PRAGMATIC AND GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE INTERFACE IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND CONSTRUCTION

Andi Rustandi, R. Bunga Febriani*, Bambang Ruby Sugiarto
Universitas Galuh, Indonesia
bunga.febriani@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the interface between pragmatic and grammatical competence in second language acquisition. This study aims to discover the conceptual framework of how pragmatics competence interfaces with grammatical competence. This study employs three research questions such as (1) how pragmatics competence and grammatical competence are interfaced with each other, (2) what kind of pragmatics competence should be learned by the learner of a second language, and (3) to what extent grammatical construction interface with the pragmatic domain. This study used the groundwork of the library research method, which forms the theoretical framework of this study by searching, reading, and evaluating some journals from the online journal that deals with the topic. The result revealed that pragmatic competence and grammatical competence are interfaced with each other since grammatical construction in the utterance contributes to the language use expression.

Keywords: *Pragmatics Competence, Second Language Acquisition*

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatic competence and grammatical competence are believed to have interfaced with each other in second language acquisition. This issue appeared to be pivotal in the SLA since these two notions contribute to developing language competence to use language correctly and appropriately in various social contexts. Developing language competence means learning the linguistic aspects of the language system, such as lexical categories, and an understanding of the extra-linguistic features of a given communicative context that contribute to the interpretation of meaning, such as gesture, silence, or suggested meaning. Through developing language competence, some competencies such as grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence are also included to achieve mutual communication in a second language. Grammatical competence emphasizes knowledge of the syntax or morphological structure of a language to derive its meaning.

In contrast, sociolinguistics competence concerns itself with an appreciation of the context in which an utterance is made, emphasizing maintaining social relationships and achieving a personal goal (Gumperz & Cook 2008). However, pragmatic competence is

concerned with emphasizing a speaker's intended meaning by appreciating the factors that govern the speaker's choice of language in a given social context, and also the learner's ability to match their utterances with the context they are in, to maintain social relationships and achieve a specific communicative purpose. However, since pragmatics competence and grammatical competence are crucial to the development of communicative competence, it remains some questions on (1) how pragmatics competence and grammatical competence are interfaced with each other, (2) what kind of pragmatics competence should be learned by the learner of a second language and (3) to what extent grammatical construction interface with the pragmatic domain.

Several recent studies have investigated the interface of these notions (Nguyen, Pham & Pham; 2015; Keckes, 2015; Beyond, 2006; Arka & Yanuar, 2016). In this regard, the previous study above viewed the interface from the pragmatics competence in the context of an empirical study of the learner in education; however, this recent article elaborates the conception theoretically from the points of view of several researchers provided by examples that contribute to the claim of the interfaces between pragmatic competence and grammatical competence. Therefore, this present article is aimed at elaborating three main points such as the theoretical conception of the interface between pragmatic competence and grammatical competence by reviewing some articles from some researchers, the types of pragmatic competence that should be acknowledged by second language learners to cope with the communicative competence, the contextual used of grammatical construction in the sentence as the foundation to claim the interface between grammatical competence and pragmatic competence.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pragmatic competence in SLA

Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics that refers to "the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication" (Crystal, 1997). However, the field of pragmatics deals with the context-dependent aspects of language and the intent behind how a speaker frames or encodes a communicative message (Levinson, 1983). This notion was originally taken from the philosophy of language proposed by Morris in Horn & Ward (2006), who views syntax addressed the formal relations of signs to one another, semantics as the relation of signs to what they denote, and pragmatics as the relation of signs to their users and interpreters. Then,

this idea developed in the field of sociolinguistics and other subfields. Nowadays, the existence of pragmatics competence has been developed in the field of second language acquisition as one of the important elements of communicative competence.

The emergence of pragmatic competence was defined by Chomsky in Horn & Ward (2006) as the knowledge of condition and manner of the appropriate use of the language in conformity with various purposes. In this regard, the conception is viewed as the opposite of grammatical competence since it is argued that form and meaning are different. Thus, in sociolinguistics, Canale and Swain (1980) inserted pragmatic competence as one of the vital components in constructing the communicative competence model. This model emphasizes pragmatic competence as the knowledge of contextually appropriate language use (Canale & Swain (1983). Then, Canale in Casper (1998) elaborates on this pivotal issue that illocutionary competence or the knowledge of pragmatic convention for performing proper language function and sociolinguistic field is appropriately given a context. Later on, the existence of pragmatics competence generates a new conception in the field of interlanguage pragmatics, i.e., pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. In this regard, pragmalinguistics refers to the strategies, including directness and indirectness, routines, and an extensive range of linguistics forms to soften communicative acts; meanwhile, sociopragmatics refers to the social perception of communicative action (Rose, 2002). In this illustration, as for the two parts of pragmatic competence, pragmatic competence refers to the competence of understanding the communicative act and knowing how to carry it out; and socio-cultural competence refers to the competence of using language appropriately in a specific context. In conclusion, pragmatic competence is the competence of understanding and using language correctly and appropriately in a particular context to achieve successful communication.

However, concerning second language acquisition, this pragmatic competence is viewed as a vital factor toward communicative competence. Some empirical studies postulated the emergence of this notion in SLA from different fields. In language and education, Harlig (2012) found that speech acts; and implicature play an important role in developing second language acquisition. Besides, In the field of learner differences, Weiner (2014) postulated that pragmatic transfer and motivation are essential in constructing communicative competencies of students of a second language learner. However, in sociopragmatics competence, Harlow (1990) confirms that requesting, familiarity, and apologizing is such an essential elements in developing second language acquisition. Through this study, it can be concluded that pragmatic competence plays an important role in developing second language acquisition.

Grammatical Competence in SLA

The notion of grammatical competence was originally described by Chomsky (1960) in Radford (2016) and refers to the implicit knowledge of structural regularities. However, Cook (2008) defines pragmatic competence as the knowledge of language stored in a person's mind. This notion is assumed to be part of communicative competence since it covers phonological, lexical, and discourse competence (Barman, 2014). In this regard, grammatical competence refers to the ability to recognize and produce the distinctive grammatical structure of a language and use it to achieve effective communication.

Concerning second language acquisition, the existence of this notion is considered to play an important role in developing communicative competence in a second language. Fikroni (2018) claims that learners' grammatical competence is very crucial within learners' language production, which is not only to produce the language but also to monitor the language production itself. In addition, Iwashita (2018) inferred the contribution of grammatical competence to overall oral language proficiency and argued that a communication-oriented approach to second/foreign language teaching, understanding the varying levels of grammar contributes to the overall proficiency of the language. Moreover, Byrnes's (2018) grammar analysis situated meaning-making to advanced learners' language use and explores what understanding and analysis of grammar competence in second language learners.

Concerning the studies above, the relation between pragmatics and SLA is very close since grammatical competence may postulate effective communication in a second language. In other words, if someone has competence in grammar, she/he probably can communicate effectively. Therefore, grammatical competence is essential to develop second language acquisition, especially communicative competence, and strategic competence.

METHODOLOGY

This study used a qualitative approach by using library research. According to George (2008), "library research" involves identifying and locating sources that provide factual information or personal/ expert opinion on a research question; a necessary component of every other research method at some point". Accordingly, related information and data were extracted from various documents, mainly official websites, government reports, theses, and journals. Therefore, this study uses the groundwork of the library research method which forms the theoretical framework of this study by searching, reading, and evaluating some journals from the online journal that deals with the topic (Booth, 2016). In the present article, therefore,

several journal articles retrieved from the online journal's website were taken to elaborate the conception of the interface between pragmatic competence and grammatical competence.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Conceptual framework of grammatical competence and pragmatic competence in SLA

Based on the library research, pragmatic competence is argued to have interfaced with grammatical competence. Leech (1983) argued that "grammar (the abstract formal system of language) and pragmatics (the principles of language use) are complementary domains within linguistics". This strong argument is postulated from some empirical studies from different perspectives. Schauer (2012) argued this interface with the term" pragmatic proceed grammar and grammar proceeds pragmatics," which refers to the notion based on the idea of Schmidt (1983) that pragmatic competence will be in line with grammatical competence. Accordingly, Schauer (2012) confirms that if grammatical development is significantly increased, pragmatic development has shown more significant progress and begun to use more direct strategies in appropriate situations. Thus, in terms of pragmatics awareness in requesting, Koike (1989) found that while her learners seemed to be aware of the pragmatic norms regarding requests in their L1 and L2, their beginner-level knowledge of grammar made it difficult for them to produce appropriate requests.

Currently, the notion of the interface between pragmatics and grammar has been elaborated teaching-learning process. Pearson (2006), in the study of pragmatics competence, found that grammatical competence cannot develop as quickly as the already present pragmatic concepts require, but the concepts are expressed in ways conforming to the level of grammatical complexity acquired. Moreover, Shu (2018) concludes from the observation of Chinese students that teaching pragmatics is not merely teaching language used in context, but it refers to linguistic components. Accordingly, Kasper & Rose (2002) argued that speakers would notice socio-pragmatic variability, make linguistic choices, and recognize the role of discourse in the construction of social identities and relations through pragmatic competence. Bardovi-Harlig (1999, 2001) confirms the evidence against the hypothesis that a grammatical platform is a mandatory prerequisite for pragmatic development by displaying advanced L2 learners employing perfect TL grammar in a pragmatically non-target-like fashion. Another critical issue is the findings from Einstein (1988), and Takahashi & Beebe (1987) conclude that learners demonstrate knowledge of a particular grammatical structure and use it to express pragma-linguistics function.

In brief, according to the studies above, it is argued that pragmatic competence and grammatical competence interface with each other. The interface dealt with the function of grammatical competence is to produce effective communication. Therefore, learning a language is not merely learning the sentence's grammatical structure but also learning how the sentence structure is used in the context situation appropriately. As a result, the goal of communication is achieved between the speaker and the listener.

Types of Pragmatics Competence in SLA

Pragmatic competence in learning a second language contributes to the development of language competence. In this regard, since the pragmatic is to use language appropriately in a social context, the learners of a second language should be aware of the pragmatic typology. Bialystok (1993) postulates the types of pragmatic competence into three abilities, i.e., the speaker's ability to use different purposes, the ability of the listener to get past the language and understand the speaker's real intentions, and the command of the role. Besides, Leech (1983) defined pragmatic competence based on the unique properties of communicative competence such as variability, negotiability, adaptability, silence, indeterminacy, and dynamicity. Accordingly, variability refers to the range of communicative possibilities, negotiability refers to the possibility of making a choice and flexible strategies, adaptability refers to modulating and regulating the communicative choices, silence refers to the degree of awareness reached by communicative choices refers to the possibility to renegotiate choices, and dynamicity refers to the development of communicative interaction.

Horn & Ward (2016) proposed other types of pragmatic competence, which postulated into the term "pragmatic domains". Accordingly, six types of pragmatic domains such as implicature, presupposition, speech act, reference, deixis, definiteness, and Indefiniteness. In this regard, implicature is a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said (Ward, 2016). Meanwhile, presupposition refers to the speaker's mark of linguistic information as being taken for granted, rather than being part of the main propositional content of a speech act (Atlas, 2016). Then, speech act refers to an action in verbal communication with a message in itself, so the communication is about language and action (Bach, 1979). Besides, reference is an act of the speaker using the linguistic form to enable a listener to identify something depending on the speaker's intention. Deixis refers to individual objects in the immediate context they uttered by pointing at them to give direct attention to them. Finally, the last types of pragmatics competence are definiteness and Indefiniteness or referring expression, which refers to the grammaticalization of a general meaning called identifiability across and within languages

Lyons (1999). In this regard, definiteness refers to referring expression**s** that give the hearer a clue in identifying its referents. Meanwhile, Indefiniteness refers to referring expression when a speaker cannot be said to be referring if they use an indefinite expression.

Concerning the types of pragmatic competence, it is clear that this type of competence influences the existence of communicative competence. All the types postulated that to achieve appropriate communication, the second language learners in important pragmatic awareness by highlighting the pragmatic typology. These typologies will help the learners to identify the utterance in the appropriate context and situation.

Grammatical construction in the pragmatics domain in SLA

Another factual information to claim the interface between grammatical competence and pragmatic competence can be seen from the existence of grammatical elements in the sentence. This grammatical element probably will give a clue of which context might be related to the appropriate expression. By identifying the grammatical elements in the utterance or sentence, the speaker and the hearer (interlocutors) will share the same reference or experience toward the utterance's meaning. Therefore, this phenomenon can only be seen from the structure of sentences containing implicature, presupposition, speech act, reference, deixis, definiteness, and Indefiniteness.

For instance, the construction of passive over active might raise the patient's intention as the topic and defer information about the agent to the end of the sentence stress. Besides, using passive expression enables the speaker to provide the unknown, irrelevant agent or avoid saying who is the agent, such as in the following example.

Passive construction and implicature

a   *The bank was robbed by two young men with extensive facial scars*

b   *My bike was taken between 3:00 and 5:30 on Monday.*

c   *Over 20,000 copies of the book were sold before it was discovered that pages 285 and 286 were missing*

d   *[Do you know where the February Scientific American is?] It was thrown out*

(Taken from Horn and Ward, 2008)

The sentence above implies that passive construction carries the implicature. Sentence (a and b) implies that the speaker is trying to hide the agent by constructing an unknown agent. In addition, sentence (c) implies that the agent is irrelevant to the topic of the sentence. However, sentence (d) implies that the agent of the utterance is avoided. Accordingly, through the example above, the types of pragmatics such as implicature can be identified from the

passive sentence construction. Therefore, it is clear that pragmatic competence interfaces with grammatical competence.

The second example of the interface of these two notions can be traced from presupposition and tense. Presupposition refers to the implicit assumption about the word or background knowledge relating to an utterance whose truth is taken for granted in discourse (Green, 2008). For example, sentences a and b show the interface between tense and pragmatics competence.

a. *The Celtics play the Bucks tomorrow.*
b. *The Celtics are going to play the Bucks tomorrow.*

(Taken from Horn and Ward, 2008)

The sentence (a) and (b) seems to have different tenses by representing the verb play. Sentence (a) represents the present tense by inserting the verb *play,* and sentence (b) represents the future tense by inserting "going to play". However, these sentences refer to the same implicit assumption for the same purpose. Therefore, these sentences indicate that grammatical competence and pragmatic competence interface with each other.

Another example of the interface between pragmatic competence and grammatical competence is speech act and grammatical construction. Speech act refers to how to do things with words (Austin, 1962). For example, the sentence below reflects the interface between the two notions through the performative and finite-verb speech acts.

a. *I (hereby) order you to leave the room.*
b. *I promise you never to be late again.*
c. *I hereby declare this meeting closed.*
d. *I hereby christen this ship "Queen Elizabeth".*

(Taken from Horn &Ward, 2008)

Sentences like these are important for the learner of L2 and this utterance in appropriate circumstances amounts to performing the action identified by the finite verb. The typical formal properties of such sentences in English include first-person subjects, second-person indirect objects, a present-tense non-progressive active form of a speech act verb, and the deictic adverb hereby. In this regard, these sentences postulate the relationship between grammatical competence and pragmatic competence.

Another pragmatic type that is believed to have a relationship with grammatical competence is a reference. Reference refers to the act by which a speaker or writer uses

language to enable a hearer or reader to identify something—for example, the sentence a, b, and c below.

a. *Always do **today** what you could put off till **tomorrow**.*
b. *(Said, frustrated at where I put my glasses, again) Darn, they always seem to be over **there**, never over **here**.*

(Taken from Horn & Ward 2008)

Examples such as this seem to have natural interpretations that are at least time-dependent: always do things the day you're faced with them and not the next; my glasses are always where I am not. If one takes these as serious data (some do not), then world-time pairs would appear to play a role in the case of at least some indexical expressions. In this regard, the time expression such as today, tomorrow, and here refers to the time the speaker indexes to the hearer. Therefore, through this example, pragmatics is interfaced with grammar.

Another facet of the interface between pragmatic competence and grammatical competence is the existence of deixis and noun phrases. Deixis refers to a word or phrase (such as *this, that, these, those, now, then, here*) that points to the time, place, or situation in which a speaker is speaking (Nordquist, 2019). The following sentences are the examples of deixis.

a. *I want **this** dish, **this** dish, and **this** dish.*
b. *I need **this** one, **that** one, and **this**.*

(Taken from Horn and Ward, 2008)

The sentence (a) and (b) reflect the existence of deictic expression and grammatical construction. In this regard, to interpret this <u>utterance</u>, the listener must have information about who*m I* refer to, about the time at which the utterance is produced, and about the three <u>noun phrases</u> *this dish* refers to. This sentence contains the deictic expression, which interfaces with the grammatical construction deixis and noun phrase.

The last types of pragmatic competence that interface with grammatical competence are definiteness and Indefiniteness. These two notions refer to the **referring expressions** that give the hearer a clue or identify its referents, for example, in the following sentences respecting the two notions of deictic expression.

*" **Everyone** was sick"*

The sentence above reveals an incomplete definite description, which results in a vague proposition. Since the indefinite noun phrase "everyone" is represented in the sentence, it is difficult to understand. The problems may result from the unknown of the context and situation.

In this regard, argued that incomplete descriptions are not confined to definite descriptions but are faced equally by (other) quantified NPs.

In brief, from the example above, pragmatic competence and grammatical competence are interfaced with each other. Some grammatical construction will probably be one of the clues to understanding the communication. This communication does not stand alone, but they have some grammatical elements that develop the sentence. The grammatical element and its construction and context are conjoined to contribute to comprehensible communication. As a result, communicative competence is achieved based on the interface's grammatical elements and the use of the language.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, pragmatic competence and grammatical competence are interfaced with each other since grammatical construction in the utterance contributes to the language use expression. Some empirical studies on these two notions also believe that implicature, speech acts, reference, deixis, definiteness, and Indefiniteness, which is known as the pragmatic domain, have strong relationships with grammatical structure. Language can only be understood by analyzing the structure of the sentence and the context situation that may influence each utterance. Therefore, understanding grammatical elements in communication contributes to the development of communicative competence in SLA.

REFERENCES

Barman. (2014). The linguistic philosophy of Noam Chomsky. *Philosophy and Progress*, 103-112.

Booth, A. (2016). Searching for qualitative research for inclusion in systematic reviews: a structured methodological review. *Systematic Review*, 1-15.

Byon, A. (2006). Developing KFL Students' Pragmatic Awareness of Korean Speech Acts: The Use of Discourse Completion Tasks. *Language Awareness*, 244-263.

Byrnes, H. (2018). Advanced-Level Grammatical Development in Instructed SLA. In Malovrh, & A. Benetti, *The Handbook of Advanced Proficiency in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 131-156). Massachusett: John Wiley and Sons.

Canale, & Swain. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1-15.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language. *Language and Communication*, 2-27.

Cook, G. &. (2008). studying language, culture, and society: Sociolinguistics or linguistic anthropology? *Journal of sociolinguistics*, 532 - 545.

Crystal. (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fikroni, M. (2019). Grammatical Competence within L2 Communication: Language Production, Monitor Hypothesis, and Focus on Forms Instruction. *Pancaran Pendidikan*, 1-15.

Green, M. (2002). Review of Implicature: Intention, convention, and principle in the failure of Gricean theory, by Wayne A. Davis. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 241-414.

Harlig, B., & Velenga. (2012). The effect of instruction on conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *System*, 1-13.

Harlig, K., Mosaman, S., & Heidi, V. (2014). The effect of instruction on pragmatic routines in academic discussion. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-13.

Harlow, L. (1990). Do They Mean What They Say? Socio-pragmatic Competence and Second Language Learners. *Modern Language Journal*, 328-351.

Horn, & Ward. (2006). *The handbook of pragmatics.* Victoria: Blackwell.

Iwashita, N. (2018). Grammar and Language Proficiency. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1-15.

Kasper, G. (1998). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Kecskes. (2015). How does pragmatic competence develop in bilinguals? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 419-434.

Kesper, G. &. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principle of Pragmatics.* London: Longman.

Mary W, G. (2008). *The Elements of Library Research: What Every Student Needs to Know.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Nordquist, R. (2019, 5 20). *Definitions, Examples, and Discussions of English Grammar.* Retrieved from thoughtco.com: https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-grammar-1690909

Pham, N. &. (2015). The effects of input enhancement and recasts on the development of second language pragmatic competence. *Language Awareness*, 169-195.

Radford, A. (2016). *Analyzing English Sentence.* UK: Cambridge University Press.

S, L. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schauer, G. A. (2012). Pragmatics and Grammar. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 1-15.

Schimidt. (1983). 'Interaction, acculturation, and the acquisition of communicative competence. *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisitio*n, 137-174.

Vivian, C. (2008). Investigating the Construct Validity of a Performance Test Designed to Measure Grammatical and Pragmatic Knowledge. *Second or Foreign Language Assessment*, 131–179.

Weiner. (2014). Some pragmatics features of lexical ambiguity and simple ridless. *Language and Communication*, 183-193.

Yanuar, A. &. (2016). On the morphosyntax and pragmatics of -in in Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, 1-15.