

Perception of Pragmalinguistic Knowledge in Primary Spanish Teacher Training Students of English as a Foreign Language

Antonio Garcés Rodríguez

CMI College for Education, Granada University, Spain

Corresponding author:

Antonio Garcés Rodríguez

✉ agarcesrod@correo.ugr.es

Professor of EFL, CMI College for Education, Granada University, Spain.

Tel: 34958243000

Citation: Rodríguez AG. Perception of Pragmalinguistic Knowledge in Primary Spanish Teacher Training Students of English as a Foreign Language. *Int J Appl Sci Res Rev.* 2017, 4:2.

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to present the results of a research study on a small scale in the pragmalinguistic knowledge of a group of university students who attend the Degree in Elementary Education with respect to the English language. The research focused on two speech acts; request and permission. The study employs Discourse Completion Task Tests (DCTs), guided and free role play activities and systematic observation. The models of the target language expected and DCTs were evaluated by a group of teachers with extensive experience in teaching languages to confirm validation. The different patterns of speech act performances in Spanish and in English are analyzed, contrasted and discussed. It reflects on the potential to introduce basic elements of pragmalinguistics as a conceptual learning matter for non-native English speakers.

Keywords: Pragmalinguistics; Sociopragmatics; Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs); Systemic observation

Received: June 29, 2017; **Accepted:** July 24, 2017; **Published:** July 31, 2017

Introduction

English teachers of the primary and secondary schools in Spain, even under the umbrella of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), in the process of teaching and learning English As A Foreign Language (EFL) have continued to focus on elements directly related to aspects of grammatical or lexical character, of course, but contextualized in communicative environments more or less close to the interests of students. However, the mere fact of contextualizing the lexical or grammatical element has been shown to be insufficient to produce in our students a change regarding the structuring of discourse according to the cultural and social patterns of EFL. As a consequence, students continue up to today: distorting, misinterpreting and misusing certain socio-cultural elements that are part of the target language in EFLE and replacing them with elements of their mother tongue in Spanish (hereafter L1). We refer here to the pragmatic components of a language. Such dislocations may reflect both lack of accuracy or direct translation of the linguistic structures in use to perform a concrete communicative function, in our study: Interrupting a prior speech act; asking for and requesting permission, or may reflect lack of skill in using the norms and social elements that are an essential part of the FL culture. According to Thomas, the first type of misunderstanding is called pragmalinguistic insufficiency, while the latter is called socio-pragmatic failure [1].

There is an extensive literature about the different necessary conditions of adaptability that an apprentice of a FL should face; Berns focuses on the compensation by the non-native in LE of the lack of sociolinguistic and discursive knowledge, with the use of communicative strategies; Brown cites it as "the stylistic adaptability" of an adult LE student, in the same sense we can find references in Scarcella and Oxford.

Being a communicatively intelligible speaker in a FL, in our study, does not only suppose an adequate use from the metalinguistic plane of the appropriate linguistic exponents, neither a mere strategic or discursive adaptation of a social and cultural context, but a true act of pragmalinguistic usage of the different pragmatic and sociopragmatic elements, from now on (SPL) that makes the speech act a communicative success. Pragmalinguistics is deeply rooted in the culture and communication of a FL because the culture on which a language depends not only dictates how, when and with whom it is spoken but helps native speakers to decode and encode messages and their meanings in the locative, elocution an perlocative plane [2,3].

The fact that there are differences between languages in relation to sociocultural norms and linguistic components and elements used to express a specific function in language may lead to certain verbal responses and wrong attitudes (SPL) in students of one language LE, that produce in the native receptor of the

message a rejection, to consider it in certain situational contexts a lack of respect or education, as it is the case that occupies us, where we are in an academic environment and a student-teacher relationship. In short, there is a failure in the use of communicative competence [4-10]. We must therefore accept a reformulation of the initial notion of communicative competence [11-14] following the line of more contemporary authors and with a pragmatic linguistic vision in the conception of competences that groups the communicative action [15,16] and above all interesting seems to us Bachman [17].

In a more general, but very successful way from the point of view of combining educational policies in the teaching of a FL in Europe, the Common European Framework for Languages (CEFR) in its chapter five lists the pragmatic competence as one of the three ones, along with linguistic and sociolinguistic sub competences encompassing communicative competence to teach and acquire a FL. This change of perspective from the traditional Canale and Swain [13] research has had a positive impact on a return to the inclusion of SPL exponents in teaching methodologies of FLs. In other words, the teaching of a language, mostly at an early age, for the intuitive and acquisition of the process, does not consist in a mere presentation of linguistic elements but in a whole cultural and social experience with the FL that initiates students in the importance of expressing, gestualizing and organizing SPL elements through the creation of an effective oral discourse in different contexts that in real or simulated contexts the FL classroom may offer.

The research in our study focuses on three main objectives: Review of the literature on speech acts of addressing and requesting and asking for permission from an SPL view; Secondly, the pragmalinguistic features within the use of linguistic exponents of a general speech act of interruption, and permission in a formal academic context. Finally, we discuss and reflect on future prospective researches on the need to establish SPL threshold levels appropriate to the language levels designed in CEFR; Materials and resources in teaching the SPL and strategies that should be renewed in the teaching of the FL with Spanish students. It is not the object of this study to establish whether what we know as English as an International Language (EIL) should involve in its teaching and learning process a SPL and sociocultural support or simply a learning of communicative functions that allows the exchange of information to people of different linguistic environments, but to bring to light the enormous gap between native speakers usage of the pragmatic elements in a basic act of speech in the academic context and Spanish users of EFL when applying linguistic elements in the same act of communication and to discuss and reflect how this might contribute negatively in their further studies abroad in English native speaking institutions or in their process of teaching EFL if they become to be teachers in their future careers.

In the first part, we refer to a basic corpus on the literature regarding the theory of courtesy. Then, in the methodological part, we present a DCT design for obtaining qualitative and quantifiable data for our research and results, we finally present conclusions and reflections of the data obtained as well as a series of issues of open discussion for future research.

Background

Theory of courtesy

Globalization and the internationalization of certain languages such as English has constituted in the last decade a determinant element so that the education policies at world-wide level became aware of the basic necessity that the learning of a foreign language should enable their students to communicate efficiently and successfully in different labor or academic international contexts. English has become a lingua franca [18,19]. However, the internationalization of the English language has not included in its teaching and learning process a whole set of discursive expressions and designs along with sociocultural attitudes that make this language regulated by SPL rules associated with its Cultural and social development.

In the pragmatic field, there are different theories about verbal courtesy in English. In general, all of them agree to identify it as a phenomenon that manifests itself linguistically and in an attitudinal way in the process of communicative sender-receiver interaction. The SPL phenomenon is affected by factors such as: the social difference between interlocutors; the context in which the communicative act is performed; the position role of head that the receiver has over the issuer and the degree of affection that the public image of the listener could suffer. Elements all and their influence on verbal courtesy are culturally and socially dependent. Although, supposedly universal in their existence their manifestation and degree grade depend on parameters established by each language and community of speakers. The SPL as a phenomenon has a social interactional purpose and a psycho-linguistic base, which are modified according to the socio-cultural and linguistic changes that may affect a language. If do we enter into the detail of its nature, however, we find different perspectives that identify it. Watts et al. in their works distinguish between two levels of realization of the act of polite speech: the first of them related to the different ways in which courtesy and its use is represented and accepted, according to different socio-cultural environments [20]. The object of our work, the second of those, deals with a concrete construction and linguistic use, based on the theory of the politeness that manifests itself in an SPL mode and origins in the metalinguistic and cultural development of the language itself.

The use of forms of courtesy following the classification of Brown and Levinson, honorific, positive or negative, direct or indirect in their strategy formulation has gone through different journeys, as Jucker and Leech assure in their different studies [21-23]. This group of authors mainly focus their theory of courtesy on the condition that receives the public image (face) of the individual as a social being: that is, positive within the framework of social acceptance that has the image of the listener and negative in terms of the freedom of each person to exercise its action of acceptance or denial of the proposal enunciated in the communicative act (in the former study: "asking for permission").

The strategies are conceived as manifestations of the message emitter of the conciliatory, attenuating or aggravating message to the positive or negative image of its interlocutor and may be direct; indirect; conventional or not. It is important, however,

despite the criticisms of later writers Meier, the Brown and Levinson classification for three reasons in this study. First, when dealing with the first classification to group the typologies of courtesy from the experience of the recipient of the message; if you feel empathy and respected by the issuer (positive courtesy) or if a non-empathetic act is established with it, not imposing on the freedom of the one to accept or not. Secondly, because within his courtesy theory he mentions non-taxing courtesy, which will later be reformulated by Jucker and is a substantial part of interpreting the experimental data in this study. Thirdly, as recognized by Santana, his study focuses on the norms and rules of the Anglo-Saxon world [24-27].

From Jucker and Taavitsainen [21], we take his characterization of courtesy types "discernment" and "deference." In the first case, generally, the honorific uses of language, which do not seek to attenuate the meaning of a communicative act (for example, asking something) but to adapt wisely and judiciously to an existing social convention? In the second, the speaker generally uses strategies that attempt to attenuate, mitigate or aggravate the enunciation of the speech act. The issuer, within that "deference," will use a more direct or indirect strategy to formulate the speech act and address the listener depending on his/her position role with respect to the factors described at the beginning of this section. We take for granted for this analysis, following on from what Jucker suggested, his theory of Non-Imposition Politeness (NIP) in the use of contemporary English. NIP is characterized by pragmatic strategies within the SPL knowledge realized in a hidden way (off record) within an apparent textual invisibility, in a sort of inferential or illocutionary way, not explicit yet persuasive. In other words, periphrastic utterances, within indirect SPL strategies, that seek to mitigate the potential threat to the freedom of action of the listener who receives the speech act. Wierzbicka calls them "whimperatives" and we can find many examples in the use of "should"-should as advice-replacing "have to"-having that as an obligation; The uses of "might" and "could"-could-update and everyday use of "shall" to offer, promise or suggest, inclusion of "maybe", "might be" to keep some distance with the statement. Contemporary English both British and American constantly seek to adapt to the new times re-incorporating into the daily language non-authoritarian, democratic and egalitarian formulas [28-38].

The act of request and permission

In Achiba [39], based on the classification of Blum-Hulha et al. establishes an important difference between different expressive-linguistic realizations of "request" depending on the objective pursued in the request, familiarity or social distance with the receiver, the age, sex and role that play emitter and receiver in their relationship, and the channel of communication. In our study we observed these characteristics as valid, presenting special attention to: oral communication medium and teacher-student formal relationship. It is important to distinguish between directive formulas and request and permission formulas with the use of "please" when we speak of expressions and SPL actions. In the same line, we find Stubbs that characterizes the use of the "please" with those acts of request and permission speeches. We should not find them in other options such as suggestions,

invitations, offers, promises or other acts of speech in formal context.

The act of request and permission: Organization of the speech event: The basic elements in an act of request and asking for permission are: receiver; issuer and the request. To these three, we should add according to the context (formal or informal) the honorific pronominal referent of the receiver, listener or both interlocutors-Mr. Sir, Dr. Professor, student-, the alerters, mitigators and supporting reasons. According to the classification established by Blum-Hulha et al. we may establish:

- To the listener: "Could you (X)" The listener's action is emphasized and the receiver's freedom of action to accede or not to the request is formulated.
- To the speaker: "Can I (x)" Emphasizes the role of the speaker and his desire and the importance of the request for himself.
- Inclusive (not applicable in this study): "Could we both get to an agreement?"
- Impersonal (not applicable): "It might be better to (x)".

Strategies, depending on whether they are direct or indirect, in use to attenuate or increase the imposition of the request:

- Directives (not appropriate in this study): "I would like to get into the class". Use of imperatives or mitigating formulas such as "shall" or "would", but in affirmative syntactic structure.
- Conventional indirect: The pre-condition of the context and adaptation to the conventional use of the FL of the SPL form "May I get into the class?"
- Non-conventional indirect: Hidden, not explicit but very persuasive for the listener. "It's just 2 min late, do you think I (x)?"

Methods and Procedures

The DCT questionnaire

The research aims to carry out a study of the SPL use of university students who are going to be teachers of English as a foreign language in the compulsory elementary education grade in Spain. It is addressed to:

- Record students' SPL performance in the context of interrupting a class for being late.
- Record their SPL responses in the communicative request function with the aim of asking for permission.
- Analyze the most frequent variable from a SPL view, in the construction of the speech act of interruption and permission request.

We will use the structure of Blum-Kulka et al. on the use of the request and permission formula, to establish a SPL model of contrast with the answers taken from the DCT passed to students. We review the SPL relations from a typology of requests, following

the reading of Achiba. It is in this type that we find the expressive formula more indirect and of negative politeness (Table 1).

An aspect to be considered in the presentation of a language from a socio-pragmatic perspective is related to the organization of discourse, here in after Target Discourse (TD) and the rules of interaction that a speaker should follow in order to take part in an appropriate way according to verbal interaction. The speech act of the TD for interruption, permission request and closure is established from the literature reviewed and the model of Blum-Kulka et al., adapted to the communicative situation described in this study. The model has been validated by a sample of English teachers as a Foreign Language at university and school grades. The TD was passed to a group of English native speakers (four of them spoke BE and three of them AE) who mostly accepted the discursive structure suggested, as one of the most general in use from their speakers reality. The TD validators were only asked to analyze the sequence of the student-issuer, but not the teacher-receiver one.

Participants

The research project involved 76 students from two classes. All of them were enrolled in a training teacher course to become English teachers in an elementary school in Spain. The material included questionnaire DCT and direct and systematic observation of the realizations of the speech act under study.

Design and procedure

The student's tardy reaction can be directive in the form of an affirmation; "I'm late. I can enter," or opt for a request: "I can enter please, I'm late." In both situations the same meaning and communicative intention converge, but it is in the second that a real act of petition and permission is established, Brown and Levinson. There are other markers that classify communicative action as "request," as indicated by two important elements; the formulation of the question as a request and the use of "please" as a reliever of the permit question, White.

Table 1 SPL model of contrasts.

Users	Act of Speech SPL	Type of element SPL	Answers
S (Speaker)	Excuse me! (Sir, teacher, professor)* optional	Alerters	Good morning; (I`m) sorry (In these cases used as "alerters", with great loss of semantic and grammatical meaning) The honorific pronominal to address the teacher, was subject to "optional" by the validators, understanding that it was a routine class and not a conference with an unknown speaker
H (Hearer)	Oh, yes	-	-
S	(Ouh, well) I `m afraid I`m (a bit) late	Mitigator	(I`m) sorry ; I apologize
S	because I (x) (missed the bus)	Supportive move	
H	I see		Well; that`s ok; right
S	Can I come in (into the class) please?	HA	May I; Could I wonder if you (x)... Could you (x) Would you
H	Sure		Let in; come in (x)
S	thanks	Closing	Cheers (x)

Design and procedure

Participants were instructed to write down a description as complete as possible on their behaviors, acts and sayings when they arrived late to one of the university classes early in the morning. They were given different options of subjects including EFL. What was made known to them was that we were interested in getting to know how they would interact in that situation. No names of professors were given but just general titles of courses and lessons. The following context of situation was given on written to students so they could read calmly:

There is a fixed and public schedule for a lesson at the university. You are late—you may have or not a reason. The door is closed but you have a look to your watch and it is just 10 min late. The lesson lasts for 2 h. You wish to get into. You have been up early for this lesson. Explain using your own words: what would you do? What would you say? (if you consider necessary) What would be your body language?-You may add or delete any comment you may consider.

Participants were additionally asked to offer further descriptions to characterize the student-sender/professor-receiver in this situation.

Results

The quantitative and qualitative analysis

Analysis 1: Interruption (formal); Absence (A): The student directly produces the request question HA (Head Act); HR accuracy (HRA): The student makes a concrete use of the conventional "excuse" model-Excuse me-; Target forms: The student uses another form of non-honorable apology but mitigation for being late. That is, the apology is actually mitigating the HA "asking permission" (Table 2).

In Table 2, 76 responses only 15% fit the SPL model to disrupt a class as a conventional, honorable expression of opening its word shift with an honorary "excuse me," unintentionally as mitigating an apology. In the study, we have considered, however, acceptable any other type of formal alert; Is the case of good morning,

Table 2 Quantitative and qualitative analysis of SPL model.

SPL interrupting models	User frequencies	Percentages
Excuse me	12	15,7894737
I'm sorry	4	5,26315789
Sorry	18	23,6842105
Good morning	8	10,5263158
Hello	22	28,9473684
Hi	3	3,94736842
Absence	9	11,8421053
Total	76	100
Total: suitable to form	42	55,2631579
Total: not suitable to form	34	44,7368421
HR concretion	12	15,7894737

forgive (sorry), excuse (I'm sorry), which would imply a total of 55% of the sample. However, the subsequent analysis shows how students do not formulate SPL elements as a basic element of the interruption, but as mitigators or greetings. In the subsequent record of the structure of the full speech act, students do not act SPL according to the needs that would demand the use of LE in this context. Means and standard deviation of the proper use of "alerters" or "switches" appropriate for the communicative function (Table 3).

Analysis 2: Petition for permission; Frequency of users and percentages of grammatically correct forms and use of SPL indicators for permission request (Table 4). In Table 5, we recorded the different responses in number of answers grouped to the form of HA used by the students. Whether or not you use a permissible SPL marker as "please" and the values in use of HAD mitigation and supporting reason for the request (Table 6).

Table 4 shows how in global terms of the sample taken, students use linguistic expression appropriately to convey the suggested communicative function. In contrast to Table 5, it is observed that the adequate grammatical use of HA does not lead to an adequate use or inclusion of SPL elements (there is a value of 54-72 where the student's response does not include any SPL element).

Averages and standard deviation of the pragmatic use of the request and permission HA + "please" (Table 7).

The data presented in Table 7 are significant because they emphasize that although the use of HA is mostly adequate and students use the modal "can; could; may" and the question form, they mostly exclude the "please" marker to emphasize that it is a permission request that they perform and not a directive function (which would entail absence of the mitigator "please").

Frequency in use and percentages of mitigators and SPL elements supporting the petition and permit.

In Table 8, it is observed in numbers of users like the most characteristic in the formulation of the request and permission is not to include any element SPL, except the use of the question of HA.

Analysis 3: Frequency rate and percentages of oral speech discursive structures with permission target. The data have been grouped according to the structures of the full speech act

Table 3 Means and standard deviation for communicative function.

Media	10,8571429
Rank	19
Variance	42,4081633
Deviation	6,51215504

Table 4 Frequency and percentages: concrete models of target language.

HA	Request+please	Mitigator	Supportive move
Can I+verb	43	A 62	I'm sorry 4
Afirmative+?	16	Please 14	because I+reason 4
Could I+verb	7		Sorry 18
May I+verb	2		A 54
Lack of grammar accuracy	8		A 72

Table 5 Responses in number of answers grouped to form of HA.

Interruptor/alertar	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mitigador	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Supportive move	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
HA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Closing	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Total	20	2	14	4	28	6	4
Percentage	27,02	2,70	18,9	5,40	37,83	8,10	5,40

Table 6 Permissible SPL marker.

HA	Media
Can/Could/May I verb	68,421052
Afirmative+?/Lack of GA	31,578947

Table 7 Averages and standard deviation of the pragmatic use of the request and permission.

HA	Petición+"please"	Media	Variance	Deviation
52	14	33	361	19

Table 8 Observation in the number of users.

	Use	Lack of use	Percentage
Mitigador	22	54	28,9473684
Movement/Sustaining reason	4	72	5,26315789
Closing of the HA	9	67	11,8421053

performed. There was no speech act structure similar to the model established in the theoretical framework of this study. Of the analyzed ones, those that are closest to the SPL type model use an "apology," such as mitigation of the request or "excuse" as a switch. No data was collected in the sample where the students noticed the difference between them or used a conventional mitigation model such as "I'm afraid"-I'm afraid, I'm sorry-or any other.

Discussion

Courtesy has a prominent and non-marginal position compared to Spanish in the structure of speech in English, as has been seen

in the review of the literature for the present study. Within the courtesy, there are important elements that are part of the SPL that have to be executed so that a speech act is complete from the vision of contemporary communicative competence. The analyzed sample, although it reflects a most adequate use in the linguistic formulation of the communicative expression of petition and permission, suffers from a lack of use of SPL fundamental elements for the creation of a real communicative act and close to the native speaker. Sampling to a university student population reveals a truth that we will call relative by the size of the sample but that any English language teacher as a foreign language usually finds in their classes; The inappropriateness from a pragmatic view of the use of linguistic expression HA by the young university students who, although they have attended LE classes within the communicative approach-in Spain since LOGSE-was granted a small presence and importance To the SPL elements and the SPL attitude in the English classes and in the textbooks of the time. The results, likewise, show the ignorance that our university students have of the differences between the different SPL elements in use in a speech act, using at best an honorific pronominal like "sir", or a switch or Alert as "excuse me", or a mitigator as "sorry"; However, by systematic observations and personal interviews after the completion of the DCT to a number of students; They were unable to distinguish, if they intended to apologize, to interrupt an act of speaking and to take the floor, to get the attention of the teacher, or as it was mostly his answer "a little of everything."

We are therefore convinced that the cultural and social aspects, which are largely represented by SPL elements, are not only necessary but indispensable to the future speaker of a FL. It is not an easy task for a FL learner to speak English as a foreign language, more so for a young student at an early age who is experimenting with his/her mother tongue in L1, to understand the rules of courtesy and their relation to the linguistic expression of An act of speech, so that the realization of it reaches its full meaning. There are formulas, for example the use of the imperative in the petition "give me a beer", or "pass me the command" in that sense that they are perfectly acceptable in Spanish, but are considered "offensive" in English for an English-speaking person and both the communication process is unsuccessful. This lapse is of relevant importance, especially when there is a limited lexicon and has an initial or pre-intermediate level, since the SPL failure can lead to difficult disagreements; probably the disinterest of the native speaker in continuing the communicative interaction. The SPL lapses is understood by the native speaker as an incongruity, abruptness, bad manners and ultimately a lack of courtesy; And therefore, although unconscious of the error and even incapable of identifying it as such, as if it did with a mistake of pronunciation or grammatical, will be interpreted, by the native speaker in a real communicative situation, as a serious error of adequacy, which will lead to The breakdown of communication [40-45].

Conclusions, Limitations, and Suggestions for Future Research

We would speak of a TD subject to a principle of non-negative negative polite indirect style. The most interesting that we can

highlight of this TD, in what concerns the distribution of certain linguistic forms that is the exchange of expressions that is part of the ritual of opening and interruption. To get an idea of the importance of the discursive order in the use of the language, we only need to think about the discourtesy that would be in L2 if, as an opening element, we started with the HA, or if after using the alert or calling the Attention of the receiver to interrupt its class, immediately the speaker expresses the HD, without waiting for the receiver to give the speech, or by intonation or expressive linguistic use as "swha vowel + well ... yes (X).

Prospective research

Although from the review of the literature for the basis of this experimental analysis, there are studies considered classic in the conception and analysis of the SPL theory as is the courtesy theory of Brown and Levinson [3] and that the petition-specific communicative function has been studied in contrast to different languages in Blum-Kulka et al. However, there are few studies aimed first to distinguish as the communicative function of petition, it is done in different ways depending on its purpose; permission; Obtaining a good; Information, etc. Second, the analysis of communicative realizations from the SPL in communities of Spanish students who will be future teachers is scarce. In the last place, there are not many experiences of instruction to the students of an L2 in the SPL principles that govern any act of speaking, fundamentally conversational, as a conscious and programmed act of teaching and learning.

There are, however, studies and literature on the subject which considers that English as an International Language (EIL) will relegate the SPL components of native English BA to a marginal plane; AE as the percentage of non-native speakers exceeds in large numbers the natives of that language with the consequent acceptance and modification of SPL uses from the different languages of origin of the different speakers [46]. It was not the object of this study to establish whether what we know as English as an International Language (EIL) must involve in its teaching and learning process an SPL and sociocultural support of native English in its different varieties or simply a learning of linguistic expressions that allows The exchange of information to people from different linguistic backgrounds. In our view, further research is needed; The English language as we have described in the brief historical course of the theory of politeness has always boasted of a great power of adaptation and integration in the changes. In a personal way, our answer would be clear; there is no possibility of existence of a language without its cultural and social component. The SPL elements and attitudes are an essential part of this historical socio-cultural component and therefore to give up that would make it a dead language, with no possibility of evolution and therefore adaptation to tomorrow.

We understand, however, that it is necessary to advance SPL studies with the most important communicative functions to be performed at the different threshold levels marked by CEFER, in order to arrive at consensus levels in a referential approach that allows to be adapted to different European languages in such a way that it is incorporated in the curricula of teaching of an L2 from early ages, in the different countries of the European Union (EU). Until that happens, my anecdote recurred in the training

classes of specialist teachers of English in the teaching centers, when I remember them as a friend who visited me, he faced a beer in an English pub, a small town Near Oxford where I used to live. After many unsuccessful attempts to take a pint, I left the bar down and wondered what I had said incorrectly or how I had formulated syntactically and morphologically the question not to be understood. Some pints later, after checking several examples "live", understood that the problem lay not in the non-intelligible textual message, but in the incorrect use of pragmalinguistic formulas and an unfortunate use of sociopragmatic elements. Most disturbing of all, is that being unconscious of where error and reason occurred, it was impossible to solve it and therefore the act of communication was permanently failed. Getting students and teachers of English as a foreign language aware of the importance of implicit or explicit instruction of SPL elements and attitudes is a first step, so that the materials and resources available for language teaching consider the issue SPL as an essential element of its contents, just as it once happened with the knowledge and valuation of L2 culture and literature [47-55].

The university institutions through the Master's Degrees of Secondary teacher training or Master's degree studies, as well as the national and European educational administration and teachers of an L2 currently in exercise, should as well have become aware of the levels Linguistic and communicative thresholds to which CEFR refers, to become aware sooner than later of the SPL elements of a language, with their corresponding learning standards and objective and proper evaluation criteria,

in order to facilitate the complete development Of the pragmatic and therefore communicative competence of the learner of the foreign language.

Verbal courtesy should be considered, not as a mere behavior or content, which would require a simple explicit instruction, but as a pragmatic strategy of SPL knowledge. Perhaps it would be convenient to advance from the theoretical level of the concept of positive or negative politeness and seek applications to the classroom closer to the actual expression of the native speaker and to the current social context. The theory of politeness and SPL strategies hold an essential position within the concept of modern communicative competence in the English language, especially at an early age, where the habits and uses of the foreign language are shaped. We believe that the contemporary literature of reference grants this condition, however in the didactic application in the classes there is still a long way to go and effective paths of tasks and activities to discover.

For further research, an analysis of the minimum threshold levels in the SPL expression and attitude in relation to the linguistic levels expressed CEFR. So that teachers, administration and publishers, feel more prepared and well informed about the SPL situation in teaching English as a foreign language.

In addition, we hope that future teachers will understand that SPL components are as valuable in teaching an L2 as morpho-syntactic or phonological components.

References

- 1 Thomas J (1983) Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Appl Linguist* 4: 91-112.
- 2 Searle J (1969) *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, USA.
- 3 Searle J (1976) A classification of illocutionary acts. *Lang Soc* 5: 1-23.
- 4 Blum-Kulka S, House J, Kasper G (1989) *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies*. Alblex Publishing Corporation, USA.
- 5 Brown P, Levinson S (1987) *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 6 Conejos G (1995) Critical review of some of the postulates of the theory of linguistic courtesy advocated by Brown and Levinson. *Quaderns de Filologia: Estudis Linguistics* 1: 43-61.
- 7 White R (1993) Saying please: pragmalinguistic failure in English interaction. *ELT J* 47: 4.
- 8 Fukuya Y, Zhang Y (2002) Recasts and pragmalinguistic conventions of request. *Second language studies, University of Hawaii* 21: 1-47.
- 9 Choi J (2008) *Pragmática intercultural: The act of speaking of the compliment in the Spanish and Korean cultures*. Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid.
- 10 Pablos-Ortega D (2010) Attitudes of English speakers towards thanking in Spanish. *Pragmatics* 20: 149-170.
- 11 Hymes DH (1971) *Acerca de la competencia comunicativa. Traducción de extractos de on Comunicativa Competence*, University of Pennsylvania Press, USA.
- 12 Sauvignon SJ (2002) *Interpreting communicative language teaching: contexts and concerns in teacher education*. Yale University Press, Yale.
- 13 Canale M, Swain M (1980) Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Appl Linguist* 1: 1-47.
- 14 Canale M (1983) From the communicative competence to the communicative pedagogy. In: Richards J, Schmidt R, Llobera Canaves EM (eds.) *Language and Communication (coord.) (Communicative competence)*. Basic documents in the teaching of foreign languages, Edelsa, Madrid.
- 15 Spitzberg BH, Cupach WR (2007) *The dark side of interpersonal communication*. Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- 16 Suntharesan V (2014) English as a second language proficiency issues of jaffna students. *Language in India, India*.
- 17 Bachman L (1990) Communicative linguistic ability. In: Llobera EM (ed.) *Communicative competence. Basic documents in the teaching of foreign languages*. Madrid.
- 18 Crystal D (2003) *English as a global language (2nd edn.)*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 19 Seidlholfer B (2005) Key concepts in ELT English as a lingua franca. *ELT J* 59: 4.
- 20 Watts RJ, Sachiko I, Konrad E (1992) *Politeness in language: studies in its history, theory and practice*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- 21 Jucker AH, Taavitsainen I (2013) *English historical pragmatics*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- 22 Leech G (2014) *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- 23 Leech G (1983) *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman, London.
- 24 Cots JM (1990) Learn to use a language. *Sintagma* 2: 19-25.
- 25 Cots JM (1991) The pragmatics of communicative competence.
- 26 Meier AJ (1990) Passages of politeness. *J Pragmat* 24: 381-392.
- 27 Santana AC (1999) Review and evaluation of the courtesy model of Brown and Levinson. *Pragmalingüística* 7: 1-44.
- 28 Fraser B (1990) Perspectives on politeness. *J Pragmat* 14: 219-236.
- 29 Bax M, Kádár DZ (1984) Understanding historical (im)politeness: relational linguistic practice over time and across cultures. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Netherlands.
- 30 Brown RW, Gilman B (1989) Politeness theory and Shakespeare's four major tragedies. *Lang Soc* 18: 159-212.
- 31 Vidal E (1995) Politeness: a relevant issue for relevance theory. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 11: 45-57.
- 32 Vidal E (1998) Courtesy and relevance. In: Haverkate E, Fraile Maldonado GM (eds.) *The linguistic pragmatics of Spanish: Recent developments*. Rodopi: Amsterdam.
- 33 Vidal E (2004) Norms and principles. Putting social and cognitive pragmatics together. In: Márquez-Reiter R and Placencia ME (eds.) *Current trends in the pragmatics of Spanish*.
- 34 Watts RJ (2003) *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 35 Leech G (2003) Towards an anatomy of politeness in communication. *International Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 101-124.
- 36 Kopytko R (1995) Linguistic politeness strategies in Shakespeare's plays. In: *Historical pragmatics: Pragmatic development in the history of English*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- 37 Wierzbicka A (2006) *English: meaning and culture*. Oxford University Press, UK.
- 38 Wierzbicka A (1991) *Cross-cultural pragmatics: the semantics of human interaction*. Mouton de Gruyter, NY, USA.
- 39 Achiba M (2003) Learning to request in a second language. *Lang Soc* 33: 780-783.
- 40 Kasper G (1990) Linguistic politeness-current research issues. *J Pragmat* 14: 193-218.
- 41 Yoshimi DR (2001) Explicit instruction and JFL learner's use of interactional discourse markers. In: Rose KR and Kasper G (eds.) *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press, UK.
- 42 Kasper G (2001) Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In: Rose KR and Kasper G (eds.) *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 43 Kasper G (2001) Learning pragmatics in the L2 classroom. In: Bouton LF (ed.) *Pragmatics and Language Learning*. University of Illinois at urbana-champaign
- 44 Ballesteros Martín FJ (2002) Attenuation mechanisms in Spanish and English. Pragmatic implications in courtesy. *Revista Electrónica Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*.
- 45 Bordería SP (2005) *The teaching of pragmatics in the class of E/LE*. Arco libros, Madrid.
- 46 Sharifian F (2015) *Cultural accommodation of new varieties: The routledge handbook of language and culture*. Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

- 47 Coulthard M (1985) An introduction to discourse analysis (2nd edn.). Applied Linguistic and Language Study.
- 48 Treviño F, Bonfiglio I (2014) The (dis)courtesy in the discourse: interdisciplinary perspectives). UANL-Programa EDICE: Monterrey-Estocolmo.
- 49 Lépinette, Péré (1983) Aspects of the reflection of the interlinguistic praxi. University of Valence, Valencia.
- 50 Gilmour R (1981) Idea of the gentleman in the Victorian novel. First edition, Routledge.
- 51 Traugott A (2003) Interlanguage pragmatics, requests, complaints and apologies. Mouton de Gruyter, NY, USA.
- 52 Llobera E (1995) Communicative competence. Documentos básicos en la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras, Madrid, Edelsa.
- 53 Nevala M (2004) Address in early english correspondence: its forms and socio-pragmatic functions. Société Néophilologique, Helsinki.
- 54 Lázaro JP (2004) Pragmatics for Hispanists. Síntesis, Madrid.
- 55 Lord W (1978) A night to remember. Penguin Books, UK.