Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development[1]

Gabriele Kasper

University of Hawai‘i at MÅnoa

Introduction

An increasing body of research examines the development of L2 learners' pragmatic ability (cf. reviews by Kasper & Schmidt, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig, 1999a; Kasper & Rose, 1999). While some earlier longitudinal studies chart observed acquisitional patterns descriptively without relating them to an explanatory framework of second language development (e.g., Ellis, 1992; Sawyer, 1992), other investigations are explicitly guided by – in the rare case, even designed to test – theoretical approaches to L2 learning. Since a fair amount of research under different theoretical orientations now exists, it is timely to take stock of what these approaches have contributed to our understanding of L2 pragmatic development and – not unlike the tenure process at some North American universities – assess their 'future value'.

In the anniversary year of Canale and Swain's influential article 'Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing' (1980), it is particularly appropriate to relate the present discussion to its historical roots. As is well known, the original Canale and Swain framework comprised three components - grammatical, sociolinguistic, and

[1] This paper is a revised version of a plenary given at the annual conference of the American Association of Applied Linguistics (AAAL), Vancouver, March 2000.

strategic competence. At first glance, this trinity suggests a relevant absence, which prompted Schachter to ask: ‘Where does pragmatics fit into the Canale and Swain framework? Is it assumed not to exist?’ (1990, p. 42). A quick look at how sociolinguistic ability was operationalized in the Development of Bilingual Proficiency Project (Harley, Cummins, Swain, & Allen, 1990) reassured the pragmatically concerned. Sociolinguistic ability was defined as ‘the ability to produce and recognize socially appropriate language in context’ (p. 14), operationalized as requests, offers, and complaints produced in oral roleplays, the selection of contextually appropriate realizations of speech acts in a multiple choice format, and written directives in a formal letter and informal notes. Pragmatics was thus included in the framework; it had just not yet come to its own name.

Canale (1983) extended the original tripartite framework by adding discourse competence. In the same paper, he cautioned that ‘this theoretical framework is not a *model* of communicative competence, where model implies some specification of the manner and order in which the components interact and in which the various competencies are normally acquired’ (p. 12, italics added). The second issue – how the competencies are acquired - is, of course, co-extensive with the fundamental project of second language acquisition research. This project can be approached in two ways. One can examine learners’ development of one component, for instance pragmatics, and look for acquisitional regularities and the factors that influence acquisition. Such an approach emphasizes the integrity of the investigated component. Or one can study how two (or more) components are related to each other in second language use and development, whether, for instance, a particular level of development in one component is a necessary condition for progress in the other component, or whether the components develop independently.

Although compared to studies of L2 grammatical development, the history of research on L2 pragmatic development is neither long nor particularly rich, we can discern three phases of emphasis. A few early studies were conducted as explicit test cases of Canale and Swain's framework. For instance, Walters (1980) asked 'To what extent are grammatical ability and sociocultural ability independent as claimed in the Canale and Swain model? In what ways are they interdependent, i.e., in what ways does the sociocultural component depend on the grammatical component? (p. 338). Walters' questions are open to a possible independence of the two competencies and to a dependency of pragmatics on grammar. A further possibility to consider is that grammatical development may require already established pragmatic knowledge.

The first comprehensive investigation of the development of communicative competence was Schmidt's famous Wes study (1983). This study distinguished itself not only by expanding the prevalent focus on interlanguage *structure* to functional aspects of SLA but also by its theoretical and methodological sophistication. As the study's *descriptive* framework, Schmidt adopted Canale's (1983) framework of communicative competence. *Theoretically*, the study was motivated as a test of Schumann's Acculturation Model (1978). Within what Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) called a 'theory-then-research' approach to SLA, the study illustrates a causalprocess form, described by Larsen-Freeman and Long as ‘traditionally, at least, the most valued in the nomothetic scientific tradition’ (1991, p. 224). *Methodologically*, the study features a longitudinal case study design. With an observational period of three years, it remains the longest study of communicative L2 development to date.

The second phase of developmental L2 pragmatics examined learners’ pragmatic ability as an independent component. Grammar and, to a much lesser extent, discourse and strategic competence (Hassall, 1997), were discussed as some among a range of possible factors that influence pragmatic development, but their relationship to learners’ pragmatic ability was not the focal research question (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999a). In order to account for acquisitional patterns, theoretical perspectives from child language acquisition and grammatical development in SLA have been extended to the explanation of L2 pragmatic learning. The most prominent of these perspectives are information processing hypotheses, sociocognitive theory, and language socialization theory, each of which I will discuss later in this paper. ‘Autonomous’ studies of pragmatic development from different theoretical vantage points are continuing – and given the scarcity of developmental research, such studies are urgently needed. But recently, a concurrent interest in the relationship of pragmatic and grammatical knowledge and their development has reemerged.

Pragmatics and grammar

The renewed attention to the relationship between pragmatic and grammatical competence was marked by Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei's (1998) study of ESL and EFL learners' pragmatic and grammatical awareness. EFL students in Hungary rated grammatical errors higher than ESL learners, who scored higher on pragmatic appropriateness judgments than the EFL learners did. Low-proficiency Hungarian students gave lower ratings to both grammatical and pragmatic errors than the high-proficiency group; however, the high-proficiency students demonstrated a much greater increase in grammatical than in pragmatic awareness. While the high-proficiency ESL group also noticed more pragmatic inappropriacies than their low-proficiency colleagues, the recognition of grammatical errors deteriorated with increased proficiency in the ESL group. In a replication of Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei's (1998) study with Czech EFL students, Niezgoda and Röver (in press) found that their ESL students rated pragmatic errors as significantly more severe than grammatical errors, which replicated Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei's finding. Unlike Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei's Hungarian EFL group, however, the Czech students noticed a much higher number of pragmatic *and* grammatical errors and perceived both error types as much more serious than the ESL sample. Low-proficiency learners in both the EFL and ESL groups considered pragmatic errors as more serious than grammatical errors and rated pragmatic errors as more severe whereas high proficiency learners showed the opposite tendency. These findings strongly suggest that pragmatic and grammatical awareness are largely independent and that their development may be associated with different learning environments in a rather complex fashion. Not all ESL or EFL contexts are equal.

A second, programmatic initiative to explore the relationship between interlanguage pragmatics and grammar has been proposed Bardovi-Harlig (1999a). In this paper, she outlined a research agenda on acquisitional pragmatics which recommends in-depth study of specific grammatical and pragmalinguistic subsystems. This agenda moves developmental interlanguage pragmatics a significant step beyond the broad comparisons of grammatical and pragmatic development that have mostly been conducted thus far. It is grounded in a consistent finding in research on advanced learners' pragmatic ability: 'high levels of grammatical competence do not guarantee concomitant high levels of pragmatic competence' (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999a, p. 686). How have researchers arrived at this very stable result? Typically – and irrespective of the adopted design (single-moment, cross-sectional, or longitudinal design; Rose, 2000; Kasper & Rose, 1999) –, previous studies have typically matched learners' performance of a *particular* pragmatic feature, mostly a speech act, with the performance of that speech act by native speakers, on the one hand, and a *general* measure of L2 proficiency, on the other – a standardized proficiency test like the TOEFL, grade level, or even measures that are related to proficiency indirectly if at all, such as length of residence or study. Such studies have found repeatedly that high general proficiency is not matched by native-like performance in the examined pragmatic feature. This line of investigation is appropriate if pragmatic ability is viewed as an autonomous component of communicative competence and the research question centers on the development and attainment of a pragmalinguistic feature within an independent pragmatic ability. But this approach does not tell us how a *particular* pragmalinguistic feature is related to the *particular* grammatical knowledge implicated in its use. It is precisely this question that Bardovi-Harlig (1999a) recommends to SLA researchers' attention.

Studies examining the relationship between pragmalinguistic and grammatical ability report two sets of outcomes. One group of results documents that learners acquire an L2 grammatical feature before they acquire its pragmalinguistic functions. The other set of findings indicates that learners use L2 pragmatic functions before they acquire the L2 grammatical forms that are acceptable realizations of those functions.

The 'grammar precedes pragmatics' scenario comes in different varieties. (1) Learners demonstrate knowledge of a particular grammatical structure or element while not adopting it to express or modify illocutionary force; (2) learners know a grammatical structure and use it to express pragmalinguistic functions that are not conventionalized target usage; (3) learners know a grammatical structure *and* its pragmalinguistic functions yet use the structure in non-targetlike fashion. The first variety is best illustrated by studies designed to implement Bardovi-Harlig's (1999a) research agenda. In a one-year longitudinal study, Salsbury and Bardovi-Harlig (in press a, b) examined the emergence of modality in beginning ESL learners. The researchers compared the learners' acquisitional profiles in context-free modality inventories with the learners' use of modals in performing disagreements during oral interviews. Despite considerable variability in learners' modality profiles, modal expressions emerged in a consistent acquisitional pattern:

maybe>think>can>will>would>could

However, availability of modal verbs in learners' grammars did not necessarily translate to the use of these verbs in mitigating disagreement. Salsbury and Bardovi-Harlig observe that 'even learners with grammaticalized expressions of modality rely heavily on lexical forms to unambiguously mark their pragmatic intent' (in press b, p. 16). A similar observation was made in earlier cross-sectional research on epistemic modality in interlanguage pragmatics. In her study of epistemic expressions in Finnish learners' English, Kärkkäinen (1992) found that her low proficiency learners mainly modified their speech acts by parentheticals such as *I think* and *I know*. The high proficiency learners opted more frequently for modal adverbs and modal verbs, though not as frequently as the native speakers of English in her study. Kärkkäinen's findings suggest that implicit, syntactically integrated, nonroutinized expressions of epistemic modality are more difficult to acquire than explicit, extraclausal (parenthetical), and routinized expressions.

The relationship between syntactic structures and their illocutionary and politeness functions is at issue in Satomi Takahashi's studies on transferability (1996) and input enhancement (in press) of request strategies. In both studies, Takahashi finds that advanced Japanese EFL students reject the biclausal 'I was wondering if you could VP' and 'Would it be possible for you to VP', opting for monoclausal structures such as 'would/could you (please) VP' instead. Although no independent grammar test was conducted, the students had evidently been taught and understood the semantics of the biclausal structure. Takahashi concluded that 'the Japanese EFL learners lack the L2 pragmalinguistic knowledge that an English request can be mitigated to a greater extend by making it syntactically more complex' (in press, p. 5).

In the second variety of the ‘grammar precedes pragmatics’ scenario, grammatical knowledge enables non-target-like pragmalinguistic use. Bodman and Eisenstein (1988) cite learners’ transliterated thanking routines in their expressions of gratitude in English, such as

May God increase your bounty
May God grant you a long life
You are a blessing to us from God.

Evidence of advanced grammatical knowledge put to pragmatically inappropriate use led Takahashi and Beebe (1987) to propose that advanced learners ‘have the rope to hang themselves’, or less graphically, advanced grammatical knowledge may correlate positively with negative pragmatic transfer.

The third variety of learners’ grammar preceding their pragmatics is in evidence when learners know a grammatical structure *and* its pragmalinguistic functions yet demonstrate lack of familiarity with the contextual and sociopragmatic conditions that constrain targetlike use. Several studies report on learners’ use of information questions as indirect strategies in requests for action, warning, disagreeing, refusing, rejecting, or criticizing, in contexts where more transparent strategies would be more effective (e.g., Beebe & Takahashi, 1989a, b; Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1991). The example below is from Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford’s advising session data (1991, p. 47f.) The advisor wants the student to take Linguistics 560. The student responds with a series of questions.

A= faculty advisor, S= graduate student

A: Yeah. Are you going to be here next fall?
S: Mmmmm. Exactly, no. Actually, actually.
A: Then you’ll have to do L560.

--> S: Which one is that one? Oh.
A: It's American Culture.
--> S: That one's required?
A: Yes it is. It's right…there.
--> S: It's American Culture. What time is it? 4:20. [mumbles as looks at schedule] (softly) L560. This was… I was thinking if I could take your class Mondays and Wednesdays. 15 credits. It'd be crazy, too many credits.
[20 turns later]
--> S: So you know about 560, who teaches
A: Mr. Smith
--> S: Mr. Smith, is the one who is next to Professor Brown?
A: No, no, Mr. Smith is not here. He's in Malaysia, so he'll be back next semester.
--> S: OK. Mr. Smith is twice a week. Do you have any idea what the syllabus is like? Do you have to write a paper, do you have to…
A: Ah yes. But I don't think it's going to be terribly difficult for you. I, I don't think it's going to be a real problem.
S: Umm. I wish I could also take language testing.

(Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1991, p. 47f.)

One gets the sense that the student may not be entirely keen on taking Linguistics 560. The use of the question strategy demonstrates that learners have the grammar to form interrogatives, *and* they have the pragmalinguistic knowledge to use questions in order to convey pragmatic intent indirectly. The non-target-like uses are indicative of students' pragmalinguistic competence not incompetence. However, they also show us that learners do not have the sociopragmatic knowledge to assess when the use of a question strategy is appropriate and effective.

Pragmalinguistic knowledge and concomitant lack of sociopragmatic knowledge is evident in Japanese ESL learners' verbal protocols, elicited by Mary Ann Robinson (1992) in a study on refusal. Prompted to refuse to help a friend with her house moving, one learner responded:

> I hate to say that I can't help you, but on Sunday *I want to study* at libraly, because I should prepare for the term paper, the due date of which is Tuesday.

In her concurrent verbal protocol, she said:

> (…) on Sunday I will – I will uh – I would I would like – I will – on Sunday – um – um yeah *friends would like is too polite* so uh – I want – okay I sa I want – I want to study – to study – um – I want to study - at library (…)
>
> (M.A. Robinson, 1992, p. 58, italics added)

The learner's self-repairs in her think-aloud protocol show not only that she knows the form 'I would like' but also that she knows that 'I would like' is more polite than 'I want'. Her grammatical and pragmalinguistic knowledge are demonstrably intact. Where she goes wrong is in her sociopragmatic hypothesis that 'would like' is 'too polite' when talking to American friends. As Scarcella noted, 'adult L2 performers seem to use politeness features before they have acquired their co-occurrence and appropriate distribution' (1979, p. 285).

In the reverse scenario, the learner's pragmatics is ahead of her grammar. One SLA celebrity whose pragmatic skills progressed to great effectiveness while his grammar lagged behind is Wes, the participant in Schmidt's (1983) study. Over the three year observation period, Wes's grammatical knowledge developed only minimally, whereas his pragmatic and discourse competence greatly improved. Wes's case impressively illustrates the dissociation of grammatical from pragmatic/discourse ability. He demonstrates that a restricted interlanguage grammar does not necessarily impose constraints on pragmatic and interactional competence, and that high acculturation is not necessarily related to target-like grammar, whereas it appears to be strongly related to pragmatic and interactional competence.

In another early study which explicitly addressed the structure and development of pragmatic competence and its relationship to grammatical competence, Walters (1980) found that children and adolescents between the ages of 7 and 15 used appropriately polite request strategies with ungrammatical forms, as in the examples below.

> We borrow your basketball please? (rising intonation)
> We can go in front of you? (rising intonation)
> You give me the paper? (rising intonation)
> Can you tell me where is the can openers, please
> Do you know where is the can opener?
> Do you give me 35 cents for the lunch?
> May you give us the towels to clean up our milk?
> Can you know where is the can opener?
> Are you have some rice? (Walters, 1980, p. 341)

These data are consistent with Koike's (1989) comment on the dissociation of pragmatics and grammar: 'since the grammatical competence cannot develop as quickly as the already present pragmatic concepts require, the pragmatic concepts are expressed in ways conforming to the level of grammatical complexity acquired' (p. 287). In Eisenstein and Bodman's (1986, 1993) study of expressions of gratitude, advanced ESL learners provided pragmalinguistically appropriate thanking strategies with ungrammatical forms, such as

Intensifiers: I very appreciate
Tense: I never forget you kindness
Word order: I'll pay back you
Idiom: This is the thing what I've wanted; Thank you. Sound is good.
Prepositions: That's very nice from you; I hope to see you by us
Word choice: I have never taken such a good dinner; it is so glad to me that I have such kind of good friend)

(Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986, p. 175; 1993, p. 69)

The grammatical errors may make these thanking expressions less effective, but they are not pragmalinguistic errors. The implicated grammatical features do not convey illocutionary force or politeness. Learners' imperfect grammar *may* constrain their expression of pragmatic intent, but as Wes, Walters' young learners, and Eisenstein and Bodman's participants show us, this is not always the case.

The last examples suggest that not all grammatical features are good candidates for studying the relationship between pragmatics and grammar. Nor are all aspects of pragmalinguistics good candidates for studying this relationship. The required qualification is that linguistic expressions have a double life as symbols and indexicals. This requirement is met by grammatical subsystems that have pragmalinguistic, or indexical, meaning, such as expressions of modality, tense and aspect, sentence type, negation, and prosody. The requirement is not met by prepositions, many types of grammatical morphemes, and most of the things that our colleagues in the UG department care about. Conversely, not all aspects of pragmalinguistic knowledge have a grammatical counterpart. Some indexicals do not have a context-free symbolic meaning, such as sentence-final particles in Japanese (*ne, no, yo*) and modal particles in German (*ja, doch, wohl, mal, eben*). It would be insightful to investigate how these particles emerge in learners' performance and how they are used to modify specific speech acts or convey specific interpersonal functions in discourse. But even with such a double research focus, the endeavor remains entirely within the boundaries of pragmalinguistics, or the study of indexicality.

Moving on from issues to theories, pragmatic development has been studied from the perspectives of two psychological paradigms, information processing and sociocognitive theory.

Information processing

The strong impact of information psychology on SLA is also evident in research on pragmatic development. Two influential proposals on L2 learning have been applied by their authors to the acquisition of L2 pragmatic ability: Schmidt's noticing hypothesis (Schmidt & Frota, 1986; Schmidt, 1993, 1995, in press) and Bialystok's two-dimensional model of L2 proficiency development (1993, 1994). The noticing hypothesis says, in a nutshell, that in order for input to become intake and thus available for further processing, it has to be 'noticed', or 'detected' under 'awareness' (Schmidt, 1995). Schmidt (1995) distinguishes 'noticing' from 'understanding'. 'Noticing' refers to the 'conscious registration of the occurrence of some event', whereas 'understanding' 'implies the recognition of some general principle, rule, or pattern. Noticing refers to surface level phenomena and item learning, while understanding refers to deeper level(s, GK) of abstraction related to (semantic, syntactic, or communicative) meaning, system learning' (1995, p. 29). The noticing hypothesis thus accounts for initial input selection, whereas the two-dimensional model explains the development of already available knowledge along the dimensions of analyzed representation and control of processing. While neither proposal has been tested explicitly in interlanguage pragmatic studies, both have been engaged in theoretical frameworks for investigating pragmatic development.

Studies of interlanguage pragmatic use and development consistently demonstrate that adult learners rely on universal or L1 based pragmatic knowledge (Kasper & Rose, 1999; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig, in press). As Hassall (1997) suggests, this finding lends support to Bialystok's claim that 'for adult L2 learners, the task of forming representations of pragmatic knowledge is already largely accomplished, such that the most important task facing them is the development of control over attention in selecting knowledge when appropriate' (Hassall, 1997, p. 287). The first prediction of the two-dimensional model, i.e., for adult learners, 'the task of forming representations of pragmatic knowledge is already largely accomplished', is also supported by Koike's (1989) study, in which she investigated the comprehension and production of speech acts by beginning learners of Spanish as a foreign language. As she comments, 'since the range of options of L1 request forms is already familiar to the learner, pragmatic competence in interlanguage does not have to develop *conceptually* in a developmental continuum from simple/basic to the elaborate/complex forms (…) learners are often guided to produce more polite forms from their L1 notions of politeness' (p. 286f).

Bialystok's second prediction - adults' learning task in pragmatics is primarily to gain control over effective allocation of attentional resources -, has been related to observations about learners' speech production and conversational skills. Examples include intonation contours and conversational responses. Some of the learners in Kasper (1981) and Hassall (1997) produce their utterances in short intonation contours, as in these excerpts:

(someone has taken learner's library seat)

L: you ↑**wou**ldn’t (.) be ↑**an**gry (.) if you er come ↑**ba**ck and you ↑**see** that there’s **some**↑thing (.) er that there’s somebody ↑**o**ther

(adapted from Kasper, 1981, p. 162)

(asking to try a cassette in a store)
L: Saya (.) saya mau (.) uh (.) mendengar (.) uh (.) kaset (.) Iwan Fals.
L: I (.) I want (.) uh (.) to hear (.) uh (.) an Iwan Fals (.) cassette.

(ordering a drink in a restaurant)
L: Saya (.) saya harus (.) uh (.) membeli (.) sebotol bir juga (.) sekarang.
L: I (.) I must (.) uh (.) buy (.) a bottle of beer too (.) now.

(Hassall, 1997, p. 136f.)

In terms of Levelts’ model of speech production (1989), these data suggest that the learners have their requests mapped out in their Conceptualizer when they take their turn at talk, whereas the linguistic material required to implement their speech acts is not yet available for fast and effortless recall from the Formulator. For these learners, accessing the linguistic forms requires much attention and can only be accomplished in an incremental, one-segment-at-a-time procedure, resulting in a dysfluent, choppy speech style.

Hassall (1997) notes that processing difficulties can affect sequencing constraints on speech act strategies. Following a specification exchange, the learners of L2 Indonesian in his study tended to repeat their initial request strategy, as in the example below. The learner produces his initial request and the follow-up request in the last line with *saya mau* ‘I want’.

(buying a movie ticket)

L: Uh (.) saya (.) uh mau (.) uh (.) karcis (.) untuk duduk (.)
uh I uh want uh ticket(s) for sit
L: uh (.) di tengah (.) depan bioskop? ya?
uh in middle front cinema yes
P: He eh/
uh huh

L: Apa (.) apa ongkosnya
what what cost-the
(.)
P: Uh (.) tiga ribu lima ratus.
uh three thousand five hundred
L: Oke (.) uh (.) saya mau (.) uh (.) satu karcis (.) ya?
okay uh I want uh one ticket yes

L: Uh, I want a ticket (or 'tickets') to sit, um, in the middle-front of the cinema, okay?
P: Uh huh.
L: What's, uh, what's the cost?
(.)
P: Um, three thousand five hundred.
L: Oke. Er, I want , uh, one ticket (.) yes? (Hassall, 1997, p. 140f)

The second Want statement repeats previously established information and aligns poorly with the preceding turn. Native speakers use elliptic goal statements for follow-up requests, which in this case could be *Satu, Pak* "One, 'father'". The problem for the learners does not seem to be how to construct elliptic turns but to attend to the contingently evolving interaction and design their contributions in a sequentially appropriate fashion (Kasper, 1981, 1984; Stemmer, 1982; Trosborg, 1995; House, 1996; Hassall, 1997). House (1996) made a parallel observation about poorly aligned responses in advanced German EFL learners' interactions. She, too, argued that the inappropriate response turns indicate insufficiently developed control of processing.

It should be noted that the studies reporting (even advanced) learners' difficulty with conversational fluency and discursive skills have two things in common: they all examined *foreign* language learners and used *open roleplays* for data collection. Both factors may well contribute to the findings. First, foreign language classroom learning, no matter how communicative and learner-centered, may just not provide enough occasions for conversational practice; therefore it may be difficult for learners to develop the processing control in utterance comprehension and production required for effective participation in conversation. Secondly, roleplays can be quite taxing even for very fluent speakers because in absence of an external supporting context, roleplay participants have to create a context ongoingly. These extra demands on learners' processing capacities may result in an underrepresentation of their discourse abilities and may be compounded in the case of foreign language learners (Kasper & Rose, forthcoming).

Turning to the noticing hypothesis, Schmidt applies his distinction between noticing and understanding to pragmatics as follows:

> In pragmatics, awareness that on a particular occasion someone says to their interlocutor something like, "I'm terribly sorry to bother you, but if you have time could you look at this problem?" is a matter of noticing. Relating the various forms used to their strategic deployment in the service of politeness and recognizing their co-occurrence with elements of context such as social distance, power, level of imposition and so on, are all matters of understanding (1995, p. 30).

Evidence for the noticing hypothesis was found by DuFon (1999) in her study on the acquisition of politeness in L2 Indonesian during a homestay program. What her six participants noticed depended partly on the pragmatic salience (Errington, 1988) of a feature. All learners commented extensively in their journals on address terms and greetings and not at all on experience questions, which DuFon defined as 'queries concerning whether one has engaged in an activity (e.g. play gamelan, ski, eat, etc.), observed or participated in an event (e.g., attend the concert, arrive in Singapore, etc.), sensed a particular feeling (e.g. hunger, satisfaction, etc.) or achieved some other state (e.g. know, have, etc.)' (DuFon, 1999, p. 167). These questions and the responses to them are particularly interesting to study because sociocultural and grammatical knowledge are closely intertwined in their use. One example must suffice here:

A: Sudah pernah ke Bali?
B: Belum
A: Have you ever been to Bali?
B: “Not yet”.

If it is possible that the event addressed in the question will happen in the future, the question is phrased with *sudah (pernah)*, and the unmarked negative response to it is *belum.* A negative response excluding future occurrence, *tidak*, is possible but highly marked because it indexes that the questioner’s presupposition was wrong. Learners thus have to figure out what constitutes culturally expected events or experiences and make their grammatical choices accordingly – a compelling example of how L2 specific sociopragmatic knowledge is required in order to choose the correct grammatical forms. As evident from the learners’ journals, they did not expend much metapragmatic reflection on experience questions. However, in interaction, native speakers made the correct use of negative responses salient for the learners through modeling, expansions, translations, backchanneling, and requests for confirmation (p. 248). The native speakers did not appear to be inhibited to focus the learners’ attention on form, presumably because they perceived learners’ wrong adverb choices as grammatical errors, which they deemed correctable without posing threat to face. This was to the learners’ great benefit, because they all progressed from zero or English *no* responses to wrong uses of *tidak* to correct *belum* responses, certainly not a bad record in two months of residence in the target community.

But learners also varied individually in what they understood and how they acted upon it. The learners' acquisition of address terms illustrates well that noticing is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for pragmatic learning. All six learners commented in their diaries on the many different terms of address used in Indonesian. On the level of noticing, there seems to have been little difference between them. Yet one learner, Kyle, persisted in using *anda* 'you' in a rather undiscerning fashion, apparently without realizing that addressing higher status interlocutors with *anda* is quite rude. Charlene, on the other hand, took great care to discover the sociolinguistic regularities that govern the intricate system of Indonesian address terms. She put effort into understanding and made use of what she had understood in her own communicative practice. Charlene noticed the gap and made efforts to close it; Kyle noticed the gap and left it at that. To explain such individual differences, one has to look beyond cognitive processing. DuFon (p. 456) notes that Kyle mainly seemed concerned about feeling 'comfortable', which for him implied that social differences between him and his interlocutors were minimized. Charlene, however, showed great concern for displaying proper 'respect,' and using target-like address terms was one important way for her to accomplish this. As studies by Peirce (1995) and Siegal (1996) on learner subjectivity suggest, learners' personal values may influence how much effort they expend on understanding L2 pragmatic and sociolinguistic practices and to what extent they converge to native speaker use.

Classroom research on instruction in pragmatics includes a number of studies that have explicitly tested instructional interventions building on information processing hypotheses. Most type of instruction studies have examined the effect of implicit versus explicit teaching approaches to a specific pragmatic learning objective. In explicit instruction, the targeted pragmatic feature is made the object of *metapragmatic* treatment through description, explanation, or discussion. In implicit instruction, the pragmatic feature is included in contexts of use and practiced in various activities. Pragmatic features targeted so far include a variety of speech acts and discourse strategies, e.g.,

- discourse markers and strategies (EFL, House & Kasper, 1981)
- implicature (EFL, Kubota, 1995)
- pragmatic fluency (EFL, House, 1996)
- pragmatic routines (JFL, Tateyama, Kasper, Mui, Tay, & Thananart, 1997; Tateyama, in press)
- sociopragmatic factors of requesting (ESL, Fukuya, Reeve, Gisi, & Christianson, 1998)
- thanking, apologizing, commanding, requesting (SpFL, Pearson, 1988)
- mitigation in requesting (ESL, Fukuya & Clark, in press)
- compliments (EFL, Rose & Ng, in press)
- request strategies (EFL, S. Takahashi, in press)
- interactional markers (JFL, Yoshimi, in press)

A strong general trend emerging from these studies is a distinct advantage for explicit metapragmatic instruction, irrespective of such factors as the specific pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic learning objective, L2, learners' L2 proficiency level, their L1 background, or length of instruction. This finding is consistent with Norris and Ortega's (in press) meta-analysis of studies on the effectiveness of L2 instruction, forthcoming in *Language Learning* later this year. Their quantitative synthesis of 77 studies published between 1990 and 1998 demonstrates a clear advantage for explicit over implicit teaching. One intriguing observation about the effectiveness of explicit instruction in pragmatics was made by Yoshimi (in press). In her study, JFL students learnt about the interactional functions of the discourse markers *n desu*, *n desu kedo*, and *n desu ne* in oral narratives through a variety of techniques that fostered students' attention to and understanding of these markers. Yoshimi notes that through this instructional approach, learners' attention to the interactional demands of the task seemed to increase even in areas where no explicit instruction was provided. Future work will have to examine whether indeed attention to pragmatic features generalizes beyond the instructional target and through what interventions attentional readiness can be enhanced.

Sociocognitive theory

Information processing theories and learner collaboration are integrated in the interactionist hypothesis of SLA, which underlies task-based language teaching (Long, 1996; Skehan, 1998). The foundational role of interaction in cognitive and language development is at the center of sociocognitive theory, a.k.a. sociohistorical, sociocultural, or cultural-historical theory. The fundamental ontological and epistemological differences between information processing theories and the interaction hypothesis, on the one hand, and sociocognitive theory, on the other, have been extensively discussed in the literature, especially in the work of Lantolf and colleagues (e.g., Frawley & Lantolf, 1984; Lantolf, 1994; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Dunn & Lantolf, 1998). From the perspective of L2 pragmatic development, it is noteworthy that SLA research under the interaction hypothesis has typically asked how interaction and the cognitive processes afforded through particular interactional arrangements contribute to learners' acquisition of *grammar*. In contrast, sociocognitive studies of SLA do not conceive of interaction as just a means for acquiring grammar. In analogy to the double function of language as means for communication and a tool for thinking, interaction is viewed as a tool for L2 learning and as a competency in its own right. Sociocognitive theory is therefore particularly suited to the study of pragmatic development. Central theoretical constructs that have been adopted to examine pragmatic development are the activity as the structuring force of L2 use and development, the Zone of Proximal Development, and Neo-Vygotskyan notions of differential types of participation and apprenticeship (e.g., Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1995).

Among the sociocognitive studies of L2 pragmatic learning, Shea (1994) is exceptional because he examined interactions between *advanced* nonnative speakers in a *second* language context *outside* the classroom. Shea (1994) analyzed authentic conversations between advanced Japanese ESL speakers and their North-American, native English speaking interlocutors along two dimensions, called 'perspective' and 'production'. 'Perspective' refers to the negotiated degree of intersubjectivity (i.e., the extent to which participants see eye-to-eye on a particular subject matter) , while 'production' refers to participant's 'interactional authority', their control over the floor and patterns of solicitation and uptake (p. 364). The two dimensions configure into four interactional patterns -

- incongruous perspective and asymmetric production
- incongruous perspective and symmetric production
- congruent perspective and asymmetric production
- congruent perspective and symmetric production.

On Shea's analysis, the four participation structures provide differential opportunity spaces for learners' development of conversational ability. Engaging Vygotsky's notion 'Zone of Proximal Development' and Rogoff's 'guided participation' (1990), Shea notes that 'the quality of conversational participation can be seen as a critical locus for the development of second language proficiency (even for advanced speakers) because the native speaker's response is a critical means of constructing the nonnative speaker's discourse' (p. 378). This observation has far-reaching implications for second language teaching and assessment. As will be discussed below, the interlocutor's role in shaping learners' discourse contributions affects the learning opportunities afforded by different instructional arrangements. The literature on oral language interviews documents that interviewer styles impact candidates' performance in these test formats (Young & He, 1998). In a similar vein, Swain (2000) argues that in small group testing, 'performance is not solo performance, but rests on a joint construction by the participating individuals' (p. 6).

Most sociocognitive work on, or including, the development of L2 pragmatics has concentrated on *classroom* interactions involving *beginning foreign* language learners. I want to focus on two important observations from this research.

The first observation relates to differentially configured pair or small group work. One popular concern among students and teachers is that in groups or pairs of students with unequal L2 proficiency, only the weaker student will benefit. Studies by Ohta provide evidence to the contrary. In her 1995 study, Ohta examined how JFL students at different proficiency levels used polite request strategies in Japanese in a roleplay activity. Both the stronger and the weaker learner brought their interactional skills to bear on the activity and shifted expert-novice roles during interaction. It was not the case that only the weaker learner profited from the activity at the cost of the stronger partner. Also, unlike in previous studies, there was no evidence of learners picking up each other's errors; rather they assisted each other in reaching more advanced levels of communicative ability**.** The peer interaction enabled target language use beyond each individual learners' current pragmatic ability.

Ohta's findings transcend those of Shea (1994) in an important sense. Shea's observation that native speaker interlocutors can open up of zones of proximal development for learners falls squarely into Vygotsky's definition of the ZPD, according to which assisted performance requires a *more* competent interactional partner. However, through collaborative, task structured effort, both participants can act as experts and novices in the same task. A parallel finding was reported by Donato (1994) in his study of collaborative planning by three learners of French as a foreign language, showing that the learners assisted each other through collective scaffolding. Ohta's and Donato's studies demonstrate that it does not take individual superior L2 competence to guide other learners' performance, but that through collaboration, learners can contribute building blocks to each other's individual knowledge. This revision of the requirements for assisted performance has obvious implications for second language learning theory and educational practice.

Sociocognitive analyses of peer interaction have contributed important insights into the opportunities for L2 learning afforded by learner-learner collaboration. In order to examine actual development of communicative ability, Brooks, Donato, and McGlone (1997) emphasize the need for longitudinal study. As they comment,

> It is only by viewing learner performance across multiple opportunities to engage in similar tasks and by attending to task-related talk that we even begin to capture the development of the learners' communicative confidence and competence. A developmental perspective on language learning is, therefore, critical to understanding the potential benefits of collaboration on task performance (p. 530).

The second major finding I want to point out is about the learning opportunities in the teacher-fronted Initiation-Response-Follow-up (IRF) structured classroom. The literature on pragmatic learning in the L2 classroom is unequivocal in its verdict: the IRF routine is an unproductive interactional format for the learning of pragmatics and discourse (Kasper, in press). For instance, Hall (1995) examined how topic development and management were interactively constructed in teacher-fronted speaking practice. She concluded that students were not provided opportunities for developing the complex interactional, linguistic and cognitive knowledge required in ordinary conversation. Likewise, Ohta (1995) found that teacher-fronted exchanges provided a narrower interaction potential for students' learning to perform requests in Japanese than collaborative peer activities. However, Hall's and Ohta's more recent studies suggest that the IRF's bad reputation may not be entirely justified. Hall (1998) examined more closely how the same teacher as in her 1995 study interacted with four students during IRF structured speaking practice. She identified qualitatively different patterns of teacher-student interaction. The teacher assigned different interactional status to the students: two students were accorded status as primary players, the other two as supporting staff. To the primary players, the teacher displayed more attention, treated their contributions as knowledgeable and relevant, and gave them more rights to participation. The supporting staff received less teacher attention, and their participatory rights were increasingly curtailed as the semester progressed. Hall suggests that the students' differential participation opportunities in the same teacher-fronted exchange structure may affect their development of interactional ability in Spanish. As she notes, 'it was not the IRF exchange *per se* that limited learning here. Rather, it was both the amount and qualitative nature of the opportunities for participation in the exchange that the teacher made available to each of the students' (p. 308). Quite similarly, Antón (1999) concludes from her study on teacher-learner interaction in first-year French and Italian classes: 'teachers, through dialogue, can lead learners to become highly involved in the negotiation of meaning, linguistic form, and rules for classroom behavior during classroom activities' (p. 314).

While Hall's (1998) and Antón's (1999) studies indicate that the specific implementation of the IRF pattern warrants closer investigation, Ohta (in press b) suggests that for evaluating the potential for L2 learning in the IRF, the learning target may be a decisive factor. An important feature of conversational ability in Japanese is to act as an active listener and orient to the current speaker's contribution by providing listener responses. In classroom discourse, a prime locus for a listener response is the third turn in the IRF exchange, the follow-up turn. While the follow-up turn may include an evaluation, such as *hai* 'yes' or *ii desu ne* 'good/well done', it can also contain a comprehension token such as *mm* or *un* 'uh-huh' or *aa soo desu ka* 'is that so', or an assessment token such as *omoshiroi desu ne::* 'how interesting'. The evaluative responses are typical of pedagogical discourse, but the comprehension signals and assessments are very common in conversation outside the classroom (Ohta, in press b, p. 241f). In Ohta's corpus, 97% of the follow-up turns in the IRF routine are taken by the teacher. Since listener responses typically occur in this discourse slot, the students are not provided much opportunity to use listener responses productively during IRF, but they are massively exposed to the teacher's listener responses as peripheral participants (Lave & Wenger, 1991). As Ohta demonstrates, it is in peer interaction that students have most occasion to produce listener responses, but their peripheral participation in the IRF routine, supported by the teachers' explicit guidance to use response tokens, enables students to gradually develop their productive use of assessments and alignments in peer activities.

Although the history and disciplinary origin of sociocognitive theory is quite different from that of language socialization, both perspectives emphasize the developmental roles of interaction and assisted performance in concrete sociohistorical contexts. Elements of sociocognitive theory have been incorporated into many studies of language socialization, to which I now turn.

Language socialization

Ochs (1996) defines language socialization as ‘the process whereby children and other novices are socialized through language, part of such socialization being a socialization to use language meaningfully, appropriately, and effectively’ (Ochs, 1996, p. 408). A language socialization approach is thus eminently capable of examining how L2 pragmatic ability is acquired. Blum-Kulka (1997) refers to the socialization of novices to use ‘rules regulating conversation, such as the choice of topics, rules of turn-taking, modes of storytelling, and rules of politeness’ (p. 12) as pragmatic socialization.

The first studies on language socialization in adult second or foreign language teaching focused on the teachers’ implicit or explicit socialization goals as evident in the teachers’ interaction with the students (Poole, 1992; Falsgraf & Majors, 1995) and teachers’ commentary in interviews (Lim, 1996). These studies demonstrate how the teachers’ interaction practices are informed by social and pragmatic norms of the target culture. The ESL teachers in Poole’s (1992) study transferred interactional preferences typical of child socialization by white middle class American caregivers to their interaction with adult ESL students: expert-novice convergence, crediting the novice with successful task completion, and downplay of the status differential between students and teacher. In a comparative language socialization study, Falsgraf and Majors (1995) examined teachers’ directives as indices of teacher-student status relationships. Teacher directives in JFL immersion classes and elementary school classes in Japan were significantly more direct than those in English medium classes. While the high directness style reflects the teachers’ authority and the status differential between teachers and students, it also characterizes the relationship between teachers and young students as close and informal. In Lim' s (1996) study of beginning JFL classes, teachers aimed to instill in students an appropriately status-congruent mode of interaction with the teacher, a sense of responsibility for the entire group, and displays of diligence and conformity as desirable classroom behaviors. Lim's findings show that socialization goals for adult L2 learners – even *foreign* language students rather than second language learners -, reflect cultural orientations and practices in the wider target society and caretakers' and teachers' socializing interaction with young children in Japan. One practice in Japanese interaction that has been identified in different socialization contexts is attentive listening. Clancy (1986) demonstrated how mothers teach children to display appropriate listening behavior. Fred Anderson (1995) and Haruko Cook (1999) analyzed how teacher-fronted elementary school discourse is structured so that children provide third turn metacomments to the previous students' response. Ohta has demonstrated in several studies (1994, 1999, in press a, b) how JFL students are socialized to display attentive listening through modeling by the teacher, peripheral and guided participation, direct instruction, and peer interaction. One standard classroom activity used by a JFL teacher in Lim's (1996) study is to prompt a student to ask another student a question (such as Tanaka-san, what did you do yesterday?). Later, the teacher would ask the class what Tanaka-san did yesterday. The class is expected to have listened to Tanaka-san's answer and remembered it verbatim.

As all socialization, much of pragmatic socialization is implicit, occurring through the novices' participation in recurrent communicative practices. Yet in some aspects of pragmatics, explicit socialization is strongly in evidence. Explicit pragmatic socialization reflects metapragmatic awareness of pragmatic practices that are salient and important to the party that invokes the pragmatic norm. DuFon (1999) reports that during the initial orientation to their homestay program, her adult learners of Indonesian were explicitly instructed to *pamit*, or ask for permission, every time before leaving their host family's house. As a metalinguistic activity type par excellence, second and foreign language teaching offers ample opportunity for explicit pragmatic socialization through metapragmatic comments. Ohta (in press b) reports how the JFL teachers in her study explicitly remind students of providing third turn responses during peer activities. Teachers would sometimes interrupt the pairwork, reminding students to 'ne o tsukatte kudasai kakunin' 'please use *ne* to confirm' (p. 251) and 'minasan itte kudasai yo aa soo desu ka' 'everyone please say 'oh really'?' (p. 252). In the Japanese immersion kindergarten investigated by Kanagy in a series of studies, the interactional routines *aisatsu* 'greeting', *shusseki* 'attendance', and *jiko-shookai* 'personal introduction' are metapragmatically announced by the teachers, as in

T: hai, asa no aisatsu o shimasu. rei
'ok, we will have our morning greeting. Bow'

T: hai, jaa shusseki o torimasu. (name)-san/kun
'ok, (I) will take attendance. (name)' (Kanagy, 1999, p. 1470)

T: ja:, namae o kiite
Ok, ask his name. (Kanagy, 1999, p. 1480)

But whether in the classroom or in out-of-classroom settings, most language socialization occurs implicitly, either through the learners' repeated participation in target discourse practices, or through participation *and* various strategies by which the more competent co-participant makes the pragmatic information salient to the learner. We have already seen that through the IRF routine, the JFL teachers in Ohta's (in press b) study provide a virtual input flood of listener responses to their students. In her JFL study, Lim (1996) observed how teachers socialize students to appropriate classroom demeanor. Students are expected to acknowledge the asymmetrical status relationship between themselves and the teacher through status-congruent verbal and nonverbal conduct and to comport themselves as members of the class community, not just as individual students. One strategy of fostering group–orientedness is the teachers' displays of intolerance to students' tardiness. Apart from direct reprimands, one teacher in Lim's study reacted to two students who walked in late as follows:

> (two students enter the classroom)
> Sensei: irasshaimase. Futari sama desu ka?
> Please come in. Will it be [a table for] for two?
> Ss: ((a few chuckle)) (Lim, 1996, p. 69)

The teacher adopts here the voice of a restaurant hostess, using the conventional greeting formula complete with honorific. Even though the irony was lost on the two latecomers, the chuckling by their classmates suggests that some did get the message. A different teacher reported the following method of discouraging tardiness. Latecomers are not allowed to take their seat before they have apologized in two ways: first, standing in front of the teacher and saying *osokunatte mooshiwake arimasen* ‘I am late and I have no excuse’ while bowing. Then, they have to make the round and apologize with a bow to each of their classmates individually. Meanwhile, the teacher continues the class, without making allowances to the tardy student or to the students who are being apologized to and therefore cannot attend to the main classroom business.

While the techniques by which these teachers socialize students to group-orientedness in the JFL classroom may be quite idiosyncratic, the socialization goal is widely accepted among JFL educators. For the teachers in Lim’s study, learning Japanese is more than learning ‘the language’; it includes learning culturally appropriate ways of interacting in Japanese. It may be worth noting that one of the teachers in Lim’s study who put particular emphasis on appropriate JFL classroom conduct was a North American nonnative speaker of Japanese. In order to function as L2 pragmatic socialization agents, teachers do not need to be natives of the target community. What is required is that teachers themselves have been sufficiently socialized to L2 pragmatic practices, that they can comfortably draw on those practices as part of their communicative and cultural repertoire, and that their metapragmatic awareness enables them to support students’ learning of L2 pragmatics effectively. As has been noted for second and foreign language education generally (e.g., Rampton, 1990), language teachers have to be experts in the target language rather than native speakers of it. Likewise, L2 language socialization, an integral aspect of L2 teaching, relies on teachers' cultural, pragmatic, and interactional expertise in L2 but is not conditional on native speaker status.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I will briefly consider how the four perspectives on pragmatic development relate to each other. Are they mutually exclusive or compatible? Since the relationship between pragmatic and grammatical development is an issue not a theory, the question does not apply. In her proposal for a research agenda on learners' acquisition of grammar and pragmatics, Bardovi-Harlig (1999a) leaves the question of appropriate theories open. One productive approach, exemplified in Salsbury and Bardovi-Harlig's recent studies (in press a, b), is to start with established theories or hypotheses on the development of a particular grammatical subsystem, such as the grammaticalization of modality, and investigate how grammaticalization of modal expressions relates to their use as illocutionary force indicators or modifiers. In a similar vein, theories of the acquisition of temporality (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig, 1999a) could guide studies examining how tense and aspect are acquired as grammatical categories and how the use of temporal expressions as pragmatic modifiers develops (e.g., the use of the past progressive as in *I was wondering if you could do me a favor*).

As mentioned above, language socialization studies frequently engage sociocognitive theory. Schiefflin and Ochs (1986) identified sociocognitive theory as one of the three approaches informing a socialization perspective (the other two being symbolic interactionism and phenomenology). In their original formulations, language socialization and sociocognitive theory pursue different epistemological goals: language socialization is interested in the integrated acquisition of culture and language, while sociocognitive theory explores the development of higher-order cognitive functions and the role of language in this process (Vygotsky, 1978). But the ontological stance assumed by both approaches is highly compatible. In sociocognitive and language socialization theory alike, the acquisition of language and culture and the development of cognition critically depend on social interaction in concrete sociohistorical contexts. Both emphasize the role of expert members to guide novices in their accomplishment of tasks that they would be unable to complete on their own. Both reject a view of cognition that considers knowledge and learning (predominantly or exclusively) as an individual's intrapsychological representations and processes, arguing instead that knowledge, including knowledge of language, is not only transmitted but created through concrete interaction and therefore properly viewed as interpsychologically distributed and constructed.

Consistent with their theoretical premises, sociocognitive and language socialization theory also have some methodological principles in common. As a psychology that defines its research object as 'individual-in-society-in-history' (Dunn & Lantolf, 1998, p. 427, citing Newman & Holzman, 1993, p. 85), sociocognitive theory resists isolating individuals from their concrete sociohistorical life circumstances in order to study 'uncontaminated' learning processes in the laboratory. Consequently, sociocognitive studies of L2 learning examine learners' interactions with experts and peers in authentic environments, often (but, as we have seen, not always, cf. Shea, 1994) in classroom contexts. Since communicative and interactional ability evolve over time and the opportunities that different activities and participation structures offer for their development can only be assessed through multiple observations, longitudinal research designs are the appropriate methodological choice (Brooks, Donato, McGlon,1997), as illustrated by the studies discussed earlier. Likewise, language socialization studies require longitudinal observation of expert-novice interactions in authentic settings. *Prolonged* observation in *authentic* settings are two methodological principles of ethnography (e.g., Watson-Gegeo, 1988, Davis, 1995). Furthermore, its focus on socialization through language use into the target culture aligns language socialization with ethnography's focus on cultural meanings and practices in authentic settings. Many language socialization studies therefore adopt an ethnographic approach (e.g., DuFon, 1999).

Since sociocognitive and language socialization perspectives converge on their close attention to interactional processes, electronic records and microanalysis of discourse are a further methodological requirement. Despite its antimentalist stance (Duranti, 1997), Conversation Analysis offers precisely the conceptual and analytical tools required to capture the intricate details of talk-in-interaction, as recently demonstrated for L2 classroom discourse by Markee (2000). Some of the studies discussed earlier (e.g., Ohta, in press b; Kanagy, 1999) illustrate how, by incorporating Conversation Analysis, the happy marriage of language socialization and sociocognitive theory can be extended to an even happier ménage à trois.

Unlike sociocognitive and language socialization theories, the two psychological approaches applied to pragmatic development, sociocognitive theory and information processing theory, are not compatible. In an enlightening recent discussion of Vygotsky’s notion zone of proximal development and Krashen’s *i + 1*, Dunn and Lantolf (1998) argue that not only the two notions are incommensurable, but so are their underlying theories. Tracing how current concepts of language and communication emerged in the history of ‘Western’ linguistics, Dunn and Lantolf emphasize the profound impact of Saussure’s (1916) project to establish a science of semiotics and specifically of linguistics, modeled on the natural sciences. In Saussure’s theory, this was achieved through two epistemological strategies: by separating the diachronic from the synchronic perspective of analysis, positing them as orthogonal dimensions, and privileging synchronic analysis as the primary perspective of linguistic study; and by separating language into three existential modes - the virtual and abstract language system (*langue*, ‘un systÈme òu tout se tient’), the human capacity to use language (*langage*), and the actual language use (*parole*). Of these, *langue* was elevated to the privileged object of scientific study. As Dunn an Lantolf (1998, p. 426) point out, a parallel development took place in psychology. In the interest of constituting a scientific psychology, Wundt (1897) designated the higher-order cognitive functions (intention, voluntary attention and memory, conscious planning, semiosis) as objects for study in anthropology, ethnology, and philology, reserving the elementary functions (sensation, involuntary attention, perception, and memory) as research objects for psychology, properly to be investigated in controlled laboratory studies. Wundt’s compartmentalization of human psychology was practiced throughout the period of behaviorism. Contemporary cognitive psychology comprises the study of elementary and higher cognitive functions; in fact, the connection between both in cognitive development and processing is a prime research issue. From this perspective, the extreme reductionism of Wundtian psychology has been reversed. It is also true that approaches in cognitive psychology that explore the interface between cognition and interaction are gaining ground. Collaborative theory (Wilkes-Gibbs, 1997), for instance, echoes the principles of mutually ascertaining and jointly constructing knowledge that were previously established in ethnomethodology. But under the information-processing model that dominates contemporary cognitive-psychological discourse, the division between the social and the psychological sphere remains watertight.

Even after the cursory characterization of sociocognitive theory sketched earlier, it is abundantly clear that the metaphor of human cognition as a limited capacity information processing device does not mesh with the individual-in-society-in-history that constitutes the object of investigation in sociocognitive theory. To Dunn and Lantolf’s (1998) detailed and persuasive argument that the two theories are incommensurable, I can perhaps add the footnote that the ontological, epistemological, and methodological incompatabilities between the two theories clearly locate them in different paradigms. According to the four paradigms distinguished by Guba and Lincoln (1998), information-processing theory falls squarely under the ‘neopositivist’ paradigm, whereas sociocognitive theory is compatible with both the ‘critical’ and the ‘constructivist’ paradigm. Whereas the critical and the constructivist paradigms share a number of overlapping or compatible features, they separate themselves from the neopositivist paradigm on most accounts.

As transpires from this discussion, studies of pragmatic development can be conducted under information processing or sociocognitive theory, but integrating the two does not seem a feasible proposition. Since sociocognitive theory is currently on the rise in SLA and has demonstrated strengths as an explanatory framework for pragmatic development, we may perhaps wonder whether information processing theories have a future in interlanguage pragmatics. My current view on the issue is that there is a continued need for information processing theory. In their focus on the 'higher' cognitive functions, sociocognitive studies of pragmatic development have not had much to say about attention, memory, representation, restructuring, transfer, and speech processing in comprehension and production. I cannot envision a comprehensive psychology of second language learning, including interlanguage pragmatics, that makes do without these constructs and research into their roles in L2 pragmatic development. In acquisitional pragmatics, microanalysis of cognitive processing is just as indispensable as microanalysis of interaction. At this point of interlanguage pragmatics research, sociocognitive and information processing approaches to pragmatic development do not only look to examine the same object of investigation from different perspectives but focus on different aspects of a complex research object.

References

Anderson, F. (1995). *Classroom discourse and language socialization in a Japanese elementary school setting: An ethnographic-linguistic study*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawai'i at MÅnoa.

Antón, M. (1999). The discourse of a learner-centered classroom: Sociocultural perspectives on teacher-learner interaction in the second-language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 83*, 303-318.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999a). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning, 49*, 677-713.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999b). From morpheme studies to temporal semantics: Tense-aspect research in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*, 341-382.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (in press). Empirical evidence of the need for instruction in pragmatics.

In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1991). Saying 'no' in English: Native and nonnative rejections. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, vol.2 (pp.41-57). Division of English as an International Language, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Beebe, L. & Takahashi, T. (1989a). Do you have a bag? Social status and patterned variation in second language acquisition. In S. M. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition: Discourse and pragmatics* (pp. 103-128). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Beebe, L. M., & Takahashi, T. (1989b). Sociolinguistic variation in face-threatening speech acts: Chastisement and disagreement. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage* (pp. 199-218). New York: Plenum.

Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representation and attentional control in pragmatic competence. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 43-59). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bialystok, E. (1994). Analysis and control in the development of second language proficiency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*, 157-168.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). *Dinner talk*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bodman, J., & Eisenstein, M. (1988). May God increase your bounty: The expression of gratitude in English by native and nonnative speakers. *Cross Currents, 151*, 1-21.

Brooks, F.B., Donato, R., & McGlone, J.V. (1997). When are they going to say "it" right? Understanding learner talk during pair-work activity. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*, 524-541.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2-27). London: Longman.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-47.

Clancy, P. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 213-250). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, H.M. (1999). Language socialization in Japanese elementary schools: Attentive listening and reaction turns. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 1443-1465.

Davis, K. A. (1995). Qualitative theory and methods in applied linguistics research. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 428-453.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J.P Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskyan approaches to second language research* (pp. 33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

DuFon, M. A. (1999). *The acquisition of linguistic politeness in Indonesian as a second language by sojourners in naturalistic interactions.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawai‘i at MÅnoa.

DuFon, M. A. (in press). The acquisition of negative responses to experience questions in Indonesian as a second language by sojourners in naturalistic interactions. In M. Anderson, C. A. Klee, F. A. Morris, E. Tarone, & B. Swierzbin (Eds.), *Interaction of social and cognitive factors in SLA: Selected proceedings of the 1999 Second Language Research Forum*. Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA.

Dunn, W.E., & Lantolf, J.P. (1998). Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development and Krashen’s *i + 1*: Incommensurable constructs; incommensurable theories. *Language Learning, 48*, 411-442.

Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. W. (1986). ‘I very appreciate’: Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 167-185.

Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. (1993). Expressing gratitude in American English. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Hg.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 64-81). New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 14*, 1-23.

Errington, J. (1988). *Structure and style in Javanese: A semiotic view of linguistic etiquette.* Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.

Falsgraf, C., & Majors, D. (1995). Implicit culture in Japanese immersion classroom discourse. *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese, 29, no. 2*, 1-21.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal, 81*, 285-300.

Frawley, W., & Lantolf, J. (1984). Speaking and self-order: a critique of orthodox SLA research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6*, 143-159.

Fukuya, Y., & Clark, M. (in press). Input enhancement of mitigators. In L. Bouton (Ed.), P*ragmatics and Language Learning Monograph Series*, vol. 10. Division of English as an International Language, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Fukuya, Y., Reeve, M., Gisi, J., & Christianson, M. (1998). Dose focus on form work for sociopragmatics? Paper presented at the 12th Annual International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1998). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research* (pp. 195-220). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Gumperz, J.. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. (1992). Contextualization and understanding. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context* (pp. 229-252). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, J.K. (1995). "Aw, man, where you goin?": Classroom interaction and the development of L2 interactional competence. *Issues in Applied linguistics, 6*, 37-62.

Hall, J.K. (1998). Differential teacher attention to student utterances: The construction of different opportunities for learning in the IRF. *Linguistics and Education, 9*, 287-311.

Harley, B., Allen, P., Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (1990). *The development of second language proficiency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hassall, T.J. (1997). *Requests by Australian learners of Indonesian.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Australian National University.

Hill, T. (1997). *The development of pragmatic competence in an EFL context*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University Japan.

House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18, 225-252.*

House, J. and Kasper, G. (1981). Zur Rolle der Kognition in Kommunikationskursen. *Die Neueren Sprachen, 80,* 42-55.

Kanagy, R. (1999). Interactional routines as a mechanism for L2 acquisition and socialization in an immersion context. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 1467-1492.

Kanagy, R. (Ed.). (1999). *Language socialization and affect in first and second language acquisition. Special Issue, Journal of Pragmatics,* 31:11.

Kanagy, R., & Igarashi, K. (1997). Acquisition of pragmatics competence in a Japanese immersion kindergarten. In L. Bouton (ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, Vol. 8 (pp. 243-265). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Kärkkäinen, E. (1992). Modality as a strategy in interaction: epistemic modality in the language of native and non-native speakers of English. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, vol.3 (pp. 197-216). Division of English as an International Language, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Kasper, G. (1981). *Pragmatische Aspekte in der Interimsprache* [Pragmatic aspects in interlanguage]. Tübingen: Narr.

Kasper, G. (in press). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G. & Rose, K.R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 19*, 81-104.

Kasper, G. & Rose, K.R. (forthcoming). *Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18*, 149-169.

Koike, D. A. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts in interlanguage. *Modern Language Journal*, *73*, 79-89.

Kubota, M. (1995). Teachability of conversational implicature to Japanese EFL learners. *IRLT Bulletin, 9*. Tokyo: The Institute for Research in Language Teaching, 35-67.

Lantolf, J.P. (1994). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 418-420.

Lantolf, J.P., & Appel, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Vygotskyan approaches to second language research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M.H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition.* London: Longman.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Levelt, W. (1989), *Speaking*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lim, D.S.J. (1996). *Cross-cultural instruction and classroom discourse: A study of the foreign language classroom culture*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures, University of Hawaiʻi at MÅnoa.

Long, M.H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition.
In W.C. Ritchie and T.K. Bhatia (eds.) *Handbook of second language acquisition.* San Diego: Academic Press. 413-468.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (in press). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, *50(3)*.

Newman, F., & Holzman, L. (1993). *Lev Vygotsky: Revolutionary scientist.* London: Routledge.

Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J.J. Gumperz & S.L. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 407-437). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A.S. (1994). Socializing the expression of affect: An overview of affective particle use in the Japanese as a foreign language classroom. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 5*, 303-326.

Ohta, A.S. (1995). Applying sociocultural theory to an analysis of learner discourse: Learner-learner collaborative interaction in the zone of proximal development. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *6*, 93-121.

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. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style in adult learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*, 1493-1512.

Ohta, A.S. (in press a). From acknowledgment to alignment: A longitudinal study of the development of expression of alignment by classroom learners of Japanese. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A.S. (in press b). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pearson, L. (1998). Spanish L2 pragmatics: The effects of metapragmatic discussion. Paper presented at Second Language Research Forum, University of Hawai‘i at MÅnoa.

Peirce, B. N. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*, 9-31.

Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning*, *42*, 593-616.

Rampton, M.B.H. (1990). Displacing the ‘native speaker’: expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, *44*, 97-101.

Robinson, M. A. (1992). Introspective methodology in interlanguage pragmatics research. In G. Kasper (ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as native and target language* (Tech. Rep. No. 3, pp. 27-82. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai‘i at MÅnoa, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rose, K.R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *22*, 27-67.

Rose, K.R., & Ng, C. (in press). Inductive and deductive approaches to the teaching of compliments and compliment responses. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Salsbury, T., & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (in press a). “I know your mean, but I don’t think so:” Disagreements in L2 English. In L. F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 10). University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International Language.

Salsbury, T., & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (in press b). Oppositional talk and the acquisition of modality in L2 English. In M. Anderson, C. Klee, F. Morris, B. Swierzbin, & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Selected proceedings from SLRF '99*. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.

Saussure, F. de (1916/1959). *Course in general linguistics*. New York: Philosophical Library (C. Bally & A. Sechehaye, eds., W. Baskin, transl. Original 1916).

Sawyer, M. (1992). The development of pragmatics in Japanese as a second language: The particle *ne*. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as a native and target language* (pp. 83-125). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i.

Scarcella, R. (1979). On speaking politely in a second language. In C. A. Yorio, K. Peters, & J. Schachter (Eds.), *ON TESOL '79 - The learner in focus* (pp. 275-287). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Schmidt, R. (1983). Interaction, acculturation and the acquisition of communicative competence. In N. Wolfson and E. Judd (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 137-174. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

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.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning (pp. 1-63. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Schmidt, R. (in press). The centrality of attention in SLA. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S.N. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schumann, J.H. (1978). *The pidginization process: A model for second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics, 17*, 356-382.

Shea, D. P. (1994). Perspective and production: Structuring conversational participation across cultural borders. *Pragmatics, 4*, 357-389.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2000). Examining dialogue: Another approach to content specification and to validating inferences drawn from test scores. Plenary presented at the Language Testing Research Colloquium, Vancouver, March.

Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 189-223.

Takahashi, S. (in press). The role of input enhancement in developing interlanguage pragmatic competence. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. M. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal, 8*, 131-155.

Tateyama, Y. (in press). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines: Japanese *sumimasen.* In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tateyama, Y., Kasper, G., Mui, L., Tay, H.-M., & Thananart, O. (1997). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines. In L. Bouton (ed.),*Pragmatics and language learning*, Vol. 8 (pp. 163-177. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walters, J. (1980). Grammar, meaning, and sociological appropriateness in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology - Revue Canadienne de Psychologie, 34,* 337-345.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (1988). Ethnography and ESL: Defining the essentials. *TESOL Quarterly, 22*, 575-592.

Wundt, W. M. (1897/1969). *Outlines of psychology*. St. Clair Shores, MI: Scholarly Press. (C.H. Judd, transl., original 1897).

Yoshimi, D.R. (in press). The instruction of discourse markers in an intermediate Japanese foreign language classroom. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Young, R., & He, A. W. (1998). *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.