

Adding Pragmatic Elements in the Standardized English Test

Zhengzhe Liu^{1, *}

¹*The University of Sydney, Sydney, The New South Wales, Australia*

^{*}*Corresponding author. Email: Zliu8525@uni.sydney.edu.au*

ABSTRACT

With the deepening of global economic integration, the transnational connections are closer, and English, as a global language, has a broader range of applications. A language is a tool of communication, and the language of different countries and cultures has its uniqueness, which leads to different pragmatic habits. As a concrete manifestation of communicative competence, pragmatic competence enables interlocutors to ensure the appropriateness of cross-cultural communication through rational language principles. This paper designs some questions and references answers based on speech act theory, cooperative principle, politeness maxims, and face theory. First, it is hoped that pragmatic competence, as a cross-cultural communication competence as crucial as linguistic competence, can be considered in the standardized English test. Secondly, it is hoped to give some suggestions to Chinese students who will study in English-speaking countries to better integrate into local society; that is, it is necessary to enhance pragmatics learning.

Keywords: *Pragmatics, Standardized English Test, Applied Linguistics, Language Testing*

1. INTRODUCTION

In the background of economic, political and cultural globalization, communication between countries has become more frequent. As the most frequently used oral language, English has become the international lingua franca, which increasingly becoming a required course in many countries, such as expanding circle (The expanding circle refers to the mother tongue and official language of countries other than English, such as China, South Korea and Japan). In this situation, more and more families send their children to study in English-speaking countries, so it is very critical to master the English language. In parallel with the deepening of internationalization, more and more families choose to send their children to study abroad; Along with English being further consolidated as a lingua franca, communicative competence becomes more vital.

In terms of linguistic competence, in different periods of linguistic development, linguists have different views on the internal rules of language and the application of language's social functions. Saussure (1959) [1]. Summarized the terms language and parole from the language reality, pointing out that language is the common social core of language community, and

parole is the expression content of individual speech. That is, language refers to its system itself, while parole is the embodiment of the system in actual use. In addition, Chomsky (1965) [2] indicated that language ability is the grammatical "internalization" capability of the ideal speaker and listener and that language ability must be used in practice. In 1972, Hymes [3] put forward the concept of communicative competence based on the sociality of language and specified the importance of communicative competence. Halliday (1978) [4] believes that language is a social phenomenon, and the generation and understanding of semantics are closely related to context. Therefore, language cannot exist independently, or it will lose its application function in people's social activities. According to Cui and Yang (2008) [5], linguistic communicative competence can be divided into four categories: linguistic competence, namely the ability to select and operate the structure of the linguistic system; discourse competence, the ability to recognize and use linguistic structures within a discourse; Pragmatic competence, the ability to use language structures in context and situation; Social pragmatics, the ability to use language in practical social situations. These claims, among many others, strongly accentuate that the significance of pragmatic competence in language use.

However, pragmatic knowledge has been neglected in teaching and assessment. Due to the significant differences between different cultures and their language structures, and the rigidity of English teaching methods in non-native English-speaking countries, accuracy is overemphasized in English learning. Too much emphasis on accuracy will have adverse effects on THE THINKING DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH LEARNERS. FIRSTLY, THE LANGUAGE STRUCTURE IS SCATTERED OUTSIDE THE CONTEXT, MAKING THE MEMORY MORE MECHANICAL AND LACKING THE RATIONAL LANGUAGE LEARNING PROCESS. SECONDLY, IT IS EASY TO FORM A THINKING PATTERN THAT HINDERS THE EXTERNALIZATION OF THINKING AND LACKS THINKING CAPACITY IF THERE ARE TOO MUCH FOCUS ON THE ACCURACY OF LANGUAGE. IN STANDARD LANGUAGE TESTING IN CHINESE COLLEGES, SUCH AS THE COLLEGE ENGLISH TEST 4 AND 6; and THE INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE TEST, IELTS, TOEFL, PTE. THE CONTENT OF THEIR TEST STILL USES OUTDATED LANGUAGE MATERIAL AS WELL AS THE AIM OF THE TESTS IS TO GUIDE LANGUAGE LEARNERS REPEATED ANALYSIS OF WRITTEN MATERIALS IN A WAY THAT IS ROTE LEARNING MEMORIZED PRONUNCIATION, SYNTAX AND LEXICON. AS A RESULT, SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS CAN RECITE BUT CANNOT USE IT IN PRACTICAL ENGLISH LIFE. ROTE LEARNING ELEVATES MEMORY THINKING AND STIFLES LANGUAGE USE AND CREATIVE THINKING. THEREFORE, COMMUNICATION FAILURE IN ENGLISH-SPEAKING COUNTRIES LEADS TO SUBSEQUENT ADVERSE EFFECTS FOR SOME OVERSEAS STUDENTS FROM THE EXPANDING CIRCLE. FOR EXAMPLE, POOR COMMUNICATION MAKES IT DIFFICULT TO INTEGRATE INTO THE LOCAL LIFE, LEADING TO AUTISM, LACK OF SENSE OF BELONGING, AND THE MORE PROFOUND LOSS OF THEIR IDENTITY AS INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS. THUS, PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE SHOULD BE REGARDED AS AN ESSENTIAL CRITERION IN OUR SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING AND EXAMINATION. FOR INSTANCE, IT IS EMPHASIZED THAT THE TEST CONTENT SHOULD BE the specific communicative behaviour or the authenticity of context should be strengthened; that is, language must be suitable for the particular time, place, type of person, the genre of use, means of communication and communicative purpose. In order to strengthen language learning, we should combine the real communicative context and train the language useability of second language learners in real English-speaking countries according to the actual needs of language communication. Therefore, we need to attach

importance to pragmatic competence, such as adding pragmatic tests to standardized tests.

This review aims to analyze the significance of pragmatic competence in real life based on Austin and Searle's speech act theory, Grice's cooperative principle, Leech's politeness maxims and Brown and Levinson's face theory, and design the types of pragmatic competence test based on previous studies. It is hoped that pragmatic competence can be included in standardized language tests as soon as possible.

2. PRAGMATIC FORCES IN CROSS-CULTURE COMMUNICATION

2.1 Cross-cultural communication

Cross-cultural communication refers to the communication between native speakers and non-native speakers and the communication between two or more parties with differences in language or culture (Bao, 2012) [6]. The main characteristics of cross-cultural communication are as follows: a) The two parties have different cultural backgrounds or particular differences in their cultural habits and traditions. b) Communication among both parties use the same language in the process of communication since using the same language can improve the efficiency of communication. c) The conversation of both parties belongs to real-time oral communication. Therefore, in certain cross-cultural communication, such as Chinese and English, the practical application of pragmatics is indispensable. Pragmatics is the study of the meaning of language and how to understand and communicate with detailed utterances in given situations through context. The pragmatics has been played a key part in cross-cultural communication, which is manifested in context, language and lexis, that is, the appropriate use of language to minimize conflicts and misunderstandings. Applying pragmatic knowledge in English cross-cultural communication can help non-native English speakers better integrate into the society, enhance their sense of belonging in a foreign country and raise their overall proficiency in speaking English. For the listeners whose mother tongue is English, the effectiveness and interactivity of communication can be improved. For a long time, many linguists have devoted themselves to the study of pragmatics, from why it is pivotal in communication to how to play its function in a speech. The following are predominantly discussed from four aspects which are the Speech Act Theory, Cooperative Principle, Politeness Maxims and the Face Theory, respectively.

2.1.1 Speech Act Theory

Speech act theory was first mentioned and established by Austin, a British philosopher, in his book

How to do Things with Words in 1962 [7]. He believes that many utterances do not convey information but are equivalent to 'actions', namely speech acts. This view fundamentally changes the nature and function of language: it is not merely a passive description of the world or the transmission of information but an active implementation of an action. Austin further subdivided into three dimensions will Speech Acts. In other words, the locutionary act is speaking face to face with meaning, illocutionary act through by the host of "speak" everything is a kind of act. The perlocutionary act is SPEAKS TO THE CONSEQUENCES. It also can be understood as the three levels of verbal behaviour, which is just talking through at least three things we do: What is said (speaking behaviour), what is intended to be done (acting behaviour), and what effect is intended to be achieved (acquisitive behaviour). After Austin, Searle further revises and improves the speech act theory, especially highlighting the relationship between the speaker's intention and illocutionary force and puts forward the indirect speech act theory: An indirect speech act is an act that indirectly implements an act by implementing another act. Therefore, he divides indirect speech acts into two categories: conventional indirect speech acts and non-conventional indirect speech acts. According to Ma and Ge (2014) [8], for English learners, if they do not understand English indirect speech acts, they will encounter obstacles in English communication, which will lead to the inability of both parties to understand the real intention of the utterance in communication failure. Ma and Ge classified the expression of indirect speech acts in English into four forms. The first is the manifestation of words. For example, "not bad" is used instead of "very good" to express reserved dissatisfaction and approval and soften the tone of criticism. The second is the way of syntax. UNDER THE SAME CONDITIONS IN ENGLISH, THE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION GIVEN BY THE NEGATIVE SENTENCE IS LESS THAN ITS POSITIVE COUNTERPART, MAKING THE MEANING OF THE NEGATIVE AMBIGUOUS AND THUS MORE EUPHEMISTIC AND INDIRECT. FOR EXAMPLE, "I DON'T WANT TO WALK THE DOG ON A RAINY DAY" IS MORE POLITE THAN "I HATE WALKING THE DOG ON A RAINY DAY." THE PAST TENSE IS ALSO ONE OF THE TENSES IN WHICH ENGLISH SPEAKERS DARE TO BE POLITE BECAUSE IT OFTEN highlights things in the past, seemingly unrelated to present facts, and can therefore make requests, suggestions, more indirect. "I was wondering how long you have been working here?" "is it better than "I wonder how long you have been working here?". The third is the way of semantic expression. For example, semantic vagueness can give the language an indirectness. The speaker is evasive and allows the listener to unveil the real meaning behind the utterance rather than directly expressing it. The last one is the emergence of rhetoric, irony, metaphor,

exaggeration, and other rhetoric that can make the language indirect. According to Ma and Ge (2014) [8], irony is the most extreme manifestation of indirect language behaviour. People choose expressions that are diametrically opposite to their real verbal intention to achieve communication purposes, ostensibly trying to preserve the listener's face to express their honest thoughts indirectly.

2.1.2 Cooperative Principle

Grice first proposed the famous Cooperative Principle in his lecture *Logic and Conversation* at Harvard University in 1967 [9], the core of which is the principle of cooperation. Grice points out that "we can give a general principle to which participation is required, namely, that when interlocutor participates in a dialogue, he adapts his conversational contribution to such a need according to the accepted purpose or direction of the conversational exchange in which he participates, a concept known as the principle of cooperation." It is based on this principle that communication parties can have a smooth conversation. The cooperative principle of Grice consists of four items, the quantity maxim, that is, provide the appropriate amount of information and do not provide extra information than the required information. The quantity maxim is violated when less or more information is provided than is required for the current communication. The second is quality maxim, TELLING THE TRUTH. THE THIRD MAXIM IS RELEVANCE, WHICH MEANS THAT WHAT THE SPEAKER SAYS SHOULD BE CONNECTED TO THE CONVERSATIONAL GOAL. THE LAST IS THE MAXIM OF MANNER: AVOIDING VAGUE, OBSCURE EXPRESSIONS AND AVOIDING AMBIGUITY.

2.1.3 Politeness Maxims

In 1983 [10], British linguist Leech coined the politeness theory based on the cooperation maxims. Politeness maxims and cooperative PRINCIPLES COMPLEMENT EACH OTHER AND PLAY A GUIDING ROLE IN PEOPLE'S COMMUNICATION. INCLUDING SIX CONTENTS: THE TACT MAXIM, AS FAR AS POSSIBLE TO REDUCE THE COST OF OTHERS, AS FAR AS POSSIBLE TO INCREASE THE BENEFITS OF OTHERS; THE PRINCIPLE OF GENEROSITY IS TO MINIMIZE THE BENEFITS TO ONESELF AND MAXIMIZE THE COSTS TO ONESELF; APPROBATION MAXIM, AS FAR AS POSSIBLE TO lessen the criticism of others, as far as possible to enlarge the praise of others; The maxim of modesty, minimizing praise and exaggerating criticism; Agreement maxim, minimize the differences with others, as far as possible to exaggerate the same views with others; The maxim of sympathy cuts down dislike

for others and overstates compassion for others. However, as Leech said, even though the pragmatic principles of human society are the same, different nations and cultures have different focuses. For example, when they want to end an argumentative or confrontational discourse, Chinese people choose to make concessions, compromise or change the activity to avoid direct conflict, while German people think such behaviour is insincere, delayed and embarrassing (Susanne, 2008) [11]. The former follows the "agreement maxim" in the politeness maxim, while the latter follows the "quality maxim" in the cooperative principle, believing that the other party is not telling the truth and is not sincere. In many cultural exchanges between China and the West, Chinese people tend to be euphemistic and indirect compared with the West in terms of rejection, negation or argument. Although it violates the "quality maxim", it conforms to the "agreement maxim" and "sympathy maxim". While western culture tends to let people find the truth of things in debate, THE CONFLICT HAS ALWAYS BEEN SEEN AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO REFLECT PERSONAL VALUES. SIMILARLY, FOR native English speakers, direct refusal or compromise to END AN ARGUMENT IS IN LINE WITH THE "QUALITY MAXIM", BUT IT IS RUDE AND UNACCEPTABLE TO CHINESE PEOPLE. IN MANY CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION SITUATIONS, IT IS EASY TO CAUSE MISUNDERSTANDING IF THE ENTITY IGNORES THE Distinctions between the maxim of cooperation and politeness in different cultures.

2.1.4 Face Theory

The face theory is advanced by Brown and Levinson in 1978 [12], has an essential influence in pragmatics, including face, face-threatening acts (FTAs) and politeness strategy. Brown and Levinson (1987) [13] believed that if people want to cooperate in communication, they must follow the face theory. Brown and Levinson's definition of the face is technically inspired by Goffman's (1967) [14] DEFINITION OF THE FACE BORROWED FROM THE FOLK USAGE OF THE FACE IN ENGLISH. THAT IS, THE FACE CAN BE MAINTAINED AND THREATENED. THE FACE IS THE PERSONAL IMAGE OF EVERY SOCIAL MEMBER IN PUBLIC. IT CAN BE DIVIDED INTO A POSITIVE FACE AND A NEGATIVE FACE. A POSITIVE FACE MEANS THAT THE SPEAKER HOPES TO BE APPROVED AND LIKED BY OTHERS. IT REQUIRES BOTH SIDES OF COMMUNICATION TO EXPRESS CONSENSUS, INCLUDING APPRECIATION AND RECOGNITION OF THE OTHER SIDE, SO THAT THE LISTENERS' NEEDS CAN BE MET. A NEGATIVE FACE MEANS THAT AN INDIVIDUAL DOES NOT WANT OTHERS TO

IMPOSE ON HIM OR HER, OR THE INDIVIDUAL WILL NOT BE INTERFERED WITH AND HINDERED BY OTHERS. A NEGATIVE FACE REQUIRES THAT BOTH PARTIES IN COMMUNICATION DO NOT FORCE THE BEHAVIOUR PARTY TO ACCEPT THEIR VIEWS OR REQUIREMENTS, AVOID THE EMBARRASSMENT CAUSED BY THE OTHER PARTY BECAUSE THEY DO NOT KNOW HOW TO REFUSE, AND MAINTAIN THE OTHER PARTY'S NEGATIVE FACE NOT HURT. FACE-THREATENING ACTS, AS THE NAME IMPLIES, ARE THOSE THAT THREATEN THE FACE OF THE SPEAKER OR THE HEARER. BROWN AND LEVISON'S SEPARATED FTAS INTO THREATENING POSITIVE FACE BEHAVIOUR AND THREATENING NEGATIVE FACE BEHAVIOUR, RESPECTIVELY. CRITICIZING, RIDICULING, SCOLDING ARE ACTIONS THAT THREATEN POSITIVE FACES, ORDERING, WARNING, DEMANDING IS BEHAVIOURAL THREATEN NEGATIVE FACES. FACE CULTURE IS A COMMON CHARACTERISTIC IN CHINESE AND WESTERN CULTURE THAT ORDERS COMPLEX SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY AND PLAYS A VITAL ROLE IN CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION. FOR EXAMPLE, IN CHINA, DUE TO THE INFLUENCE OF TRADITIONAL CONFUCIAN CULTURE, THE FACE AMONG CHINESE IS THE PRESTIGE THAT PEOPLE HAVE FROM SOCIAL ACHIEVEMENTS, WHICH IS THE RECOGNITION OF PEOPLE'S VISIBLE ACHIEVEMENTS BY SOCIETY". TO A CERTAIN EXTENT, THIS REFLECTS THE SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FACE, BECAUSE IT IS OFTEN RELATED TO PERSONAL IMAGE, DIGNITY AND honour. Therefore, it is also used to explain and coordinate a code of conduct that people follow in interpersonal relations in China. In Chinese communicative culture, regardless of honours social distance, people will try their best to "save face", "earn face", and avoid "lose face". However, in western culture, face is more individual-centered AND FOCUSES ON INDIVIDUAL INDEPENDENT DEVELOPMENT. THEREFORE, IT IS HOPED THAT IN COMMUNICATION, THE OTHER PARTY CAN GIVE ENOUGH FACE TO TAKE THE CORRESPONDING REACTION THAN THEIR FREEDOM BEING INTERFERED WITH AND RESTRICTED. THIS CORRESPONDS TO DIFFERENT CULTURES' EMPHASIS ON A POSITIVE FACE AND NEGATIVE FACE. IN CHINA, PEOPLE ARE MORE INCLINED TO MAINTAIN A POSITIVE FACE, ATTACHING GREAT IMPORTANCE OWN RECOGNITION. HOWEVER, WESTERN CULTURE ATTACHES MORE IMPORTANCE TO THE MAINTENANCE OF NEGATIVE FACE. INDIVIDUALS ARE NOT

WILLING TO BE SUPPRESSED AND INTERFERED WITH BY OTHERS, AND MORE EMPHASIS IS PLACED ON THE FREEDOM OF INDIVIDUAL THOUGHT AND ACTION. THEREFORE, FACE THEORY SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION IN CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION.

2.1.5 *The current situation*

However, in the present stage of cross-cultural communication, pragmatic failures still lead to communication failures. Jenny Thomas, a British linguist, initiated pragmatic failures in 1983 [15]. She believed that pragmatic failures are "inappropriate or wrong understanding of what is said" and grouped them into pragmalinguistic failures and sociopragmatic failures. Pragmalinguistic failure refers to communication failure caused by incorrect choice and use of language in the process of communication, NAMELY, LINGUISTIC PROBLEMS. Sociopragmatic failure refers to the failure in communication due to the differences in cultural background, cognitive habits, geographical location and other aspects, resulting in the differences in social norms and terms. Such mistakes are common in cross-cultural communication and are mainly manifested in greeting, farewell, invitation, rejection, praise and address (Du, 2021) [16]. Tracing the causes of pragmatic failures, the first is pragmatic failures caused by cultural differences, the second is pragmatic failures caused by lack of context consideration, and the last is pragmatic failures caused by lack of cultural knowledge and identity (2021, Du) [16]. This requires us to enhance the sensitivity of second language learners to pragmatic competence while cultivating their language competence. For the first and third reasons, the learners need to have an updated understanding of the knowledge and common sense of the target country, such as historical allusions, common religious sense, life customs. For the second reason, the natural context environment is simulated so that the two parties with significant cultural differences can use language flexibly in combination with the context. Therefore, it is urgent to add the pragmatic test into the standardized test book with English as the lingua franca.

2.2 *Test Design*

Based on the standard English tests IELTS, TOEFL and PTE model, this paper puts forward some new suggestions on the content of the Standard English tests, that is, whether the pragmatic test should be included in the standard English tests. The test content is based on the four famous theories in pragmatics and is ANALYZED from the written and spoken parts, aiming to heighten the awareness and improve the learning of

the target pragmatic ability of non-native language examinees.

2.2.1 *Speech act theory (Written Test)*

The output of the speech act of the subject can be regarded as the main content of the evaluation of the pragmatic competence of the second language (Huang & Li, 2016) [17]. Speech act theory hypothesizes that the basic unit of human communication is not sentences or other means of expression, but certain behaviours, such as to request, command, refusal and apology. It is characterized by the speaker performing one or several similar behaviours through one sentence or several sentences, and the implementation of these behaviours will bring a certain influence on the hearer. This part is based on Hudson, Detmer and Brown's six kinds of pragmatic competence tests from 1992 to 1995 [18]. The content of the test is expanded from three kinds of speech acts: request, apology and rejection to six kinds of speech acts address, greeting and pleasantry. Request, apology and rejection are frequently used in daily life; while the latter seems to be common phrases, they are all difficult for international students to grasp when they enter English society. The multiple discourse completion tasks in Hudson et al. 's six pragmatic competence tests were used in this part of the test.

Example:

Scenario 1: Greetings

On the first day of the commencement ceremony, you greet a new student on the campus. He says hi first, and your answer is:

Max: How are you

You:

a.Hi, How are you?

b.I am fine. Thank you, and you?

c.Hi, Good morning.

d.Hello, I am ok. How are you?

Suggested Answer: A, c, d.

Many new overseas students do not know how to answer the question "How are you" properly. Although the b answer is considered the standard answer in Chinese textbooks, it is considered unnatural, rude and negative for native English speakers. First of all, it is a very formal greeting and is rarely used. Secondly, it makes native speakers think the questioner is upset or giving a false answer.

Scenario 2: Address

You have already taken three lectures with James Lee (He is your instructor at the university). If you want to send him an email to ask a question you didn't understand in class, how would you begin with him:

- a. My Dear Professor
- b. Dear Professor Lee
- c. Dear James
- d. Hi James

Suggested Answer: B, c.

The use of address language mainly depends on the social distance between the speaker and the hearer. Only had three classes, and the teacher should be unfamiliar with their students. Directly starting with 'Hi James' will make the relationship too close, while answer 'a' is too distant and stiff.

Scenario 3: Pleasantry

When you meet your lecturer Debra at the bus stop, you are about to say something to her, and you prefer to start with:

- a. Hi, dear professor.
- b. Hi, how are you, Debra?
- c. HI DEBRA, WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO?
- d. Nice day, isn't it?

Suggested Answer: B, d.

When communicating with native English speakers, the most important thing is to avoid asking about specific, personal things. However, the answer "a" is too polite and stiff.

Scenario 4: Request

When you arrived in Sydney, you were going to have coffee with your friends. You have pointed to cold brew and said to the waiter:

- a. I want that cold brew.
- b. Give me that cold brew.
- c. Can I have the cold brew one?
- d. May I have the cold brew, venti, please?

Suggested Answer: C, d.

Because of the difference usage between Chinese and English, interrogative sentences are more polite when making requests in English. However, in Chinese, people tend to use imperative sentences to make requests.

Scenario 5: Apology

When someone bumps into you accidentally, and they say sorry, you say:

- a. It doesn't matter.
- b. That's all right.
- c. No worries.
- d. No problem.

Suggested Answer: B, c, d.

The condition of the speech act of apology is that the apologizer must sincerely apologize, and the apologizer also hopes that the offended party can show tolerance and accept the apology. Such a speech act of apology is complete. In Chinese, accepting an apology often involves saying, "It doesn't matter", but the literal translation of 'it doesn't matter' in English does not mean that the listener has accepted the apology. This will lead to a negative transfer from Chinese to English.

Scenario 6: Rejection

When your best friend invited you to her home for dinner, you turned her down because you were too busy with your classes. At this moment, you will say:

- a. Sorry, I can't because I haven't done my essay yet.
- b. Sorry, I need to submit my 6000 words essay tomorrow.
- c. I would love to come and join you, but 6000 words are waiting for me to finish; I am afraid I don't have time for dinner.
- d. Oh, I feel bad because I can't come but can I join next time?

Suggested Answer: a, b, c, d.

The speech act of refusal is relatively similar in Chinese and English culture, because it is a potential threat to face and breaks the politeness principle. Nevertheless, the difference is that in Chinese, rejection is relatively euphemistic. In this example, answer 'a' and 'd' tends to be western and answer 'b' is more

indirect and euphemistic. In addition, it is a sign of respect to the person being rejected, whether in the West or the East, to specify the reason for the refusal. Therefore, answer 'c' is a complete and respectful rejection.

2.2.2 Cooperative Principle (Written Test)

The main testing direction of the principle of cooperation is to investigate the four criteria. Because conversational implicature exists in a context, it is necessary to test the application of the four principles in context. The examination of the cooperation principle can be based on the speech act examination, in the form of judgment questions, and the examinee is required to give reasons after judging true or false. For example, answer b (I AM FINE, THANK YOU AND YOU?) in scenario 1 violates the quality maxim for the listeners whose native language is English. People sometimes speak words that are not true or lack evidence intentionally due to politeness, comfort and ignorance of how to use sentences in specific situations in conversation.

Scenario 7: Quantity Maxim

1.A: When exactly do you graduate?

B: 2021.

2.A: What's the date today?

B: On December 13th. This time last year, we were in the Maldives having much fun with many new friends.

Suggested Answer: False; False.

Both are false because number one violates the quantity maxim, and the listener doesn't give enough information. The second question is also wrong because it provides too much information and is off-topic.

Scenario 8: Quality Maxim

3.Your friend asks you: How are you today?

You are in a bad mood but reply: I am great, you?

4.You have known from your professor that your best friend is failed in her class, you are trying to comfort her, you will say:

I have heard from our professor that you will be fine.

Suggested Answer: FALSE; False.

In question 3, the hearer may, for various reasons, deliberately say something that is not true, that is, 'I am not good, thus violating the quality maxim. In question 4, the speaker uses a comforting language strategy, but it's not true and therefore violates the quality principle.

Scenario 9: Relevance Maxim

5.Your roommate is spiting mean words about another your mutual friend,

She says: Sally is such a pain in the neck. She always asks others for help when she can't do her own thing.

You: What would you like to eat later?

Suggested Answer: False.

In question 5, the hearer's answer violates the relevance maxim; the hearer's answer is irrelevant to the speaker's question. Although the listener uses a gentle way to make the speaker understand that she does not want to participate the topic, she violates relevance maxims.

Scenario 10: Manner Maxim

6.Your flat-mate wants you to buy some chips for her. She says:

Because I'm taking an online class right now, and the tutor will call the roll later. I already walked the dog for you. It's a nice day today. Would you like a snack? If you want cookies, bring me a bag of crisps.

Suggested Answer: False.

Question 6 violates the rule of manner because it is not perspicuous, not brief and not orderly. Although the speaker makes some understatement to be polite, it is still too jumbled.

2.2.3 Politeness Maxim (Oral Test, Open-ended Question)

An examination of the politeness maxim is more about testing how to use the six-core politeness principles in different contexts. This part investigated the use of Discourse role-play Tasks by Hudson et al. (1992-1995) [18], which required the subjects and native speakers to perform role play in the specified situation and imitate authentic language communication.

Scenario 11:

Whether the listener is consciously using the principle of sympathy while the speaker is explaining a sad event.

Speaker: I feel bad since my grandpa had passed away last week.

Hearer: _____.

Suggested answer: In this case, the hearer is supposed to say some comforting words, such as "Oh, I am sorry to hear that ',' Do you feel better now?".

Scenario 12:

Your new flat-mate asks you: What do you think of my new dog?

You: _____.

Suggested answer: The listener is expected to say something complimentary, but be careful about social distancing not to exaggerate or fake the compliment. Approbation is also an essential part of the politeness maxim, so it is significant TO USE AFFIRMATION, ENCOURAGEMENT, AND PRAISE IN COMMUNICATION. HOWEVER, BE AWARE OF THE SOCIAL DISTANCE BETWEEN THE LISTENER AND THE SPEAKER WHEN USING THESE LANGUAGE STRATEGIES. Overstated compliments from unfamiliar friends can make the conversation seem false, so be careful.

2.2.4 The Face theory (Written & Oral Test)

THE STUDY OF FACE THEORY CAN RUN THROUGH THE WHOLE STUDY OF PRAGMATIC THEORY. BROWN AND LEVINSON BELIEVE THAT MANY SPEECH ACTS THREATEN FACE IN NATURE, AND PAYing attention to politeness mitigates the threat brought by certain communicative behaviours to face. In social communication, we should respect each other's positive faces and take care of each other's negative faces. However, Mao (1994) [19] put forward a new opinion that "due to the enormous difference between China and the West, the model based on Brown and Levinson's face theory is not universally applicable. Therefore, according to the examinee's target language and country, reasonably give the cultural customs close to the target country, for example, in the examination questions for the English studying examinees whose mother tongue is Chinese, more investigations on the negative face should be added, so that the examinees can understand the use of local language and culture as soon as possible. The examination of face theory can be combined in written and oral tests. Multiple-choice discourse completion tasks can be used in written tests. In the oral test, Discourse role-play can be used.

Scenario 13 (MDCT)

When you express your preference for an item of your English-speaking friend's:

- a.I don't like it.
- b.I hate it.
- c.I am not too fond of it.
- d.I am not very interested in it.

Suggested answer: c, d.

This question aims to test "to what extent, the hearer's positive face will be hurt". Answer b is the most harmful to the hearer's positive face, followed by a.

Scenario 14 (DRPT)

You want your friends to wait for you while everyone else is getting ready to go out.

You _____ will _____ say:
_____.

Suggested answer: What is examined here is your language strategy in the face of a threat to the negative face of the other party. The first type of answer is rude, like "wait, I will be here quickly." Another one is more euphemistic, like "Could you give me 5 minutes?".

3. CONCLUSION

With the deepening of global economic integration, the transnational connections are closer, and English, as a global language, has a broader range of applications. A language is a tool of communication, and the language of different countries and cultures has its uniqueness, which leads to different pragmatic habits. As a concrete manifestation of communicative competence, pragmatic competence enables interlocutors to ensure the appropriateness of cross-cultural communication through rational language principles. This paper designs some questions and references answers depending on speech act theory, cooperative principle, politeness maxim, and face theory. Firstly, it is hoped that pragmatic competence, as a cross-cultural communication competence as key as linguistic competence, can be considered in the standard English test. Secondly, it is hoped to give some suggestions to Chinese students who will study in English-speaking countries to better integrate into local life; that is, it is time to strengthen the knowledge of pragmatics.

Pragmatic understanding is a prerequisite for successful pragmatic expression. In expressing a speech act, speakers often convey their feelings and attitudes through indirect discourse, allowing the hearer to infer (Sperber & Wilson 2002) [20]. In order to understand speech acts, the interlocutor must acquire contextual information in real-time, such as the roles and social status of the informal parties and the environment in which the conversation takes place, in addition to language understanding (such as vocabulary and syntax). Therefore, pragmatic competence and linguistic competence are equally important. The research on the pragmatic competence test of the second language has only been more than 20 years. Although some achievements have been made in test conception, tool development and validity research, the field research is still in its infancy (Cohen 2008; Roever, 2013) [21] [22]. In particular, there are still many problems in the theoretical basis, the representativeness of pragmatic competence constructs and the authenticity of testing tasks. Secondly, this article only refers to Chinese students' present situation has carried on the design of questions and answers. To scholars of both boasts, who are interested in a single cultural communication and cross-cultural communication in the multiple cultural communication can concentrate on other countries to help international students better absorb into local life.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. De Saussure. (1959). *Course in General Linguistics*. (1959). New York: Philosophical Library. [JL]
- [2] N. Chomsky. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [3] D. Hymes. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- [4] M. A. Halliday. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London.
- [5] Y. Cui, & Q. Yang. (2008). On pragmatics and language testing. *Journal of Northwest University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 1.
- [6] B. Wang. (2012). A Brief Literature Review on Cross Cultural Adaptation Studies. *Journal of Lanzhou Jiaotong University*, 5.
- [7] J. L. Austin. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*[M]. London: Oxford University Press.
- [8] M. Ma, & B. Ge. (2014). Indirect Speech Acts: Means of Presentation and Pedagogical Implications. *Shandong Foreign Language Teaching Journal*, 02.
- [9] H. P. Grice. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. Speech acts, ed. by Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan, 41-58. *Syntax and semantics*, 3.
- [10] G. N. Leech. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- [11] H. Spencer-Oatey. (Ed.). (2008). *Culturally speaking second edition: Culture, communication and politeness theory*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- [12] P. Brown, & S. C. Levinson. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-311). Cambridge University Press.
- [13] P. Brown, & S. C. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- [14] E. Goffman. (1967). On face-work. *Interaction ritual*, 5-45.
- [15] J. Thomas. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied linguistics*, 4(2), 91-112.
- [16] Y. Du.(2021). Pragmatic Failure Analysis and Avoidance Strategies from the Perspective of Cross-cultural Communication. *Journal of Inner Mongolia University of Finance and Economics* (01), 131-133.
- [17] W. Huang, & X. Li (2016). Review and Prospect of Foreign Second Language Pragmatic Assessment. *Journal of PLA University of Foreign Languages*, (02), 82-90.
- [18] T. Hudson, E. Detmer, & J. D. Brown. (1995). *Developing prototype measures of cross-cultural pragmatics*. Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii.
- [19] L. R. Mao. (1994). Beyond politeness theory: 'Face' revisited and renewed. *Journal of pragmatics*, 21(5), 451-486.
- [20] D. Sperber, & D. Wilson. *Relevance, Communication and Cognition* [M]. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1995.
- [21] A. D. Cohen. Teaching and assessing L2 pragmatics: What can we expect from learners? [J]. *Language Teaching*, 2008, 41 (2) : 213-235.
- [22] C. Roever. Assessment of pragmatics [C] // C. A. Chapelle. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2013: 1-8.