rose, 2005), such as pragmatic routines (Tateyama, 2001; Tateyama, Kasper, Mui, Tay, & Thananart, 1997), speech acts (Alcón, 2005, 2007; Koike & Pearson, 2005; Martínez-Flor & Fukya, 2005; Olshtain & Cohen, 1990; Rose & Ng, 2001; Safont Jordà, 2005) and pragmatic comprehension of conversational implicatures (Bouton, 1994; Kubota, 1995). Furthermore, studies have shown that pragmatic instruction has a positive effect on the acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence (Jeon & Kaya, 2006; Takahashi, 2010). Hence, Judd suggests that "instruction in pragmatic skills and speech acts" be "carried out formally, as part of the regular content in second language curricula" (1999, p. 154).

The central issue of pragmatic instruction is "the availability of relevant pragmatic input in academic encounters and in textbooks" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001, p. 24). Since L2 classrooms have a bad reputation for developing pragmatic ability (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p. 208), textbooks are expected to play a key role in developing this ability. China has invested heavily in textbook development to improve the quality of English instruction (Hu, 2002), hence it is important to examine the currently used textbooks to assess their capacity for promoting communicative competence in general and pragmatic competence in particular. The present study aims at a detailed examination of several widely used textbooks for English major students in China regarding their potential for developing learners' communicative competence.

---

## 1. LITERATURE REVIEW

---

This part makes an explanation to pragmatic competence and reviews the previous studies on pragmatic input in the textbooks.

### 1.1 The Pragmatic Component in Models of Communicative Competence

Pragmatics studies the negotiation of meaning between interlocutors as determined by the context and social constraints (Crystal, 1997; Levinson, 1983; Mey, 2001; Thomas, 1995). It consists of two aspects: pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. Pragmalinguistics refers to the "the particular resources which a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions" (Leech, 1983, p. 11). In other words, it refers to the linguistic resources that speakers of a language can choose from to perform language functions and achieve

communicative purposes. Such resources include pragmatic strategies, routines, and modification devices for intensifying and softening communicative acts (Kasper, 1997; Thomas, 1983). While pragmalinguistics is the "linguistic end of pragmatics" (Leech, 1983, p. 11), sociopragmatics is the "sociological interface of pragmatics" (Leech, 1983, p. 10). Sociopragmatics refers to the language user's assessment of the context and social constraints in which linguistic resources are implemented (Leech, 1983). Specifically, it includes language users' perceptions of the power relations in communicative encounters, social distance, their rights and obligations, and the degree of imposition. These perceptions shape their linguistic choices in social interaction (Kasper, 1997; Thomas, 1983). Pragmatic competence is predicated on the acquisition of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge, and the development of an efficient control of the knowledge in real-time communication (Taguchi, 2011). Put it simply, pragmatically competent language users are able to "understand and produce sociopragmatic meanings with pragmalinguistic conventions" (Kasper & Roever, 2005, p. 318).

### 1.2 Inauthentic Pragmalinguistic Input

Studies have reported that pragmalinguistic input in textbooks does not reflect how speech acts are realized in naturally occurring speech. Usó-Juan (2007) examined the realization strategies and modification devices for the speech act of request in five tourism textbooks used in Spain. A total of 21 request realization strategies were found in the textbooks, among which 20 were conventional indirect requests. Conventional indirect strategies are used when the speaker makes reference to contextual preconditions necessary for performing the speech act of request, which is conventionalized in a given language.

As for the modification devices, findings indicate a preference for internal modifiers over external ones, and an exclusive and frequent use of the politeness marker *please*. Internal modification operates within the main part of request, while external modification affects the context in which the main part is embedded, indirectly modifying the illocutionary force (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). Usó-Juan (2007) pointed out that the textbooks she investigated neglected the important role that external modification has in getting the hearer to comply to the request in authentic language use (Martínez-Flor, 2010). Similarly, Konakahara's (2011) study of requesting in English textbooks for Japanese secondary school found a considerably narrow range of modification devices. A conventional indirect strategy modified by a modality and a politeness marker like *Would you please ...?* was a recurrent form of making polite requests in the textbooks.

Other studies also reported that the realization strategies adopted by textbooks were very limited compared with those found in real-life conversations. These studies include Chang's (2003) investigation of

four speech acts (thanking, apology, request, and offer) in textbooks for Korean middle school students, and Delen and Tavil's (2010) evaluation of textbooks used by Turkish university students that focused on the speech acts of request, refusal, and complaint.

### 1.3 Skimpy Sociopragmatic Input and Metapragmatic Information

The deficiency of textbooks in fostering communicative competence is not only caused by the inauthentic pragmalinguistic input, but also by the paucity of sociopragmatic input and metapragmatic information. According to Vellenga (2004), most speech acts in her study were presented without contextual references to the relationship between the interlocutors, or other contextual information that might help to judge the imposition of the speech acts. Though terms such as formal and informal, polite and impolite were used throughout all eight textbooks, metapragmatic information on politeness or appropriateness was rarely included. This absence of metapragmatic explanation of linguistic realizations related to context may lead to negative transfer or the use of inappropriate linguistic form. Vellenga suggested that textbooks include a variety of linguistic choices for accomplishing a certain speech act, explicit metapragmatic explanation, contextually rich opportunities for students to practice those linguistic forms, and activities to raise students' pragmatic awareness.

Usó-Juan (2007) also reported that the textbooks examined concentrated almost exclusively on the acquisition of linguistic competence. Situational and contextual variables regarding interlocutors' social status, degree of intimacy, and the degree of imposition of requests were neither mentioned explicitly nor incorporated implicitly for learners.

Speech acts in the textbooks for non-English major students in China (Ji, 2007) and the textbooks in Vietnam (Nguyen, 2011) were found to contain very little explicit metapragmatic information. The researchers argued that availability of multiple linguistic choices for the same speech act would not be enough to guarantee successful communication, and it is necessary to include metapragmatic information that gives "direct explanation of target pragmatic features" (Taguchi, 2011, p. 291) in textbooks so as to help learners acquire the ability to use language appropriately in different contexts.

### 1.4 Research Questions

The above literature review suggests that English language textbooks, as the primary source of language input, generally do not provide conditions necessary for fostering learners' pragmatic competence. Yet, there is little research on how textbooks written for different language skills may differ in their treatment of pragmatics. The gaps necessitate a comparative study to examine the pragmatic input included in textbooks targeting at different language skills.

The present study assumes that how textbooks prepare learners to comprehend and produce speech acts indexes their potential in developing learners' pragmatic competence. The following specific research questions were formulated to guide the study:

- What pragmalinguistic input is provided in the textbooks?
- What sociopragmatic input is included in the textbooks?
- To what extent do pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic input facilitate learners' acquisition of pragmatic competence?
- What are the similarities and differences in pragmatic teaching between textbooks targeting at different language skills?

---

## 2. METHODOLOGY

---

This part first makes an introduction to the selected textbooks, then and presents the method and procedure of data analysis.

### 2.1 Textbook Selection

The four sets of textbooks analyzed in this study include: *Challenge to Speak* (Book 1 and Book 2), *Learn to Talk and Say it Right* (Book 1 and Book 2 of the same textbook series), *Integrated Skills of English* (Book 1 and Book 2), and *A New English Course* (Book 1 and Book 2) (see the Appendix). For ease of reference, these textbooks are referred to as *Challenge*, *Talk/Say*, *Integrated Skills*, and *New Course* respectively. The selected oral-English textbooks and integrated-skills textbooks were used at the foundation stage for learners at similar language proficiency levels. They presented pragmatic input in conversations and lists of linguistic formulae.

The candidate textbooks are published by the top three publishers in China that specialize in publishing foreign language teaching and learning materials: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, and Higher Education Express. Textbooks published by these publishers enjoy great reputation among language teachers and learners. These textbooks are widely used among English major students in institutions of higher education, so that the findings can have wide applicability.

In order to make a comparison between textbooks targeting at different language skills, textbooks for oral-English courses and those for integrated-skills courses were chosen. Oral-English courses mainly aim at fostering learners' speaking skills and communication ability; integrated-skills courses aim to promote learners' all-round development of the four language skills — listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The exclusion of other types of textbooks, for instance, textbooks for reading and listening, was based on the fact that these courses barely offer opportunities for verbal communication that involves

the interpretation and production of speech acts. Though language knowledge and abilities developed by the other courses can be.

In accordance with the *National English Syllabus for English Majors in Institutions of Higher Learning* (The English Division, 2000), all four sets of textbooks placed a great emphasis on learners' communicative competence. With the exception of *Integrated Skills*, they explicitly announced the aim of developing learners' communicative competence in the preface. In every unit, two speech acts were taught and practiced through model conversations, functional patterns, and varied pragmatic activities. That is to say, besides the condensed treatment of particular

speech acts in a certain unit, conversations in other units usually involved these speech acts.

As shown in Table 1, the four sets of textbooks were comparable in terms of the number of units. Except *Integrated Skills*, which contained a total of 30 units, each of the other three sets of textbooks had 36 units. There were more pages in the integrated-skills textbooks than in the oral-English textbooks, and this is related to the inclusion of reading texts and relevant linguistic exercises in the integrated-skills textbooks. If only the speaking section of the integrated-skills textbooks is taken into account, there were fewer pages in the integrated-skills textbooks than in the oral-English textbooks dealing with communicative functions.

**Table 1**  
**General Information About the Textbooks**

Textbooks	Challenge		Talk/Say		New Course		Integrated Skills	
	Book 1	Book 2	Book 1	Book 2	Book 1	Book 2	Book 1	Book 2
Total units	18	18	18	18	18	18	15	15
Total pages	142	148	212	188	210	214	253	224

## 2.2 The Method of Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative analyses were conducted in this study to answer the research questions. For the first research question concerning pragmalinguistic input, quantitative analysis was utilized to explore the variety and frequency of realization strategies and modification devices, so that the distribution pattern of these strategies and modification devices in the textbooks can be compared with that in real language use. In the meanwhile, typical examples were used to illustrate strategy use in certain situations. For the second research questions, qualitative analysis was used to explore what kind of sociopragmatic input was included. Findings of the first two research questions will give answers to the last two research questions regarding the textbooks' potential for developing learners' communicative competence and textbooks' similarities and differences in teaching pragmatics.

## 3. FINDINGS

This part presents the quantitative and qualitative results regarding the pragmalinguistic input and sociopragmatic input of each speech act's realization strategies and modification devices.

**Table 2**  
**The Distribution of Request Strategies**

Request strategies	Challenge	Talk/Say	New course	Integrated skills	
Direct	Mood derivables	10	19	8	16
	Explicit performatives				
	Hedged performatives				
	Locution derivables	2	1	1	2
Conventional indirect	Want statements	12	13	6	9
	Preparatory conditions	27	25	32	29
	Suggestory formula		1		
Non-conventional indirect	Strong hints	2	2	1	2
	Wild hits				

## 3.1 Pragmalinguistic Input

### 3.1.1 Request

#### 3.1.1.1 Request Strategies

As shown in Table 3, the four sets of textbooks displayed similar distribution patterns with regard to request realization strategies. Generally speaking, the textbooks presented slightly more conventional indirect strategies than direct strategies. Adopting conventional indirect strategies is an acceptable and widely practiced form of polite requestive behavior for speech communities of different L1 backgrounds (Billmyer & Varghese, 2000; Hassall, 2003; Trosborg, 1995; Wang, 2011; Woodfield, 2008; Yang, 2006). Specifically speaking, reference to preparatory conditions ranked first among all the strategy types used in the textbooks, fulfilled in formulae such as *Can you*, *Could you*, *Would you mind*, and *Would you*. House and Kasper (1987) point out that reference to preparatory conditions dominates because this strategy type is heavily routinized in the English language. By implementing this strategy type, the requester explicitly mentions the desired act and, at the same time, allows the hearer the chance to opt out.

Want statement and mood derivable were the top two most frequently used direct strategy types. Unlike reference to preparatory conditions, which does not take compliance for granted, want statement and mood derivable are used when compliance is expected. Consistent with previous work (Trosborg, 1995; Wang, 2011), conversations involving want statements in the textbooks generally took place in service counters. For example, *I'd like to return this jacket* (Challenge, Book 1, p. 104) was used at the department store, *I came to pick up my package* (Challenge, Book 1, p. 112) was employed toward the post office clerk, and *Excuse me. Is this book available? I need it badly* (Challenge, Book 1, p. 33) was produced at the lending counter of the library.

Locution derivables, suggestory formulae, and strong hints are were occasionally used in the textbooks. Locution derivables explicitly mention the hearer's obligations in relation to the request, so they are more often used by people in positions of authority. If it is used with an interlocutor at higher rank, a locution derivable

may be thought to be an impolite behavior. Hence, this strategy type was seldom used by competent language users in empirical studies (Hassall, 2003; Trosborg, 1995), nor was it presented frequently in the textbooks. The low frequency of suggestory formula and strong hints in daily conversations and the textbooks is possibly because there is no assumption on the part of the speaker that the requested act should be carried out. Moreover, explicit performatives and hedged performatives were absent from the textbooks probably because of their high level of directness that might result in confrontation.

### 3.1.1.2 Request Modification Devices

The degree of politeness of a request is determined not only by the selection of direct or indirect strategies, but also by the inclusion of appropriate modification devices (Trosborg, 1995). As shown in Table 3, requests in the selected textbooks tended to be internally modified rather than externally modified. However, both the internal modification and external modifications fell in a restricted range of modification devices.

**Table 3**  
**The Distribution of Request Modification Devices**

Type	Sub-type	Challenge	Talk/Say	New course	Integrated skills		
Internal	Interrogatives	25	22	23	25		
	Negations						
	Past tense						
	Syntactic	Conditional clauses	3	1	5	4	
		Tentative	1	1	5	2	
		Embedding	Appreciative	1		5	2
			Subjectivizer				
		Tag questions			1	1	
		Ing-forms		2	1	1	
	Lexical and phrasal	Consultative devices					
Understaters		1		1			
Hedges		2					
Downtoners		1	2		1		
Politeness markers		8	10	5	8		
Interpersonal markers		1		1			
External	Checking on availability	1		1			
	Getting a precommitment	1	2				
	Grounders	5	7	4	7		
	Sweeteners						
	Disarmers	2		2			
	Cost minimizers						
	Promise of a reward	1					

As with the findings of empirical research on request (House & Kasper, 1987; Trosborg, 1995), interrogative was the most frequently used modification among the various internal modification devices in all the textbooks. The frequent use of interrogatives was related to the high frequency of references to preparatory conditions.

The next most frequently used internal modification device was politeness markers, in particular *please*. The prevalence of politeness markers *please* has been documented in Usó-Juan's (2007) investigation of tourism textbooks in Spain. Following politeness markers, conditional clauses and embedding were often used

jointly in moderately to extremely polite situations to tone down coerciveness. A closer examination of linguistic formulae involving conditional clauses and embedding in the textbooks showed that requests were often realized in *I was wondering if, I would be grateful if, It would be nice if, or I hope that*, but not in *Would it be possible if you, or I don't think you could*. The absence of *Would it be possible if you* and *I don't think you could* from the textbooks might explain why Chinese learners of English were found not to use them in Wang's (2008) study. When it comes to external modifications, grounders were most frequently used to elaborate and justify requests, with at least 4 occurrences in the one textbook series.

A majority of the modification devices, including tag questions, Ing-forms, understaters, hedges, downtoners, interpersonal markers, checking on availability, getting a precommitment, disarmers, and promise of a reward, were used only once or twice across the four sets of textbooks. Six types of modification devices, (i.e., negations, past tense, subjectivizers, consultative devices, sweeteners, and cost minimizers) did not appear in the textbooks. The absence of these modification devices in the textbooks

might explain why Chinese learners underused them in elicited discourse (Yang, 2006).

The distribution of request realization strategies and modification devices was basically in accordance with their frequency of use revealed by empirical cross-cultural research (Billmyer & Varghese, 2000; Hassall, 2003; Trosborg, 1995; Wang, 2011; Woodfield, 2008; Yang, 2006). However, the textbooks prioritized only a few frequently used strategies and modification devices but neglected those less frequently used ones, presenting one or two examples in one textbook series or not presenting any examples at all.

### 3.1.2 Apology

#### 3.1.2.1 Apology Strategies

It is generally acknowledged that whenever an offensive act has been committed, remedial verbal actions may be performed for the sake of harmony restoration (Bergman & Kasper, 1993; Mir, 1992; Olshtain, 1983). This need to apologize was generally recognized by the four sets of textbooks since all of them, except *New Course*, did not provide learners with any strategies to evade the responsibility for apologizing (see Table 4).

**Table 4**  
**The Distribution of Apology Strategies**

Apology strategies	Sub-strategies	Challenge	Talk/Say	New course	Integrated skills	
Evasive	Minimizing responsibility					
	Denial of responsibility	Denial of fault		10		
	Blaming hearer					
Direct	Minimizing offense					
	An expression of apology	Expression of regret	24	16	21	16
	Offer of apology	3	3	3		
	Request for forgiveness	3	2	2		
Indirect	An explanation of the situation		12	4	10	4
		Self-deficiency	1			
	An acknowledgment of responsibility	1		2		
	Self-blame		1		1	
	Explicit acknowledgement	1	1	1	1	
	Implicit acknowledgement					
Remedial support	Lack of intent					
	Embarrassment	2				
			1		1	
	An offer of repair		5	1		6
	A promise of forbearance	3	1	1	2	
	Concern for the hearer			1	2	

All the textbooks gave priority to expression of apology as a strategy, in particular expression of regret. The number of expressions of regret was almost the total number of the remaining apology strategies. On average, an explanation or account of the situation was the second frequently used strategy type in the textbooks, followed by an offer of repair and promise of forbearance. Then, strategies such as concern for the hearer, expression of self-deficiency, expression of self-blame, acknowledgment of responsibility, lack of intent, and expression of embarrassment were used minimally in the four sets of textbooks.

The example conversation below (Example 1) shows that when the severity of infraction goes beyond a certain degree, promise of forbearance or an offer of repair, in addition to the expression of apology and an explanation, is expected.

#### Example 1

A: I'd like to apologize for breaking your reading glasses while tidying up your desk, sir.

B: So it was you! You must be more careful!

A: I'm seldom so clumsy. I'm really sorry.

B: Well, in that case, don't worry about it any more.

A: I'll pay for it and try to be more careful in the future.

B: There's no need to pay, but be sure you'd be careful from now on.

(*Challenge*, Book 1, p. 84)

In Example 1, the apologizer A first makes an offer of apology *I'd like to apologize for* breaking the reading glasses. When being criticized for not being careful enough, A gives a brief explanation *I'm seldom so clumsy* in addition to the expression of regret *I'm really sorry* to play down the guilt that can be attached to himself/herself. Again, realizing the damage caused to B, A offers to pay and promises to be careful in the future. B's response indicates that although repair is unnecessary, promise of forbearance is actually expected. In this example, a combination of strategies is utilized to achieve an elevated level of politeness, which is a typical way to increase the apologetic force (Cohen, et al., 1986).

### 3.1.2.2 Apology Modification Devices

Intensifiers were commonly used modification devices to upgrade the apologetic force in the textbooks. Within each set of textbooks, at least 5 apologies were modified with intensifiers such as *really*, *terribly*, *awfully*, *truly*, *so*, etc. Moreover, embedded exclamatory sentences like *You cannot believe how sorry I am* as shown in Example 2 may also function as intensifiers.

**Table 5**  
**The Distribution of Apology Modification Devices**

Types	Challenge	Talk/Say	New course	Integrated skills
Intensifiers	6	5	8	7

Example 2 illustrates the repeated use of various intensifiers to upgrade the apologetic force. In this example, the first use of intensifier is when A intensifies his/her regret by the adverb *terribly*. Later, A expresses regret again, but with even stronger apologetic force conveyed by the embedded exclamatory sentence *how sorry I am*. When A proposes to pay for B's loss, this substantial remedial action actually intensifies the apology in an implicit way. By minimizing the interest of this repair for B with the word *least*, A intensifies the apologetic force and shows his/her attempt to restore solidarity with B.

Example 2

(A hits B with his bicycle)

A: Oh, I'm terribly sorry! Are you all right?

B: Yeah, I'm fine.

A: Please accept my apology.

B: Really it's no problem.

A: You can't believe how sorry I am.

B: Relax, it's okay.

A: That least I can do is pay for your bike.

B: Now that you mention it, I think that the damage is so bad that I may need a new one. (*Talk*, p. 95)

## 3.2 Sociopragmatic Input

According to Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, the performance of speech acts is mainly impacted by three contextual factors: social distance, relative power, and degree of imposition/severity as perceived by the interlocutors. Social distance concerns whether the interlocutors know each other very well or even intimately or they have only a slight acquaintance with each other. Relative power has to do with the interlocutors' social status. Degree of imposition/severity relates to how serious or important the issue is. The presence of these contextual variables allows learners to make judgment and choose appropriate linguistic strategies accordingly.

In the present study, contextual information is broadly defined as any information related to the interlocutors or the settings and/or the incident. Contextual information might be as simple as mention of the place where the conversation takes place, like "at the lending section" (*Challenge*, Book 1, p.32). Setting is counted as contextual information because it may indicate the relationship between the interlocutors. For example, a conversation that happens "at the lending section" is highly likely to occur between a librarian and a student who are socially distant with each other. Contextual information can also be more detailed, as in "Xiao Lu, a Chinese student, had arranged to have an English lesson with her English teacher, Frank, at 6 p.m., but Xiao Lu did not show up. Next day, they meet at the university" (*New Course*, Book 1, p.185).

In line with previous research (Boxer & Pickering, 1995; Jiang, 2006; Usó-Juan, 2007; Vellenga, 2004), the four sets of textbooks in the present study generally did not present sufficient contextual information along with the conversations. There are three major findings related to the presentation of contextual information: (1) most model conversations in the textbooks were presented out of context; (2) if contextual information was provided, it tended to be simplified; and (3) textbooks differed in the amount of contextual information provided. Table 6 shows the proportion of model conversations that involved contextual information. For example, 15/72 means that there were 72 model conversations in *Challenge*, out of which 15 conversations were presented with contextual information. Quantitatively, less than half of the model conversations were accompanied with contextual information in *Challenge*, *Talk/Say*, and *New Course*. Only *Integrated Skills* provided contextual information in most of its model conversations. It is necessary to point out that all the long topic-based conversations in *New Course* were not given any contextual information, possibly because contextual factors were considered trivial in these conversations targeted at teaching language structures rather than pragmatic functions.

**Table 6**  
**The Distribution of Conversations With Contextual Information**

Challenge to speak	Talk/Say	New course	Integrated skills
15 / 72	29 / 74	29 / 72	54 / 68

Qualitatively, the four sets of textbooks differed in the richness of contextual information provided. In *Challenge*, contextual information was reduced to a phrase or a simple sentence. For instance, the conversation about making an appointment to see the doctor was given a brief introduction “secretary on the phone” (*Challenge*, Book 1, p. 24). Similarly, *Speak/Say* tended to simplify contextual information. For example, a conversation on suggestions for better study habits was introduced with “a friend gives suggestions for better study habits” (*Speak*, p. 69). In *Integrated Skills*, the contextual information, though limited in amount, tended to make a brief introduction to the interlocutors. For instance, in a conversation inquiring about fixing television, the contextual information was provided as “A: An old gentleman, customer B: A young clerk in a service shop)” (*Integrated Skills*, Book 1, p. 118). *New Course* was better in this regard, as the contextual information, if provided, was more specific. For example, the relationship between the interlocutors, the severity of the incident, and the setting were all explicit from the contextual information: “Elizabeth meets her interpreter in the hotel lobby for breakfast. They have been in Beijing for two days and are returning to Shanghai in two hours” (*New Course*, Book 1, p. 41).

Relative power and social distance are decisive factors when making an evaluation on the appropriateness of interlocutors’ pragmalinguistic choice. Example 4 displays a conversation without any contextual information.

Example 4

A: Do you agree that someone needs to buy some ice cream for dessert?

B: Yes, absolutely.

A: OK then, why don’t you go out and get some while I clean up dinner.

B: *No! That’s out of the question.* If you stay here you’ll be able to watch the beginning of the football game and I’ll miss it. Since I’m a bigger football fan than you are and I cooked dinner, I think the best compromise is that you go out and get the ice cream. How about it?

A: *I hear what you’re saying. Do you want me to pay for the ice cream and miss out on the biggest game of the year? No way!*

B: All right, how about this? I’ll pay for the ice cream if you go out and buy it.

A: *You got yourself a deal.*

(*Speak*, p. 45)

In this conversation, the three disagreements (in italics) are direct and strong in force. Without knowing who the interlocutors are, it is hard to conclude whether or not blunt disagreements such as *no, that’s out of the question*,

and *no way* are appropriate. If this is a conversation between intimate friends or couples, the use of direct disagreements is unproblematic. Wolfson’s (1989) Bulge hypothesis points out that low-distance interlocutors are prone to use more direct strategies, as they are certain about their relationships and do not need to negotiate a great deal. However, if this is a father-son conversation, these direct disagreements are unlikely to be appropriate pragmalinguistic choice for Chinese learners. In Chinese culture, parents are of a higher status than children, and it is perceived impolite or even rude to speak to people of a higher status in such a direct and confrontational manner.

Similar to the presentation of speech acts in previously examined textbooks (Crandall & Basturkmen, 2004; Jiang, 2006; Nguyen, 2011), a list of linguistic formulae was also adopted as a typical way to teach speech acts in *Challenge*, *Talk* and *New Course*. This decontextualized presentation of speech acts obscured the fact that appropriate use of pragmalinguistic resources is context-dependent (Koester, 2002). Moreover, since no metapragmatic information was provided with regard to when, where, and to whom it is appropriate to use these linguistic forms, the decontextualized provision of linguistic forms may mislead learners because not all linguistic formulae are appropriate in every situation. In Example 5, the linguistic formulae *You’ve got it all wrong* and *You’re dead wrong* express disagreement with the judgmental vocabulary *wrong*. Although judgmental vocabulary is explicit enough to pronounce the illocutionary force, all and dead are respectively adopted to upgrade the force. Again I couldn’t disagree with you more shows an extremely strong force of disagreement due to its syntactic structure. It is risky to expose learners to these linguistic formulae without offering any metapragmatic cues about where and to whom these blunt disagreements can be used. Misuse of these linguistic formulae in cross-cultural communication will not only jeopardize the interlocutors’ relationship, but make learners seem harsh and rude.

Example 5

How to show disagreement

I hear you, but I just don’t know.

I hear what you are saying but I’m not sure if you are right or not.

I see what you are saying.

I see you point. (On the other hand.../There’s another way of looking at this./Have you considered...)

Don’t you think that you are going a little too far when you say...? (You’re exaggerating the situation.)

I don’t think so/see it that way.

No. You’ve got it all wrong.

You’re dead wrong.

You are way off!

I couldn’t disagree with you more.

That’s out of the question.

(*Talk*, p. 45)



## 4. DISCUSSION

This part discusses the merits and deficiencies of the presentation of pragmalinguistic input, sociopragmatic input found in the examined textbooks. Then it relates the textbooks' merits and deficiencies to their potential for developing learners' communicative competence in general and pragmatic competence in particular. Then there is a discussion on the similarities and differences between the oral-English textbooks and integrated-skills textbooks in teaching pragmatics.

### 4.1 Pragmalinguistic Input

#### 4.1.1 Request

The textbooks tended to frequently present a small range of request strategies and modification devices. Previous research suggests that learners' preference for strategy use is related to textbooks' presentation of strategies and modification. The textbooks' tendency to frequently use politeness marker *please* might be an additional factor which, together with the explicit, transparent and unambiguous nature of politeness markers, contributes to learners' overuse of this strategy type, as reported in some studies (Faerch & Kasper, 1989; House & Kasper, 1987; Woodfield, 2008). For example, the narrow range of modification devices, especially the recurrent use of politeness markers, included in the textbooks for Japanese secondary schools (Konakahara, 2011) might be a potential reason why Japanese EFL learners in Sasaki's (1998) study used a restricted range of internal modifications such as interrogatives and politeness markers instead of past tense and Ing-forms. Hence, the textbooks should use politeness markers judiciously. Again, though grounders are commonly used by proficient language users (Trosborg, 1995; Yang, 2006), textbooks should be careful not to overpresent grounders because this may lead to learners' overuse of this modification device (House & Kasper, 1987; Wang, 2008).

Some strategy types were only featured once or twice in the textbooks; others were completely absent from the textbooks. Woodfield (2008) attributed the absence of past tense in her learner data to learners' underdeveloped pragmalinguistic repertoires and related the absence of interpersonal markers to restricted pragmatic input in the classroom. In order to increase learners' pragmalinguistic repertoire, textbooks should provide a greater variety of strategies and modification devices rather than focus on only a few of them. Arguably, the key issue in developing pragmalinguistic repertoires and improving classroom pragmatic input lies in the pragmalinguistic knowledge provided in the textbooks. Moreover, modification devices, in particular syntactic modifiers, should be emphasized because syntactically based modification devices takes time to master (Faerch & Kasper, 1989; Kasper & Rose, 2002). Specifically speaking, the syntactically complex biclausal forms like *Would it*

*possible if you* should receive more attention in textbooks because learners may be aware of them but use instead monoclausal forms like *Would you mind* where biclausal forms are more appropriate (Takahashi, 1996).

#### 4.1.2 Apology

Speakers from different speech communities have different perceptions of the need to apologize for the same offensive act. Despite such differences, it is still questionable that *New Course* provided as many as 10 instances of apologizing that taught learners to deny their fault. Textbooks may teach learners how to evade responsibility by minimizing the responsibility or offense, but the number of evasive strategies should be controlled within a certain limit, because learners have been observed to fail to take on responsibility in situations where proficient language users tend to acknowledge responsibility (Cohen & Olshtain, 1981; Cohen, Olshtain, & Rosenstein, 1986; Trosborg, 1987). Using evasive strategies in conditions where an apology is cross-culturally expected will cause learners to be perceived as impolite or even rude.

Typical remedial verbal actions have been found to involve explicit expression of apology (e.g., *I'm sorry*) and a statement of responsibility, whereas other apology strategies such as explanations, offer of repair, and promise of forbearance are context-dependent (Cohen & Olshtain, 1981; Olshtain, 1983). In other words, when a routine formula is insufficient to make amends for the offense, explanations and offer of repair are called for (Trosborg, 1995). Largely consistent with natural speech, the textbooks emphasized the use of expression of regret and explanation of the situation, and presented more examples of offer of repair and promise of forbearance than examples of other strategies. It is helpful that the textbooks give some prominence to the strategy of explanation, offering examples of how to justify for one's offensive act with linguistic resources, because "the ability to account for an offensive act is likely to require linguistic strength" (Trosborg, 1987, p. 159) and learners have been found to provide fewer explanations than competent English speakers (Trosborg, 1987). Furthermore, the textbooks' presentation of model conversations with combined use of apology strategies, like offer of repair and promise of forbearance in Example 1, would be beneficial for learners, since research indicates that what distinguishes learner performance from competent language users' performance of apologizing is the orchestration of strategies (Trosborg, 1987).

### 4.2 Sociopragmatic Input

The close examination of the sociopragmatic input has revealed that the textbooks did not provide sufficient contextual information and sociocultural norms, and that metapragmatic information was rarely provided in the textbooks.

Textbooks should endeavor to provide learners with adequate contextual information in order to facilitate their assessment of the contextual variables and help them choose appropriate linguistic formulae. Contextual information regarding interlocutors' relative power, social distance, and the degree of severity/imposition should be made available to learners. What is more important, contextualized speech acts should be appropriately contextualized so that learners can gradually develop a sensitivity to contextual factors by relating them to relevant speech act realization strategies. The decontextualized presentation of linguistic formulae, especially those direct speech act strategies, should be remedied by providing metapragmatic explanation about their use in order to prevent learners from misusing these linguistic formulae in inappropriate contexts.

Attention should also be given to sociocultural constraints on language use, which can help learners to avoid unintentional offense in cross-cultural communication. Since sociopragmatic knowledge is difficult to acquire through implicit or less explicit interventions (Fukuya & Clark, 2001; Rose & Ng, 2001), it might be better that textbooks explicitly provide information on sociocultural norms for pragmatic behaviors. Explicit teaching of sociopragmatic knowledge means direct explanation of the target sociopragmatic features (Taguchi, 2011), informing learners whether or not particular pragmatic behaviors are acceptable in certain social contexts. Moreover, although the textbooks presented some information on sociocultural norms for general language use, more attention should be given to specific information related to speech act performance. For example, while giving suggestions is viewed as a rapport-building activity in Chinese culture, it is regarded as intrusive for Americans (Lii-Shih, 1988). In this case, learners need to be reminded that employing L1 solidarity speech acts in L2 might result in L2 pragmatic failure.

### **4.3 The Textbooks' Potential in Developing Learners' Pragmatic Competence**

Based on the above discussion, it seems safe to draw the conclusion that the textbooks may contribute to developing learners' pragmatic competence, but they did not provide sufficient conditions for learners to acquire full pragmatic competence.

Given the inauthentic pragmalinguistic input, the textbooks ran the risk of misleading learners to focus on only a restricted range of speech act strategies and modification devices, or to use speech act strategies inappropriate in a given context. For example, learners may find it easier to acquire requesting realized in interrogatives plus politeness markers and grounders due to the high frequency of these modification devices in the textbooks. By contrast, learners may be less likely or need a longer period to learn to request in syntactically complex structures like a combination of conditional

clauses and embedding because these devices were presented less frequently in the textbooks. Similarly, the unmitigated refusals and disagreements presented out of context or without any metapragmatic explanations would be unlikely to help learners maintain a harmonious relation in interactions, but would make them look rude and impolite if used in inappropriate contexts. To develop learners' pragmalinguistic competence, textbooks should try to provide a full range of speech act strategies and modifications, prioritizing those frequently used in naturally occurring speech, in particular indirect strategies, in view of the widely recognized need for indirectness in face-threatening speech acts (Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1990; Félix-Brasdefer, 2003; Malamed, 2010; Nelson et al., 2002).

Consistent with Boxer and Pickering's (1995) and Usó-Juan's (2007) finding about the textbooks they examined, the textbooks in the present study paid insufficient attention to the sociopragmatic aspects of pragmatic teaching, and would have limited effects on developing learners' sociopragmatic competence. As has been discussed earlier, pragmatically competent learners are able to assess the contextual variables of an interactional situation accurately, have relevant background knowledge of the social values of the target language, and are capable of negotiating through the different pragmatic norms between L1 and L2. However, the textbooks in the present study fell short of the expectation to equip learners with relevant knowledge and ability. For one thing, the absence or simplified presentation of contextual information would be ineffective in raising learners' awareness of contextual appropriateness of linguistic forms or helping them get a sense of contextualized language use. For another, the limited information on sociocultural norms would be unlikely to enable learners to develop an adequate understanding of different pragmatic behaviors, which would make it difficult for them to negotiate through these differences in real-life communication.

### **4.4 Textbook Similarities and Differences in Teaching Pragmatics**

The oral-English textbooks and the integrated-skills textbooks did not show great differences in the presentation of pragmalinguistic input, except that the former presented much fewer disagreements than the latter. The larger quantity of disagreements in the integrated-skill textbooks was contributed by the topic-based conversations, many of which were arguments between interlocutors. Though the textbooks had different preferences for specific speech act realization strategies and modification devices, they generally showed the same tendency to focus on a restricted range of strategies and underpresent indirect strategies. Moreover, the distribution of speech act strategies and modification devices was not representative of their occurrence in naturally occurring speech. The pervasiveness of inauthentic pragmalinguistic

input in the textbooks might have resulted from the textbook writers' unreliable intuition of how speech acts are linguistically expressed (Box & Pickering, 1995).

The two types of textbooks demonstrated somewhat complexity in the presentation of sociopragmatic input. With regard to the availability of contextual information as an essential part of sociopragmatic input, more model conversations in the integrated-skills textbooks were provided with contextual information than those in the oral-English textbooks. In general, contextual information in the textbooks, except *New Course*, was too simple to reflect the relative power and social distance between the interlocutors. Hence it would be difficult for the textbooks, especially the oral-English textbooks, to develop learners' sensitivity to contextual factors and their ability to assess the appropriateness of linguistic forms in a given situation. When it comes to information on sociocultural norms, the oral-English textbooks included some as a basic component of teaching content, whereas the integrated-skills textbooks gave no attention to them. Hence, the oral-English textbooks have a better chance of helping learners avoid unintentional offense or breakdowns in communication and facilitating their negotiation with interlocutors from different sociocultural backgrounds. The absence of information on sociocultural norms from the integrated-skills textbooks might be explained by the objectives of integrated-skills courses that include acquisition of both linguistic competence and communicative competence. The integrated-skills textbooks devoted a great proportion of their space to reading texts and linguistic-knowledge-based exercises for the purpose of developing learners' linguistic competence, so that there may not be enough space and time for teaching sociocultural norms that are crucial to the acquisition of communicative competence.

---

## 5. IMPLICATIONS FOR TEXTBOOK DEVELOPMENT AND CLASSROOM TEACHING

---

The findings of this study can inform textbook developers who look for ways to present pragmatic knowledge and activities in a manner that best facilitates learners' acquisition of communicative competence. It is desirable that textbooks draw on empirically established information and naturalistic speech samples (Biber et al., 2002; Boxer & Pickering, 1995; Campillo, 2007; Ishihara, 2010; Nguyen, 2011). This is an important step toward ensuring that the pragmalinguistic input be representative of naturally occurring speech. A wide range of speech act strategies and modification devices should be presented to learners, and those frequently used ones in natural speech should spread throughout the textbooks in order to facilitate learners' mastery of them.

Contextual information should be provided along with model conversations and role-play tasks (Jiang, 2006; Konakahara, 2011; Nguyen, 2011; Vellenga, 2004). The presence of detailed contextual information can direct learners' attention to various contextual factors embedded in the context and allow them to make a connection between the linguistic forms and the interactional contexts. In the meanwhile, contextual variation should be taken into consideration, so that learners can get the opportunities to practice using different speech act strategies and modifications in diverse contexts.

Textbooks should enhance learners' awareness of pragmatic variation. This can be achieved by drawing attention to the sociocultural norms of the target language, and using pragmatic awareness-raising tasks to foster learners' sensitivity to sociocultural differences between L1 and L2. Textbook writer should include pragmatic norms beyond the "inner circle" because of the changing demographics of English users. Awareness of pragmatic variation helps learners avoid producing unexpected speech acts or pragmatically inappropriate language.

The findings also have implications for university teachers who are using these textbooks as one of the resources to develop learners' communicative competence. Teachers may consider using some supplementary materials to present those speech act realization strategies and modification devices that are not included or underpresented in the textbooks. This would help to increase learners' pragmalinguistic repertoire and allow them more linguistic choices. With regard to the small number of direct and blunt pragmalinguistic forms presented in a decontextualized manner in the textbooks, teachers can remedy the problems by informing learners of the potential consequences of using them. It is important that classroom instruction prevents learners from "being unintentionally rude or subservient" (Thomas, 1983, p. 96).

Considering that it is difficult to acquire sociopragmatic knowledge in an implicit way (Fukuya & Clark, 2001; Rose & Ng, 2001), teachers can play a positive role in making desirable sociopragmatic knowledge explicit to learners. For one thing, teachers may give metapragmatic explanations of how contextual variables in a given situation determine linguistic choices, thus helping learners gain a sense of contextualized language use. For another, teachers can assist learners to understand the manner in which sociocultural differences between L1 and L2 influence pragmatic behaviors. Importantly, teachers should have an awareness of learners' subjectivity and avoid imposing L2 pragmatic norms on them (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010b). Instead, they should be taught strategies for negotiating pragmatic norms and have the freedom to decide whether they will diverge from or converge to the L2 norms (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Ishihara & Tarone, 2009; Judd, 1999; Kasper & Rose, 2002).

## REFERENCES

- Alcón, E. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System*, 33, 417-435.
- Alcón, E. (2007). Fostering EFL learners' awareness of requesting through explicit and implicit consciousness-raising tasks. In M. García Mayo (Ed.), *Investigating tasks in formal language learning* (pp.221-241). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp.13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. C. Scarcella, E. S. Andersen, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp.55-73). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Bergman, M. L., & Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and performance in native and nonnative apology. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp.82-107). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *The Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Billmyer, K., & Varghese, M. (2000). Investigating instrument-based pragmatic variability: Effects of enhancing discourse completion tests. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 517-552.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech acts realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 196-213.
- Bouton, L. F. (1994). Conversational implicature in a second language: Learned slowly when not deliberately taught. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 22, 157-167.
- Boxer, D., & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: the case of complaints. *ELT Journal*, 49, 44-58.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. D. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Campillo, P. (2007). Examining mitigation in requests: A focus on transcripts in ELT coursebooks. In E. Alcón & M. P. Safont Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 207-222). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Canale, M. (1983). On some dimensions of language proficiency. In J. W. Oller (Ed.), *Issues in language testing research* (pp. 333-342). Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1 (1), 1-48.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E. Alcón & M. P. Safont Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 41-56). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6 (2), 5-35.
- Chang, B. (2003). *Analysis of request events in English textbooks for Japanese secondary schools*. Proceedings of the 8th Conference of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, 35-49.
- Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: The case of apology. *Language Learning*, 31, 113-134.
- Cohen, A. D., Olshtain, E., & Rosenstein, D. S. (1986). Advanced EFL apologies: What remains to be learned? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 62, 51-74.
- Crandall, E., & Basturkmen, H. (2004). Evaluating pragmatics-focused materials. *ELT Journal*, 58, 38-49.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Delen, B., & Tavit, Z. M. (2010). Evaluation of four coursebooks in terms of three speech acts: Requests, refusals and complaints. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 692-697.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguage request realization. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 221-247). Norwood: Alex Publishing.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. (2003). Declining an invitation: A cross-cultural study of pragmatic strategies in American English and Latin American Spanish. *Multilingua*, 22, 225-255.
- Fukuya, K. J., & Clark, M. K. (2001). A comparison of input enhancement and explicit instruction on mitigators. In L. F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 10, pp. 111-130). Urbana: Division of English as an International Language, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Hassall, T. (2003). Requests by Australian learners of Indonesia. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 1903-1928.
- House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. In W. Lörcher & R. Schulze (Eds.), *Perspectives on language in performance: Festschrift for Werner Hülsen* (pp. 1250-1288). Tübingen: Narr.
- Hu, G. (2002). English language teaching in the People's Republic of China. In R. E. Silver, G. Hu, & M. Iino (Eds.), *English language education in China, Japan, and Singapore* (pp. 1-77). Singapore: National Institute of Education.
- Ishihara, N. (2010). Curriculum writing for L2 pragmatics — principles and practice in the teaching of L2 pragmatics. In N. Ishihara & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet* (pp. 201-223). Harlow: Pearson.
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2010). Learners' pragmatics: Potential causes of divergence. In N. Ishihara & A.D. Cohen (Eds.), *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet* (pp. 75-96). Harlow: Pearson.

- Ishihara, N., & Tarone, E. (2009). Subjectivity and pragmatic choice in L2 Japanese: Emulating and resisting pragmatic norms. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *Pragmatic competence* (pp. 101-128). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jeon, E., & Kaya, T. (2006). Effects of L2 instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development. In J. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 165-211). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ji, P. (2007). Exploring pragmatic knowledge in College English textbooks. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30 (5), 109-119.
- Jiang, X. (2006). Suggestions: What should ESL students know? *System*, 34, 36-54.
- Judd, E. (1999). Some issues in the teaching of pragmatic competence. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 152-219). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G. (1997). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* Retrieved 16 May 2013 from <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/>
- Kasper, G., & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 317-334). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Koester, A. J. (2002). The performance of speech acts in workplace conversations and the teaching of communicative functions. *System*, 30, 167-184.
- Koike, D. A., & Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in the development of pragmatic competence. *System*, 33, 481-501.
- Konakahara, M. (2011). *Analysis of request events in English textbooks for Japanese secondary schools*. Paper Collection of Graduate School of Education of Waseda University, 19, 325-340.
- Kubota, M. (1995). Teachability of conversational implicature to Japanese EFL learners. *The institute for Research in Language Teaching Bulletin*, 9, 35-67.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lii-Shih, Y. (1988). *Conversational politeness and foreign language teaching*. Taipei: Crane Publishing.
- Malamed, L. H. (2010). Disagreement: How to disagree agreeably. In A. Martínez-Flor & E. Usó-Juan (Eds.), *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues* (pp. 237-256). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Martínez-Flor, A. (2010). Analyzing request modification devices in films: Implication for pragmatic learning in instructed foreign language contexts. In E. Alcón & M. P. Safont Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 245-280). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Fukuya, Y. (2005). The effects of instruction on learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestion. *System*, 33, 463-480.
- Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Mir, M. (1992). Do we all apologize the same? — An empirical study on the act of apologizing by Spanish speakers learning English. *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, 3, 1-19.
- Nelson, G., Carson, J., Batal, M., & Bakary, W. (2002). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Strategy use in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 163-189.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. London: Sage.
- Nguyen, M. T. T. (2011). Learning to communicate in a globalized world: To what extent do school textbooks facilitate the development of intercultural pragmatic competence?. *RELC Journal*, 42, 17-30.
- Olshtain, E. (1983). Sociocultural competence and language transfer: The case of apology. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 232-249). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behavior. *TESL Canada Journal*, 7 (2), 45-65.
- Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System*, 33, 385-399.
- Rose, K. R., & Ng, C. (2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 145-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Safont Jordà, M. P. (2005). Third language learners: Pragmatic production and awareness. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sasaki, M. (1998). Investigating EFL students' production of speech acts: A comparison of production questionnaires and role plays. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30, 457-484.
- Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Treads and issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 289-310.
- Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 18, 189-223.
- Takahashi, S. (2010). Assessing learnability in second language pragmatics. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (pp. 391-421). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Tateyama, Y. (2001). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines: Japanese sumimasen. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 200-222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tateyama, Y., Kasper, G., Mui, L. P., Tay, H., & Thananart, O. (1997). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines. In L. F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 8, pp. 163-177). Urbana: Division of English as an International Language, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- The English division of Tertiary Foreign language Instruction Guidance Committee. (2000). *National English syllabus for English majors in institutions of higher learning*. Retrieved 14 May 2013 from <http://wenku.baidu.com/view/e05b052e453610661ed9f47f.html>

- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 91-112.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in native/non-natives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11, 147-167.
- Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints and apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Usó-Juan, E. (2007). The representation and practice of communicative act of requesting in textbooks: Focusing on modifiers. In E. Alcón & M. P. Safont Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 223-243). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Vellenga, H. (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely? *TESL-EJ*, 8(2), 1-18. Retrieved 18 November 2012 from <https://tesl-ej.org/~teslelor/ej30wp/a3.html>
- Wang, V. X. (2011). *Making requests by Chinese EFL learners*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wolfson, N. (1989). The bulge: A theory of speech behavior and social distance. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 2(1), 55-83.
- Woodfield, H. (2008). Interlanguage requests: A contrastive study. In M. Pütz & J. N. Aertselaer (Eds.), *Developing contrastive pragmatics: Interlanguage and cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 231-264). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yang, X. (2006). *Second language pragmatic development: A cross-sectional study on the acquisition of English requests by Chinese learners*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Shanghai International Studies University, Shanghai.