

王同顺 主编

LINGUISTICS

当代语言学研究文库

## 第二语言语用能力的发展

—— 一项基于母语为汉语的小学生  
英语语用能力发展的研究

Development of L2 Pragmatic Competence

—A Study on Chinese Children EFL Learners' Pragmatic Development

孙晓曦 著

上海交通大学出版社

中国英语学习者二语习得研究丛书

王同顺 主编

当代语言学研究文库

## 第二语言语用能力的发展 (英文版)

Development of L2 Pragmatic Competence

孙晓曦 著

本书由上海交通大学“985工程”二期哲学社会科学创新基地项目  
“外国语言文学理论与应用研究基地”资助出版

上海交通大学出版社

## 内 容 提 要

本书以“交际行为评价表(精简版)”为框架,在社会交际层面、言语行为层面和社会交际一言语行为结合层面观察了母语为汉语的小学生在交际中英语的使用情况,并分析描述了他们第二语言语用能力的发展特点和模式。本书进一步分析了母语为汉语的小学生交际策略、程式化语言的使用特点及第二语言语法能力对语用能力发展的影响,较全面地揭示了母语为汉语的小学生第二语言语用能力的发展,同时证明了儿童母语语用能力发展研究中广泛使用的分析框架交际行为评价表——精简版(INCA-A)在第二语言语用能力发展研究中的可行性。

### 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

第二语言语用能力的发展:一项基于母语为汉语的小学生英语语用能力发展的研究:英文/孙晓曦著. —上海:上海交通大学出版社,2009

(当代语言学研究文库)

ISBN978-7-313-05954-3

I. 第... II. 孙... III. 英语课—教学研究—小学—英文 IV. G623.312

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2009)第 143825 号

### 第二语言语用能力的发展(英文版)

——一项基于母语为汉语的小学生  
英语语用能力发展的研究

孙晓曦 著

上海交通大学出版社出版发行

(上海市番禺路 951 号 邮政编码 200030)

电话:64071208 出版人:韩建民

常熟市梅李印刷有限公司 印刷 全国新华书店经销

开本:787mm×960mm 1/16 印张:16.25 字数:244 千字

2009 年 11 月第 1 版 2009 年 11 月第 1 次印刷

印数:1~2 030

ISBN978-7-313-05954-3/G 定价:32.00 元

---

版权所有 侵权必究

英语作为一门国际性语言,已成为人们生活中不可缺少的工具。尤其在中国加入 WTO 之后,对英语人才的需求无论在质量上还是在数量上飞速增长。回顾近 20 年中国的英语教学发展,我们已经取得了很大的成就:教学大纲日臻完善与成熟,课程设置日趋合理,教材编写发展迅速,呈现一派百花齐放、百家争妍的大好局面,为中国的科学技术、社会经济发展和文化交流培养了大批英语人才。但是“我国目前的外语水平不高,教学方法普遍存在费时较多、收效较低的问题。”(李岚清)需要进一步拓宽我们的研究范围,探索新的研究途径,以提高中国英语学习者的学习效率,满足中国经济发展的需要。

长期以来,中国教师所受的培训主要侧重于如何教,教什么,而我们的研究也侧重于各种教学法、具体的教学方法、教材的编写和大纲的设计,而很少从学习的角度去研究中国的英语教学所面临的问题。近年来,国际上二语习得研究的发展迅猛,取得了令人瞩目的成果。我国也有越来越多的学者从学生的视角研究中国的英语教学所面临的问题。中国英语学习者的二语习得研究在过去十多年间也得到了迅速的发展。

二语习得领域的研究系统地探索二语习得的本质和习得的过程。其主要任务就是揭示和描述学习者是如何获得第二语言的,并解释为什么学习者能够获得第二语言。Gass 在讨论二语习得研究范畴时指出:二语习得研究是对非母语习得的研究,也就是对除母语以外任何语言习得的研究。它研究学习者在有限接触目标语的条件下如何构建新的语言体系。目前,尽管二语习得研究已取得很大成果,但是我们还远远没有建立起一套完整的二语习得理论。学者们正试图从不同的学科视角来认识和研究二

语习得。因此,二语习得研究与语言学、心理学、心理语言学、社会学、社会语言学、教育学等有着密切的关系。同时,由于二语习得与这些相邻学科之间的紧密关系,研究者们采用了不同的方法、不同的工具从不同的学科视角来审视所采集的数据和样本。实际上,不同的方法和不同的学科视角又决定了研究者采取不同的数据采集方法,运用不同的数据分析工具。因此这也决定了二语习得研究的交叉学科研究的本质。

人类的语言学习可分为母语习得和二语习得,前者是指儿童在自己的生活环境中对母语的自然而然的习得,后者是指人们习得母语后对第二门语言的学习。目前国外的二语习得研究的对象基本上为在目标语的环境中学习目标语。而中国的英语学习者则是在母语的大环境中学习其他民族的语言。换言之,中国的英语学习者是在课堂上学习英语的。他们是有意识地去学习一门语言,了解其语言结构、语法规则、词汇等。离开了教室,他们接触目标语的机会非常有限。因此,中国英语学习者习得英语的过程及目标语的发展有可能有其自身的特征。研究中国英语学习者英语习得的过程对促进和提高中国英语教学效率有重要意义。本文库的研究涉及中国英语学习者的词汇习得、时体发展、语用能力发展、一语认知资源对二语学习的影响,交际策略的应用等诸多方面,希望能为读者较全面地了解中国英语学习者二语发展提供帮助,为其他学者研究二语习得提供一些参考和启示。

这几本著作仅仅是本文库出版计划的第一批。我们对纳入文库的著作有着明确的要求:一是入选的著作力求具有相当的理论深度和原创性,能为中国英语学习者二语习得研究和中国英语教学起到推动作用;二是研究力求具有系统性,研究设计合理,研究方法科学,数据翔实,分析可靠,能把握二语习得研究前沿。我们真诚感谢上海交通大学出版社的领导和编辑人员对这套文库的出版提供的支持和努力。我们也真诚地希望广大研究工作者和研究生提出批评、建议和帮助。

王同顺

2008年6月

在语言发展的早期,语用系统占有重要的地位。语言技能中的语言运用因素也是全面了解语言系统发展过程全貌的一个重要因素。这一点在语言学界早已达成共识。但尽管如此,有关语用能力(pragmatic competence)习得方面的研究工作极少,尤其在我国的文献中针对英语初学者第二语言语用能力发展的研究还很缺乏。为弥补这一缺憾,本研究描述和探索了母语为汉语的小学生英语语用能力的发展过程。

本书研究的具体问题为:

(1) 母语为汉语的小学生英语语用能力呈现出怎样的发展趋势?

(2) 母语为汉语的小学生英语语用能力的发展呈现哪些特点?

(3) 母语为汉语的小学生英语语用能力的发展受何种因素影响? 这些因素又是如何影响学生英语语用能力发展的?

全书分为八个章节。第一章为导论,阐述了第二语言语用能力研究的背景、目的和意义。第二章为理论背景,介绍了第二语言语用能力研究的历史,语用能力、交际行为的定义,交际行为评价表——精简版(INCA-A)的理论依据及特点,语用能力发展的其他指标,如交际策略、程式化语言,影响第二语言语用能力发展的因素等。第三章介绍了本研究所采用的方法,即数据收集和分析的过程。第四章是定量研究,即根据不同年级小学生的交际行为频率变化,揭示其第二语言语用能力发展过程的特点。第五章是定性研究,即通过实例分析,描述不同年级小学生交际行为的特点及模式,进而探讨其第二语言语用能力发展。第六章进一步探索了不同年级小学生使用“要求”和“道歉”交际策略的不同表现

及他们对程式化语言使用的不同程度和特点。第七章讨论了第二语言语法能力对小学生第二语言语用能力发展的影响。第八章为结论。在这部分,本书总结了主要的研究发现,并阐述了研究的理论和教学实践的意义及进一步的研究方向。

### 理论背景

由于第二语言语用习得研究介于语用学与第二语言习得研究之间,因此本书主要从语用学和第二语言习得理论中寻找支点架构本研究的理论分析框架。首先,与以往一般只关注有限几种言语行为(speech acts),如要求、致谢、道歉的研究不同,本研究基于语用能力的主要内容——交际行为(communicative act)(即交际一方在每一次交际中为实现被交际对象注意、理解并认可从而对其产生影响的交际意图而使用语言),并借助儿童母语语用能力发展研究中广泛使用的分析框架交际行为评价表——精简版(INCA-A)描述并探讨了母语为汉语的小学生英语语用能力的发展过程中值得关注的现象。

有关语用能力发展的研究可追溯到20世纪70年代。虽然那时的研究有较明确的研究目的,即调查儿童以交际为目的的语言运用能力,但苦于缺乏统一的分析理论,很多研究无法系统详尽地解析儿童语用能力的发展。因此,很多研究者致力于建构更加完备的分析框架,更全面、科学地解释并描述儿童的语言运用能力[如“首个交际行为标注系统(First Communicative Acts Coding System, FCA)”、“100个交际行为的父母调查表(Parental Interview on 100 Communicative Acts, PICA-100”和INCA-A)]。其中INCA-A则是目前能较为有效记录儿童语言运用能力发展特点的框架(Ninio & Snow, 1996)。儿童第一语言运用能力(Ninio & Snow, 1996)研究的深入和发展渐渐影响到了第二语言语用能力发展的研究。

第二语言语用能力发展研究的起步与发展主要经历了两个阶段。首先, Kasper G 和 Blum-Kulka S 于1981年出版了他们的专著 *Pragmatische Aspekte in der Interimsprache* (《中介语中的语用层面》)。该书的出版使第二语言语用研究成为人们关注的焦点。1993年,论文集 *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (《中介语语用学》)的出版标志着第二语言语用研究已成为很有前景的研究领域。事实上,第二语言语用能力的发展是语言学习研究中很重要的一部分,它关注儿童为达到交际目的而得体、有效地运用第二语言的能力是如何发展的。而恰

恰在这方面,我们还知之甚少。另外,现有的第二语言语用研究主要以成人为研究对象,而针对儿童第二语言语用发展的研究还很欠缺。

基于以上原因,本书以“交际行为评价表(精简版)”为框架,在社会交际层面(level of social interchange)、言语行为层面(level of speech act)和社会交际—言语行为结合层面(level of social interchange-speech act combination)观察了母语为汉语的小学生在交际中英语的使用情况,并分析描述了他们第二语言语用能力的发展特点和模式。其次,本书进一步分析了母语为汉语的小学生交际策略、程式化语言(formulaic speech)的使用特点及第二语言语法能力对语用能力发展的影响,较全面地揭示了母语为汉语的小学生第二语言语用能力的发展,同时证明了儿童母语语用能力发展研究中广泛使用的分析框架交际行为评价表—精简版(INCA-A)在第二语言语用能力发展研究中的可行性。



# Acronyms

CA	Communicative Act	交际行为
CCSARP	Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project	言语行为实现模式的跨文化研究
CHAT	Codes for the Human Analysis of Transcripts	计算机文本分析赋码系统
CHILDES	Child Language Exchange System	儿童语言数据交流系统
CLAN	Computerized Language Analysis	计算机语言分析程序
DCT	Discourse Completion Task	话语填充任务
EFL	English as a Foreign Language	英语作为外语
ESL	English as a Second Language	英语作为第二语言
FCA	First Communicative Acts Coding System	首个交际行为标注系统
FLA	Foreign Language Acquisition	外语习得
FP	Formulaic Patterns	惯用形式
FR	Formulaic Routines	固定套话
IFID	Illocutionary Force Indicating Device	言外之力指示语
INCA	Inventory of Communicative Acts	交际行为评价表
INCA-A	Inventory of Communicative Acts-Abridged	交际行为评价表——精简版
KWAL	Key Word And Line	关键词与行检索
L1	the First Language	第一语言
L2	the Second Language	第二语言

NS	Native Speaker	本族语者
NNS	Non-Native Speaker	非本族语者
PICA-100	Parental Interview on 100 Communicative Acts	100 个交际行为的父 母调查表
SLA	Second Language Acquisition	第二语言习得
SLD	Second Language Development	第二语言发展

# **Contents**

## **Contents**

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>/ 1</b>
1.1	Background	/ 1
1.2	Research background of the present study	/ 2
1.3	Research objective and outline of the book	/ 6
<b>2</b>	<b>The Pragmatic and Acquisitional Perspectives on L2 Pragmatics</b>	<b>/ 8</b>
2.1	Introduction	/ 8
2.2	A pragmatic perspective	/ 8
2.3	Other indexes of L2 pragmatic development	/ 46
2.4	A second language acquisitional perspective-influence of L2 grammatical competence	/ 51
2.5	Summary	/ 53
<b>3</b>	<b>Research Design</b>	<b>/ 55</b>
3.1	Introduction	/ 55
3.2	Research questions	/ 55
3.3	Procedures of data collection and transcription	/ 56
3.4	Data analysis	/ 60
3.5	Summary	/ 63
<b>4</b>	<b>Developmental Pattern of Chinese Children EFL Learners' Performance of CAS</b>	<b>/ 64</b>
4.1	Introduction	/ 64

- 4.2 General measures of chinese Children EFL learners' pragmatic competence / 64
- 4.3 Repertoire of social interchanges engaged in by children / 70
- 4.4 Repertoire of speech acts engaged in by children / 77
- 4.5 English pragmatic flexibility of children / 86
- 4.6 Summary / 90
- 5 Developmental Characteristics of Chinese Children EFL Learners' Performance of CAs / 92
  - 5.1 Introduction / 92
  - 5.2 Examination of CA at the social interchange level across the four grades / 93
  - 5.3 Examination of CA at the speech act level across the four grades / 129
  - 5.4 Examination of CA at the social interchange-speech act combination level across the four grades / 155
  - 5.5 Summary / 171
- 6 Other Indexes of Chinese Children EFL Learners' Pragmatic Development / 174
  - 6.1 Introduction / 174
  - 6.2 Strategies used by Chinese children EFL learners in performing the speech acts of request and apology / 174
  - 6.3 Formulaic speech in children's utterances / 189
  - 6.4 Summary / 205
- 7 The Factor Influencing L2 Pragmatic Development of Chinese Children EFL Learners / 207
  - 7.1 Introduction / 207
  - 7.2 The effect of L2 grammatical competence on L2 pragmatic development at the interchange level / 207

7.3	The influence of L2 grammatical competence on L2 pragmatic development at the speech act level /	212
7.4	The effect of L2 grammatical competence on L2 pragmatic development at the combination level /	217
7.5	Summary /	221
8	Conclusion and Implications /	224
8.1	Introduction /	224
8.2	Conclusion /	224
8.3	Implications /	229
	References /	234

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

The U.S. psychiatrist Watzlawick (1967, 49) and his team workers once said, “no matter how one may try, one cannot not communicate.” In order to be a good communicator, one has to have not only a good knowledge of the language, but also a high ability of using the language. What’s more, a proper and effective use of a language other than people’s native language seems to be essential to their engagement in international communication and cooperation. Therefore, investigating the competence of using a second or foreign language<sup>①</sup> is both academically valuable and socially meaningful.

If the linguistic system of a language is taken as one leg of a man, the use of such system in real communication will be the other leg for the man to walk. Research has shown, for example, that language learners don’t necessarily use the language as well as they know the

---

① Actually, many researchers such as Krashen (1981) have discussed the conceptual difference between second language (L2) learning and foreign language learning, that is, L2 learning is characterized as learning the target language in an environment where it is commonly used, while foreign language learning refers to learning a target language which is not used for everyday communication. Despite this fact, such distinction is overlooked in the present study for as what Vivian Cook (1996) argued, learners in these two situations don’t necessarily learn in two different ways, and this distinction is not the focus of the present study. So the term of second language acquisition (SLA) is used in this study in order not to complicate the story.

grammar of the language (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999). This is the case for many instances in teaching of English as a foreign language in China. One is the failure of a college student in responding to a foreigner's "thank you". Another is about how a graduate student asked the health situation of one of his classmates. Instead of the expressions like "Are you OK?" he said "How are you?" Although small in number, similar anecdotes are impressive enough to get the researcher's attention, and in many cases they are interpreted as the matter of cultural or first language (L1) interference. It's true that culture does get in the way in everyday communication, and L2 learners can never free themselves from the influence of their mother tongue. But they are also the results of the underdevelopment of L2 pragmatic competence—the knowledge of both production and comprehension of pragmatic meaning within the confines of specific sociolinguistic contexts (Garcia, 2004). One thus cannot help wondering how L2 learners' pragmatic competence forms and develops in learning a second language.

## 1.2 Research background of the present study

The study of pragmatic development began in 1970s, which focused on children's developing mastery of the use of speech for the communicative purpose. But since then there has been no generally agreed-upon way of pragmatic analysis. In this case, much effort was made to construct a framework for defining and categorizing children's use of speech, namely their communicative acts, such as the First Communicative Acts Coding System (FCA), the Abridged Inventory of Communicative Acts (INCA-A) and the Parental Interview on 100 Communicative Acts (PICA-100). FCA is designed to code and analyze the talk of children in the single-word stage. PICA-100 is an instrument for interviewing parents about beginning speakers' speech use (Ninio & Snow, 1996). INCA-A is an effective scheme for investigating the speech uses in children whose competence of using language is developing.

As the grip that research in L1 acquisition has on the study of L2 learning, the research in the L1 pragmatic development or “developmental pragmatics” (see Ninio & Snow, 1996) also sheds light on that of L2 pragmatics both at the theoretical and the practical levels. Many theoretical models are referred to by both L1 and L2 pragmatic development studies (e.g., speech-act theory; discourse analysis), and many L2 pragmatic development research methods are borrowed from L1 pragmatic development research (e.g., tracking, psychological measuring). The modern study of L2 pragmatic development<sup>①</sup> dates back to the early 1980s, when Kasper and Blum-Kulka had their book *Pragmatische Aspekte in der Interimsprache* published. From then on, increasing attention has been paid to the pragmatic issues in SLA, and in the efforts of Kasper and Blum-Kulka and many other researchers (such as Ellis, Bardovi-Harlig, Hartfore, *et al.*), the first collection of eleven research papers—*Interlanguage Pragmatics*—was published in 1993, which marked the establishment of L2 pragmatics as a prospective research area.

According to Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993), L2 pragmatics is the baby of two different disciplines—SLA research and pragmatics. To be specific, L2 pragmatics is both an offset of SLA study paralleling with L2 phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics and a domain of pragmatics interacting with sociolinguistics or psycholinguistics. Furthermore, L2 pragmatics is also believed to be “a direct off-shoot” of cross-cultural pragmatics (Beebe & Cummings, 1996) since the question of “what language learners do in a L2?” is one of the major concerns of cross-culture pragmatics.

Owing to its interdisciplinary nature, L2 pragmatics is generally

---

① Also as “interlanguage pragmatic development” in almost all of the works regarding pragmatic development in L2 learning, which follows Selinker’s (1972) referring to the term of “interlanguage” as what the target language learners have acquired in the process of target language learning. In order to avoid unnecessary misunderstanding, the terms of “L2 pragmatic development” is used to refer to both “interlanguage” and “foreign language pragmatic development”.



defined as the "... study of nonnative speaker's (NNS) use and acquisition of linguistic action patterns in a L2..." (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993, 3) or "how nonnative speakers develop pragmatic ability" in a second or foreign language (Kasper & Rose, 2002, 1). On the one hand, as a research domain in SLA studies, L2 pragmatics investigates not only L2 use, i. e. "how nonnative speakers comprehend and produce action in a target language", but also L2 learning, that is, "how L2 learners develop the ability to understand and perform action in a target language." (Kasper&Rose, 2001,1) On the other hand, L2 pragmatics discusses the pragmatic phenomenon in the process of comprehending and producing action in a target language by the NNSs on the basis of speech act theory or cross-cultural communication theory (Barron, 2003).

Much research has been done since 1990 when L2 pragmatics established its place in the world. According to the summary of research objectives made by Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993, 3-17) and Kasper and Rose (2002), the so-far-conducted L2 pragmatic studies have mainly centered on the following topics: ① production of linguistic action; ② comprehension of illocutionary force and politeness; ③ impact of context variables on choices of conventions of means and form; ④ discourse sequencing and conversational management; ⑤ pragmatic success and failure; ⑥ development of L2 pragmatic competence; ⑦ research methodology in L2 pragmatic studies; ⑧ instruction in L2 pragmatics, etc.

Comparing the research objectives expressed in the definition of L2 pragmatics and those labeled by researchers in the existing studies, it is obvious that the bulk of L2 pragmatic studies is concerned with issues of L2 use rather than development or acquisitional processes. Incommensurateness can be easily found between the importance accorded to L2 pragmatic development and what researchers have really investigated. The development of pragmatic competence in L2 is an important part of language learning research in which researchers concentrate on how children acquire the