LICENCIATURA EN EDUCACIÓN CON ÉNFASIS EN INGLÉS

HOW TO DESIGN A PEDAGOGICAL FRAMEWORK TO ACHIEVE ILLOCUTIONARY STRENGTH IN THE LEARNER'S ENGLISH EXPRESSIBILITY

LEIDY XIOMARA MARTÍNEZ SIERRA

CARTAGENA DE INDIAS D. T y C.

2017

¡Formamos Profesionales Bilingües!

LICENCIATURA EN EDUCACIÓN CON ENFASIS EN INGLÉS

HOW TO DESIGN A PEDAGOGICAL FRAMEWORK TO ACHIEVE

ILLOCUTIONARY STRENGTH IN THE LEARNER'S ENGLISH EXPRESSIBILITY

LEIDY XIOMARA MARTÍNEZ SIERRA

Trabajo de grado para optar al título de
Licenciado en Educación con Énfasis en Inglés

Asesor
MARCELO JOSÉ CABARCAS ORTEGA

CARTAGENA DE INDIAS D. T y C.

2017

NOTA DE ACEPTACIÓN

_____

_____

_____

_____

JURADO

_____

JURADO

Dedicado a

A Dios por regalarme la vida y haberme permitido realizar este trabajo,

A Gilberto Romero y mis hijas Geraldine, Shairine y Nataly por su apoyo incondicional,

A mis profesores que contribuyeron a mi formación académica.

Agradecimientos

A Gilberto Romero Sierra quien leyó este escrito y dio sugerencias.

A Geraldine y Shairine Romero que ayudaron a transcribir este escrito.

.

Tabla de contenido

How to Design a Pedagogical Framework to Achieve Illocutionary Strength in the Learner's English Expressibility

Summary

The act of speaking by the principle of expressiveness requires that there be analytic connections between the speech act (what the speaker means), what the phrase uttered means (or any other linguistic element), what the speaker intends (intention), what the listener understands (meaning) and the rules that govern the different linguistic elements, that must converge in the same plane of action so that the dynamics of the conversational circularity of a linguistic community is fulfilled. If this dynamics of circularity is not present in the conversational act, the "play of language" is not concretized. Therefore, it is important to point out that it is fundamental that the English teacher can assist the student's expressibility without interrupting the "degree" of discursive fluency in which the learner's linguistic resources and emotional resources allow the student to behave as a member of the new linguistic community.

Keywords*: language games, principle of expressibility, speech acts, social semiotics, conversation, discursive performance*

Introduction

The learning of English as a foreign language is a linguistic phenomenon that must be revised to enable the design of a pedagogical framework that continuously facilitates the increase of the expressibility of the learner, it means that the learner's illocutionary force transcends the classroom level towards a "language game" that allows the learner to be a member of this new linguistic community. For this, it is suggested to recognize the existence of three pedagogical paths in the communicative interaction, namely: speech production, learner expressibility, the consumption of the speech (the teacher and the "classroom" listen) and the continuity of discourse (learner-teacher and "classroom" in interaction).

If speech does not have continuity, that is, if expressiveness is interrupted by the act of evaluating, a destruction or annulment occurs. Otherwise, there is a discursive enhancement suitable for expressibility. Consequently, in the pedagogical design has to be delineated with an epistemic structure that allows the teacher to have the ability to identify the indicator of illocutionary force of the emission that is present in the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic structure of the expression; that is to say, the teacher must recognize the illocutionary force indicators: word order, emphasis, intonation curve, punctuation, verb mode, verbs (Searle, 1969; 1979). Now, how to attend these devices without breaking the communicative interaction?

In the same sense, it must be understood that language is there precisely to generate meaning in a conversational context, but this will be possible only if there are openness in the phenomenon of listening, this will be one of the devices that will allow to recognize the indicator of Illocutionary force, language penetrates the field of the conversational, if the listening gives validity to speech (Searle, 1969). That is to say: when expressing "Hi" is not realized with the intention of practicing a phrase of a book, but is expressed with the meaning of greet and

transmit certain emotions to the listener with the greeting. Then when the "game" of communication is set up, "new" forms of behavior are created, to the "Hi", the listener can respond with an emission of another "hello" raising or not, possibly smiling, etc. Because in language there is a system of constitutive rules of the form "X counts as Y in the context C" (Searle, 1969; 1979) which may translate that with the greeting" Hi" and the "hello"answer establishes a real social interaction that must be continued or maintained.

From the above it may be suggested that the expressions "hi" and "hello" constitute a social empathy that must be maintained in favor of expressibility according to Wittgenstein's theory (Wittgenstein, 1962), for whom significant propositions or statements are connected with the world in an empirical form and the logical structure between language and reality makes the empirical connection relevant. In the same sense, in the *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus* (1921), Wittgenstein proposes the "pictographic theory of meaning", that is, the linguistic statements have meaning. Meaningful prepositions can paint the world or a particular "state of things." Here, one is in the presence of another illocutionary force indicating device, the use of language, the functional understanding of words by their use in specific socio-cultural contexts, what Wittgenstein called "life forms"; because communication is effective and the meaning of words is determined by their use in language.

If the act of teaching becomes mechanical, then it is not enough to understand that learning is a dynamic process that implies that the interaction between teacher, learner and context must be located on the same plane, only from that point of convergence can generate cognitive transfers, emotional and pragmatic that transcend the curricular spaces.

In English teaching tends to pay more attention to the discursive action of the teacher and, to a lesser extent, to that of the learner. The discursive action of the first is observed because it

becomes necessary to know the disciplinary knowledge of the teacher and his teaching methodology. While the discursive performance of the learner is taken care of in the measure that it is evaluated its ability to imitate and to repeat a given text and not its capacity of expressibility in a real social context. That is, it investigates the discursive action that underlies the pedagogical need to evaluate, not to the interests of the learner or to the history of the classroom in its particular social semiotic "situation".

This leads to difficulties in learning that are increased by not understanding that in the classroom of English as a foreign language not only produces linguistic transfers, but also socio-cultural transfers. These require for the dynamics of learning itself that the learner exercises in addition to a discursive action on these diverse socio-cultural spaces do on their own socio-cultural space. However, textbooks, when designed abroad, do not refer to the particular context of the learner. Then, the expressibility of it, becomes deficient or ineffective to manifest the proper feeling of its context.

In short, if one looks more closely at the expressibility of the learner in the pedagogical process, it is possible to find that this topic requires more attention than has hitherto been offered. It is possible to say that between the teacher and the learner of English as a foreign language there is no "real" communicative act immersed in a social semiotics because it has been distorted by virtue of the academic evaluation process and other factors, the functional meaning of speech act and where the apprentice attends more to the possibility of repeating the content of a text than to experience the communicative act in a genuine way and, it means that, the teacher concentrating more on attending to the evaluative task (correction, etc.) "Continually breaks" the act of communicative circularity.

The reason is that when the learner speaks, the teacher must take certain determined actions to put into play the communicative interaction, since, for a bet to take place, it must be accepted by another, who must say "accept"; you cannot say that there is a gift if you say "I give you" but the object is never delivered (Austin, 1962; 1979; 1982) that is, it must be recognized that in the educational process for the teaching of English the speech acts must transcend the classroom, otherwise, one enters into what Austin calls the doctrine of misfortunes (Austin, 1962; 1979; 1982). The scope of action of misfortunes extends and concentrates in a special way on the attention of the expressibility of the learner that is not "understood" by the teacher or by the classroom-auditorium.

How can the factors linked to the pedagogical activity that impede the expressibility and break with the circularity of the communicative act of the learner of English as a foreign language can be mitigated in the classroom?

Based on the aforementioned the general objective of this paper is to construct a pedagogical framework that takes into account the continuity of the discourse and the grammar of recognition as principles of circularity of an idiomatic community and its communicative interaction. The specific objectives for this are the following:

- Analyze the epistemic elements that give value to the recognition grammar.
- Analyze the principle of circularity that makes possible the illocutionary force that transcends the curricular spaces.
- Describe the pedagogical devices that facilitate the convergence in a same plane of action the teacher, the apprentice and the context to make effective the communicative act within the classroom.

- Provide pedagogical tools that allow the teacher to progressively increase expressiveness and recognize the different movements of socio-cultural contexts of the English learner.

There is justification for all these: learner's "expressiveness" underlies three fundamental elements for Discourse Analysis that transcends curricular spaces: real semiotic-social needs or communicative requirements, linguistic cognition of English as a foreign language, and the pragmatic possibility of idiomatic interaction, which are not measurable from the traditional evaluative system of English language institutes, that cannot "comprehend" the history of the classroom, because each apprentice as an individual, he is not part of a "universal audience". This idea of universalization makes learning failed. Consequently, it is necessary for the effectiveness of communication in the classroom to review or observe the discursive performance of the learner in their communicative actions for the target language and to respond, both teacher and learner pairs, factual and theoretically according to the learner's speech acts; that is, the communicative act becomes functional.

In the speech act there are analytical connections between what the speaker means, what he actually says, what the linguistic elements emitted, what the listener understands, and the effects that the illocutionary act produces on the listener (Searle, 1969; 1983). Now, if these analytical connections are not placed on the same plane, then the communicative process does not occur or occurs defectively. From this it is suggested that for the English teaching as a foreign language, a pedagogical design must be constructed that takes into account these analytical connections of language.

On the other hand, in order to facilitate the learner's communicative needs, one must have criteria that allow one to "intuit" or understand that at certain moments of learning, the learner does not have certain verbal or scriptural resources that allow him to say what the learner means,

Its expressiveness is limited, but even so, the "communicative act", nor its essence of real and social action, should not be broken.

If one takes into account the context, then it must be recognized in Austin's terms that language must always be manifested as an act of realization, that is to say, there is an intention of the speaker to communicate in order to produce "effects" in the listener. It is not only that the speaker wants to say something, but also intends to communicate so that the listener moves in the direction of the speaker's intention. And that movement of the listener, constitutes the purpose of the intention of the expressibility of the speaker. For example, the learner expresses: How's everything going, it involves voice type, loudness, pitch, articulation, speech speed, etc., a new idiomatic self and a new behavior as a member of a language community.

Given the above, when an apprentice expresses: "How's everything going", this expression involves the following factors: the types of voice, loudness, pitch, articulation, speech speed, etc. A new idiomatic self, backed with a new social behavior as a member of a language community, teh learner hopes to be identify as an effective member. This makes the learner maintain an internal tension because of the asymmetry of his expressibility in his language related to expressibility in the language he learns. This tension is manifest and is accentuated by the cultural changes that he undergoes in his new expressibility. This phenomenon of asymmetries must be part of the pedagogical design, Halliday said that even the new form of a driver's seat has relevance in the new driving emotions (Halliday, 1982).

In short, the discursive act of pedagogical action has focused more on what the teacher communicates and does, in such a way that the study or investigation of the discursive act of the learner has been neglected, this has resulted in the attention of the classroom is oriented toward what the teacher does in cognitive and socio-emotional terms (motivation), and it is considered

that learning is attended whenever "evaluative processes" are made on the learner. However, there is a discursive act of the learner whose progress indicator is measurable in terms of the expressibility devices that correspond to the semiotic-social interactions that effect the learner's communication in the target language. This indicates that the teacher attends with greater commitment the "text path", that is, how much has been "given" of the book, how much can the learner's lesson and not his pragmatic profitability of expressibility, since to the expressibility the teacher In response to evaluation or other factors, does not respond as an interlocutor but as an evaluator thereby distorting the communicative act.

So as to referring to analytical backgrounds, language plays a social role in the construction of the world (Austin, 1962, 1979, 1982). For communication to occur, explains Halliday, there must be interactivity with the different functions of language, examples: instrumental language (I want), regulatory language (do what I say), interactive language (existence of a self and your), personal language (I'm here to identify), heuristic language (explain why), imaginative language (idealizations) and informative language (I have something to tell you), (Halliday, 1982). In the same sense, Gadamer expresses that language only has a real existence in the fact that the world is represented by words (Gadamer, 1977), then when an apprentice expresses words, he intends to communicate something and that communicate is to penetrate the use of the interactive language. That language fulfills this social role.

On the other hand, Wittgenstein is interested in the use of "ordinary language" (Wittgenstein, 1961). For Wittgenstein, the nature and function of language is that language is the expression of thought and, at the same time, a representation of reality. According to him, language, thought and reality have the same logical form, so that language and thought can "paint" the facts of reality (Cowan, 1961, Levison, 1964). The significant propositions or statements are connected

to the world empirically, but it is the similar logical structure between language and reality that makes the empirical connection relevant (Hacker, 2005), Wittgenstein wanted to establish a connection between the logic of "ordinary language" and the empirical world (Hacker, 2005). Accordingly, Wittgenstein proposes in the Tractatus Logico Philosophicus what is known as the "pictorial theory of meaning" (Keyt, 1964). When language is used correctly, linguistic statements have meaning. From this perspective, it may be suggested that when an apprentice exercises his expressiveness, the learner intends to "use a concrete, real language" to "paint" meanings of the world to share with a linguistic community: to connect with the world through language.

The functional understanding of words comes from its use in social or specific cultural, or what Wittgenstein referred to as "forms of life" contexts. Language is very similar to a social activity in which people aspire to communicate with others (Wittgenstein, 1961), the meaning of a word does not come from the object or thing it represents; on the contrary, the word gains its concrete or particular meaning within the social situation where it is used and depends on how it is used in such a situation. The issue of language as a social activity is crucial for Wittgenstein to the extent that language and meaning are linked to communication and understanding between human beings. The social dimension has to do with the fact that "meaningful use" is shared by more than one individual. The English learner minimally aspires to express something significantly in a social context.

Similarly, from other perspectives they have also developed educational proposals based on different models of Discourse Analysis to investigate the performance of English teachers. This is how the work of Bellak (1966), which starts with the theory of speech acts of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), is recognized. It takes into account the correspondence between the statement

and the function it has in the communication. In the same vein, the research developed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) who work on and transform the Bellak model not only take into account what happens in the communicative situation in the classroom, but also other pedagogical factors. There is also the model presented by Fanselow (1987). This model includes the discourse analysis, both of the generated by the teacher as the one generated by the learner.

Now, with Skinner and his Verbal Behavior (1948), a new theoretical paradigm emerges on the model of language and how to teach. They follow the theoretical concepts developed by Chomsky (1986) with which the language was understood as a type of knowledge that had its own rules and was specific to human beings. Later, the fundamental objective of linguistics was the explanation of the "linguistic competence" of human beings. From here we come to expressibility, based on the idea of linguistic competence, as the basis of communication.

On the other hand, a less mentalistic approach to the language, anthropological current, was developed that considered language not only as a mental system but also as a "social semiotic" system that could be studied through the "ethnography of communication". And although linguistic competence was an important object of analysis, linguistic "performance" could provide insights into how language was organized. This structural dimension of the language was understood as uses of the language that affected the meaning of what was said or written and, of course, the way in which the recipient of the message constructed the meaning. Hymes challenges Chomskyan theory by stating that generative grammar was an excellent theory for explaining syntax, but it was not satisfactory to provide an explanation of the general language in Hymes and Gumperz *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (1972) and Labov *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black Vernacular English* (1972).

In the field of foreign language teaching, Searle's theory of speech acts facilitates the introduction of the concept of discourse. Wilkins (1972; 1973; 1976), shows the contradictions of the sequencing system or conversational shifts used so far and proposes a curriculum based on the semantic aspects of the language and not on its morphosyntactic structures. Van Ek develops the proposal in *The Threshold Level 1*, published in 1975. Subsequently, the notional-functional approaches, which considered the acts of speech (or linguistic functions, of the field of the Methodology of the teaching of foreign languages) as new linguistic elements object of learning, without paying attention to their complex interaction with the ample contexts in which they appeared.

However, in the field of English teaching, it was H.G. Widdowson (1973) who *presents An applied linguistic approach to discourse analysis*, and in 1978 publishes *Teaching Language as Communication*, in which he devotes a chapter to the discourse; A year later, Explorations in Applied Linguistics, addresses the same aspect. Other contributions to discourse theory and expressibility are: *Towards an Analysis of Discourse* by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Coulthard's *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* of 1977. In 1979 Brumfit and Johnson publish a collection of articles: *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching* with the initial proposals of Hymes and Halliday.

In relation to the expressibility, the analysis of the conversation is not taken care much. However, Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) make contributions that went almost unnoticed in the world of language teaching. Allwright (1988) was the first author of this field who made significant use of the concepts of distribution of turns. This proposal is very close to the idea of expressibility that is defended in this text. These concepts were used not so much to define the curricular contents of the teaching of a foreign language as to provide basic and reasonable ideas

that favored the development of research on what really happened in language classrooms. All this brings us closer to one of the fundamental aspects of discourse and language teaching that has played an important role in two areas of foreign language teaching: discourse as a component of the curriculum that must be covered through the action of teachers and students (the linguistic model) and discourse as a basic component of student teacher interaction in the classroom. Today, interest in the discourse generated by interaction in the classroom grows. Chaudron (1988) offers an excellent synthesis of the interest aroused among researchers, and Van Lier (1988) presents a good model for the qualitative research of this type of discourse.

Return to the statement and in a broader sense, the elements concerning pragmatics must be reviewed. Pragmatics is an aspect of linguistics, alongside semantics and syntax, which has a wide field of intersection with a transdiscipline of the human and social sciences that systematically studies written and spoken discourse as a form of use of Language, as an event of communication and as interaction. This transdisciplinary is called textual linguistics or discourse analysis (Long and Sato, 1983) has as object of study the functioning of languages within social and cultural life. Discourse analysis emerged in the 1960s and 1970s, presenting itself as an integrating discipline of many others that are interested in understanding what languages are and what linguistic uses are. Communication is a very complex interactive process since it includes the continuous interpretation of the intentions expressed, either directly or in a hidden way; Therefore, it concerns both what is meant and what is actually said. That is, the intentions of the speaker or writer, the linguistic and non-linguistic forms that are used at the time of speaking or writing, as well as the interpretations that the recipients of the messages make and which may or may not coincide with the intentions of the one who emits the words (Long and Sato, 1983).

An analysis of the linguistic forms can be made to discover how the use of these forms is conditioned by a context and, at the same time, can create one; Can be understood as an instrument of social action that works with authentic data; (Long and Sato, 1983) in this context, the role of the language in its communicative dimension is presented as a scenario where most of the activities are made possible by linguistic uses (Cazden, 1988; Within the pragmatics and discourse analysis many studies have been carried out on foreign languages, but the most influential contributions in this field have been: Speech Acts (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969); *The theory of politeness* (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Leech, 1983), and *Conversational Maxims* (Grice, 1975) and Halliday's *Functional Linguistics* (1978, 1985).

Pertaining to the conceptual framework in which this thesis is based on, here there are the following categories:

Language games: In *Philosophical Investigations*, Wittgenstein (1953; 1999) will use the expression games of language to refer to the multiple and diverse discursive possibilities offered by language. It is an expression of the referentialist function of language to analyze other communicative alternatives: "I will also call" language play "to the whole formed by the language and the actions with which it is interwoven" (Wittgenstein, 1953). For Wittgenstein, there is interpersonal communication and intercultural communication and the ethnographic and anthropological analysis of the communicative processes (Jacorzynski, 2011), deploying its pragmatic dimension in all its depth: not only as a philosophy of language, but also as a philosophy of culture and of communication.

With Wittgenstein, the referentialist proposal of the Tractatus moves towards the pragmatic sphere of the very action of communicating through the use we make of words (Hierro, 1986). Thus the meaning of expressions no longer lies in their ability to figure something out of reality,

but remains linked to questions derived from the use of words in everyday life. From the expression language game interpretation is thus linked to a social and everyday activity (a way of life): the activity of using language with multiple communicative ends that transcend the mere will to say how the world is or is not (Wittgenstein, 1953). What is ultimately affirmed is that the meaning of a word is its use in language.

Synthesizing, meaning is so linked to the behavior of individuals in the world, the shared and common use of language, the communicative intention of each of these uses. Thus, the normativity of the use (of games) of language lies precisely in the same act of sharing uses by a particular community or culture. To exemplify the idea of use and play of language, Wittgenstein proposes the concept of following a rule; As if to follow the rules of a game, such as chess, only now the game is none other than ordinary language itself, as an act of communication in a broad sense. However, while language is first and foremost the place where communication takes place, language is not only a criterion of correction but also, and above all, is a criterion of communication: describe in an exemplary way how to use a certain game of language in a given community. Thus, communicative behaviors according to rules describe and prescribe how the rules are followed.

Speech Acts: The idea of how to do things with words, such as doing things with language, ends up becoming the theory of speech acts in Austin (Austin, 1962, 1979, 1982). For Austin speech acts are classified as: speech act, that which informs, warns, commits, etc .; An illocutionary act is one in which a sentence is expressed with a certain degree of reference and meaning, that is, it has some conventional force and finally, for Austin, the perlocutionary act is one that causes something to persuade, convince, surprise , Confuse, deter, etc. That is, in the hearer an effect is produced by the speech act. This effect is for Austin the realization act of the

emission: "an expression is a realization if the listener makes an action" (Austin, 1962, 1979, 1982).

Now, in terms of Searle theory, there are three different kinds of speech acts:

- Acts of emission (morphemes, sentences).
- Propositional acts (refer and preach).
- Illocutionary acts (enunciate, ask, promise, argue, etc.).

They are not separate acts of the speakers, but when carrying out an illocutionary act characteristically they perform propositional acts and acts of emission (Searle, 1969, 1983). Nor should it be thought to be Searle (Searle, 1963) expresses that the acts of issuance and the propositional acts are to illocutionary acts, that to buy a ticket and to get on a train is to make the trip by rail. They are not meant for ends, the acts of emission are to the propositional and illocutionary acts of what an X in a ballot of vote is to the fact to vote.

In summary, in relation to the theory of speech acts, even recognizing for language a locutive act, related to the fact of saying something to the production of sounds - phonetic, to the grammatical organization of words - , An entire dimension of intentions inherent to the effective use of language (illocutionary force), as well as effects that are obtained through its use and that demand to be interpreted rationally as an integral part of the communication, is deployed. It is as in the program elaborated by Grice that develops the theory of speech acts as a properly pragmatic theory of meaning (Hierro, 1986), the meaning is solved through the interpretation of implicatures, that is, to follow certain maxims that They determine communication as an act of cooperation between interlocutors based on the shared social and cultural elements: mode of the rules of language.

Social Semiotics: This paper recognizes the importance of social semiotics observed from the perspective that the signs and symbols of language and expressibility are part of life itself and social practices that include teaching in the classroom. Enterder the idea of social semiotics is to understand the presence of a culture and a "time within the culture," which would be the continuous and constitutive aspect of social practices, teaching is a social practice. A social semiosis located within a time and a culture where meanings circulate. Expressibility has presence and recognition in a linguistic community and that community is a particular social community. It may be suggested here that the concept of situational context, which indicates that expressibility and language are not employed in nothingness, "operate in 'situational contexts', and any explanation of language that omits to include the situation as an essential ingredient possibly artificial and useless". (Halliday 1982).

Following the annotated, by social semiotics are understood the socio-cultural particularities of a classroom and the interactive communicational projections of the learner in the curricular and extracurricular spaces

Discourse Performance: By discursive action or expressiveness we understand both the pedagogical-didactic intention of the teacher to expose linguistic activity and the ability of the learner to use English in new social semiotic situations inside and outside the classroom. However, in this text only the learner's discursive action will be taken care of: its acts of emission, illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts that include communicative circularity.

Recently, Halliday's concepts of field, tenor and mode have made their way, providing a broad framework for the understanding of discourse in terms of context: Field, refers to the subject of a given discourse. Tenor, contributes to describe the relations between the participants

in the speech. Mode, refers to the role assigned to the language in a particular situation, in Halliday and Hasan (1989). All three aspects are essential for the concept of expressibility.

Principle of Expressibility: Now for Searle there is a "principle of expressibility" which says that "anything that may be meant can be said..." (Searle,1969) and Searle formulates this principle stating that for any Meaning X and for any speaker H, whenever H means (communicate) X, then it is possible that there exists some expression E such that E is an exact expression of, or formulation of X (Searle,1969).

Conversation: In communication, speech is not given without listening and vice versa. When talking and listening are interacting together, one is in the presence of a "conversation." A conversation, therefore, is the dance that takes place between speaking and listening, and between listening and speaking. Conversations are the effective components of linguistic interactions - the basic units of language. Therefore, whenever reference is made to the language or is being treated, directly or indirectly, with conversations (Wilkins 1972, 1973, 1976).

Methodology

I framed the research within the qualitative paradigm (Hernandez Sampieri, Fernandez Collado & Baptista Lucio, 2014). This was a qualitative study, given its emphasis on exploring, describing and comprehending experiences and perspectives towards a phenomenon, it was also qualitative due to its reliance on descriptive data, and the researcher's control over the analysis and interpretation (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). This specific qualitative research was based on the interpretation of the relations of meaning between linguistic and semiotic discourses. Its goal was to analyze the fundamental elements for a pedagogical design that could optimize the expressibility of the learner.

The findings presented in this text stemmed from the analyses of a theoretical corpus that focused on Social Semiotics and Discourse Analysis. The study was a comparative/contrastive quest on a specialized textual corpus. The design of the research was the Grounded Theory, based on the reflections on the author´s academic experiences and interpretations of the specialized publications and studies on the subject in order to construct its own theorization. The theoretical framework for the discussion this thesis enacts derived from the textual review and interpretation of the academic sources of this investigation (papers, books, essays).

As Hernandez Sampieri, Fernandez Collado y Baptista Lucio (2014) expressed, the choice of the design depends on the statement of the problem. In this specific case, it´s a question for the essence of the learning experiences of the researcher, and an intent to establish a dialogue between this experience and other learners experience about a shared phenomenon: the semiotic and discursive dimensions of English learning. The Grounded Theory was the chosen design because the current theories on expressibility are not adequate to our local context, time and circumstances. What this paper addresses is the analysis of a set of categories derived from the

conceptual background on the subject and the elaboration of a consistent reflection and theory

that explain the research problem (questions about processes and concepts in need of a structure

to adequate to a specific context).

Results

This section presents the results of the research process through its different moments. At the end of each moment, the text clarifies the contribution of the results to the research, to give way to the discussion in the next part.

The first moment consisted in the revision of the theories, authors and perspectives that constituted the background and the theoretical framework for this thesis. To do this it was established a corpus of expert work to be read and analyzed. From this starting point the different perspectives and arguments were contrasted and compared in their fundamental precepts. This provided the theoretical assumptions from which this works departed. These assumpions are, in short, that traditionally, English teaching has focused excessively on the discursive action of the teacher, while the discursive performance of the learner is limited to its ability to imitate and to repeat. Real expressibility is in need to be taken into account of in order to provide a real social contextual learning. Categories like Speech act, Social semiotics, discursive performance and Principle of expressibility were integrated to the analysis.

The second moment consisted on the execution of the research design to analyze the theories about the categories aforementioned (i.e, expressibility) to analyze the impact and dimension of the discussion about such categories in our local context, time and circumstances and its possible interrelation to construct a contextual theoretical body. The second stage elaborated a reflection on what are the fundamental elements for a pedagogical design that could enhance the expressibility of the learner. The conclusion that the second moment contributes to the investigation is that the apprentice's expressibility should be positioned as the primary learning goal in order to stimulate its communicative competences in concrete language circumstances.

The third moment of the investigation provides insight to the fact that the pedagogical design in must understand the use of language within the human interaction in society. The stimulation of the learner its connected to its immediate context. Therefore, a pedagogical design focus on expressibility takes the learning process way beyond grammar and meaning to approach to the social and cultural dimensions of the language use. The language experience provided by such a design must experiential and context-based. Additionally, the evaluative process should focus on the act of expressibility as a real language experience "act of speech".

This social and cultural dimension, applied to the English teaching as a foreign language must be based on the principle of circularity in the new idiomatic community that English constitutes for the learner. Language is a fabric, and expressibility is the tool to the construction of that fabric. Hence, specific strategies are needed to give continuity to the learner's language acquisition and expressibility, in all language dimensions (writing, reading and speaking).

Discussion

Analyzing the Fundamental Elements for Pedagogical Design

A pedagogical design that optimizes the expressibility of the learner, has to start from what Verón (1993) calls the "recognition grammar". The functioning of all discourse is defined in terms of the grammars of production-recognition and "circulation" or communication that makes it experiential in the social (Veron, 1993). The pedagogical design must consider that the discursive action or expressibility has differential "moments" that initially comprise a wide spectrum of variations of the effect in attention to the grammatical and semantic borders. It follows, the exchange of signifiers that is the nature of the circulation in perspective of social semiotics (Veron, 1993). Logically, before and as a starting point, the existence of a discourse producer (apprentice) and a receiver (teacher and classroom as a primary audience) must be recognized with the capacity to "consume" the discourse. In the ordinary classroom, the producer of the speech is the teacher and the recipient or consumer is the apprentice who does not generate discourse proper, but tries to repeat sentences from the classbook. Then, it requires a restructuring of roles in which "circulation" as a communicative phenomenon, must be fully installed with the discursive participation of the learner as a potential member of the new language community.

In short, accordingly it must be recognized that there is a "linguistic action" in teaching, therefore expressibility can be understood as a performance where the learner's ability have to move in the new language community, in English; has to change socio-cultural scenarios. This constitutes an epistemic pillar that provides value to the grammar of recognition. This implies that the following epistemic elements must be taken into account: the expressibility, the obstacles and the scope of the misfortunes of expressibility.

In synthesis, in order to increase the apprentice's expressibility in the proposed new design, the apprentice should be positioned as the primary constructor of the discourse and the teacher as the "consumer" of that discourse, only this way, this pedagogical design attends the grammar recognition which are built on the exchange of signifiers in a context: real and concrete circulation. Now, a question may arise, how to make an apprentice a good speech builder?

What is Expressibility?

In order to recognize the scope of action of misfortunes in the Austin sense (Austin, 1962; 1979; 1982), it must first be known that it is understood by expressibility. This is the possibility of being able to communicate to others and to yourself: feelings, thoughts and facts. That is to say, the expression indicates that the mood itself can be made manifest with the language or recognize the mood of the others; Ideas or actual or imaginary events can be presented. From the above it is inferred that in expressivity, the rigid and cold order of words and phrases is broken to make known the purpose and intention of the speaker and even, with the expressiveness are revealed or the character, temperament, social origin, academic formation, desires and feelings. This delation is defined by the stylist of the speaker, his phonetics, rhythm, semantics, morphosyntax and register, which, in the "listener", must generate expectations and behaviors in the direction of what is expressed.

Following the above, in expressiveness is in "play" the need to communicate, communicate from the Latin "communicatione" which means to participate, to share; therefore, in expressibility as an act there is a genuine intention to participate and this participation occurs with the verbal resources of the speaker: cognition, emotion, context, linguistic competence and the variable factors of the discursive act.

However, it is necessary for the student to produce good speeches, for which the following elements must be taken into account in this proposed model: the linguistic elements of the student's context (Freeman and Johnson, 1998), which can be given in advance before the text classes where learning is acquired significant. Here, there are two complementary dynamics, that of the production of the discourse and the requirement of the auditory comprehension of the learner (Buck, 2001) and Wipf defines auditory comprehension as "an invisible mental process difficult to describe in which people who listen should discriminate between different sounds, understand vocabulary and grammatical structures, interpret the emphasis and intention, and retain and interpret all this within of the immediate context and of a wider socio-cultural context. Then for the proposed model, the auditory comprehension has to pass from a passive ability proper of the traditional model to an active skill (Lynch and Mendelsohn, 2002).

In example, in Cartagena, it would be important for communicative interests to learn about: the palenquera, the centenary park, the "raspao" seller, the mototaxi driver, yelling alegrias at Simón Bolívar Park, the old shoes and San Felipe Castle.

- There is a terrify bed in the Inquisition Palace.

-This is a sparring in my city, He works collecting the fare from the passenger, the fare is $2.100 but sparring call people telling them $1.000.

-A "raspao" is a delicious freeze drink with differents tastes like lemon, cola and tamarind.

-He sells butifarra.

-He is a "rico peto" seller, he is Mr. Pepe, every day he sells peto along the streets. A glass of peto is 500 or 1.000

-He is a coffee seller. People call him during the day to buy Tinto, tinto.

Please give me a tinto, people say. A tinto is only two hundred pesos

Expressibility Obstacles

Expressibility has a genuine need, to communicate, then if the essence is to communicate with certain verbal resources, then the speaker expects to produce effects on the listener. Since, logically, it is necessary to differentiate between what the speaker means, his intention and desires and the effects produced by his expressiveness in the listener (Searle, 1983). Therefore it can be said that there are certain obstacles to saying that the act of expressibility was fulfilled:

- Comprehension: It should be noted that anything that can be said does not imply that it can be understood. The listener may not understand what the speaker expresses.

- The meaning: what the speaker means. This implies that between the speech act and the linguistic resources used there must be correspondence of meanings in the context, if there is no such correspondence there is no understanding of the meaning.

- Intention: the specific goal or desire of the speaker. The purpose of the speaker is to produce an effect X on the listener for the speaker to act accordingly. If the listener does not react by virtue of the expression, the intention is flawed.

- Cognition: the concordance with the rules that govern the linguistic elements: grammar, phonetics, morphosyntax. Then, if concordance does not occur, language comprehension is not possible.

- Another non-Searle point can be added here, that the expresabilidad of the learner of English must be answered in English and continue in English, without this continuity, the process of communicational circularity is unsuccessful.

- The evaluative process by virtue of the pedagogical action. The teacher as guarantor of learning intervenes the expressibility of the learner, correcting, suggesting, commenting, etc., removing fluency and interrupting with it the communicational circularity.

The first four points correspond to what Searle calls the analytic connections of speech acts (Searle, 1969; 1979; 1983) and the two end points are part of the hypothesis of the author's proposals that supports this writing. Searle's hypothesis is that speaking with language is to participate in a rule-governed form of behavior (Searle, 1983) where, following the expressibility principle, anything that may be said meaningfully can be said (Searle, 1983). Here, the word meaningfully can be taken with three interrelated elements, namely: the notion of the speaker's communicative intention, the listener's comprehension and the listener's performance in terms of that understanding. This is the circularity of illocutionary force.

In the same sense, circularity implies not only a tacit, but explicit, "consent of listening". So that the act of expressibility is fortunate or satisfactory. This indicates that in order to achieve a state of success of expressibility, the following obstacles must be overcome:

- Understanding the meaning to ensure communication (phonetic, phatic and rhetorical).
- Have sufficient locutive power to produce effects on the listener.
- Ensure apprehension of the context.
- To produce consequences in the listener, to act as a function of the expressibility (listener's responses or communicational circularity).

Now, this "listening consent" allows them to co-exist on the same plane: emitter, receiver, emission and context, since words are related to the world (Searle, 1963), recognizing that to want to say something , implies to say it significantly with certain operational criteria framed in the syntax, the semantics and the pragmatics of the language, social semiotics, with which to

speak a language is to realize speech acts that must be realized with attention to certain linguistic rules (Searle, 1963; 1979) and to certain concrete "communicative intentions" (Searle, 1963) that support the principle of expressibility (Searle, 1963; 1983). That is, without a genuine consent of listening, a disposition of communicational circularity, and an understanding of meanings in context, any attempt at expressibility is broken, the act of speech with communicational circularity is not produced.

For the problem that justifies this text, the expressibility must necessarily have an act of grammatically correct emission, with a semantics understandable in a context, with a specific communicative intention and in English. The above indicates that if it is expressed "John is doing the task," not only it is using a grammatical clothing of an act of emission, but it is saying what happens in the world (context) so that the listener of such speech acts in consequence of what is expressed. Hence, if the listener acts by the expressibility then the emission has illocutionary force by virtue of the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic structure of the expression.

Expressibility and Misfortune Radio of Action

In Austin the speech act must have a fully pragmatic character, that is, there must be consequences in the listener that correspond with the communicative intention of the speaker. This is how Austin explains that a misfortune expression is, if the intention of the speaker does not produce the intended effects in the listener, then, the act is null or devoid of effect (Austin, 1962; 1979; 1982). For Austin this is a "pretend" or "hollow" act because the act has not been perfected or consummated, for example: if I enter the classroom as an apprentice and say hello to the teacher and he does not understand that I am giving him a greeting, this is a misfortune communicative in the Austin's sense. Language has not been used seriously (Austin, 1962). The

act is a kind of farce (Austin, 1962; 1979) is mechanized and not lived. The illocutionary force of expressiveness is not addressed.

Generalizing and disregarding what Austin calls ceremonial rites and ceremonial acts such as betting, baptizing, swearing, etc., (Austin, 1962). This paper has to attend only to speech acts in the communicative process that link the speaker and the listener in an idiomatic community. The range of action of misfortune occurs when in the communicative act between apprentice and teacher the illocutionary force of the first is not manifested. That is to say, the teacher does not listen in the sense of "seriousness" to the apprentice, either because he interrupts the discourse to evaluate or because he subtracts the pragmaticity proper to the use of language in the sense of social semiotics.

In summary, a pedagogical design that takes into account the grammar of recognition, must respond to a pedagogical process that links the expressibility of the English learner to a foreign language? It should be done by attending to the idea of a range of actions of the misfortunes of speech acts in Austin's sense. Based on the need to establish a line of differentiation of speech acts in Austin and Searle. It is necessary to design giving weight to the expressibility, to the principle of the circularity that is based on the necessity to establish conversational acts and to the necessity of the apprentice to belong to the new idiomatic community.

Another epistemic pillar for pedagogical design is Discourse Analysis. Discourse is a dynamic task, discourse is the product of expressibility, is constantly changing and depends on teacher-learner interactions and the socio-cultural context. Behind the interaction of language in the educational process of English teaching, there is a requirement to facilitate in the learner the possibility of communicating, that is, there is a real communicative intention (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1989). This indicates that language education, first of all, is a linguistic

interaction with a precise intention that implies communication, which indicates that an analysis of the discourse in English teaching must understand that the learner is in permanent construction of a discourse which has to connect with real life.

Based on the above, it may be suggested that teaching languages is essentially for the learner to produce a discourse that allows him to interact and actively participate in a linguistic community (Spielman, 1981). The communicative intention is varied and depends on the teacher, the apprentice (Nuyts, 1991) and the context. And all three must be placed on the same operational plane. This convergence in the same plane, is essential to take into account in a pedagogical design for the teaching of foreign languages. So, when is it on the same plane? When the apprentice produces the speech, the teacher consumes that discourse and conversational shifts begin in real life.

On the other hand, if the theory of discourse analysis is not addressed in the teaching of English as a foreign language, one falls into the error of believing that education is embedded in the thought that students should learn from books that were written for All and for none, guided by teachers who were trained to teach everyone and no one, evaluation systems intended to evaluate everyone and anyone, as they are oriented to abstract beings and not to individual students who belong to particular contexts, with precise learning interests

In the same line of thought, from the discourse analysis it is understood that there is no such thing as a "universal audience", each classroom has different emotions and interests, hence that for the design of a pedagogical project it must be taken into account that the In spite of using "a text" with the connotations already mentioned, it has to propose a "leaving the text" to enter the context, allowing the learner to have expressibility of its own cultural history, which, will be

reflected (Beuchot, 1998), with a teacher able to contextualize contents (Lyons, 1977) and oriented to universal and local contexts (Halliday, 1978).

However, to enhance the expressiveness of the learner has always been noted that emotions are fundamental in that process. When the learner is taken into account in his / her academic interests, emotion increases understanding and therefore learning (Goleman, 1977). That is to say, with a study from the discourse analysis we understand the integrity of the educational process (Tomlin, 1987) that must be experienced in the English classroom. Education implies intentional interaction: teacher-learner-context where a communication link is established to strengthen the process through changes and conversational movements (Coulthard 1977), movements in which the learner has to take more and more the initiative of the Conversational shifts (Longacre, 1996).

Finally, a pedagogical design in the teaching of English must apply the analysis of discourse in the classroom because to construct a discourse is to participate in a culture and a social activity (Fairclough and Wodak, 1985), through speeches there is communication (Cruttenden, 1986; 129). The analysis of discourse in the English classroom is relevant, because not only the structures of discourse and social interaction are analyzed, but also the role of sociocultural knowledge in the relations between social structures and discourse (Van Dijk, 1999). The idea of the principle of circularity and its relation with the illocutionary force to transcend the curricular spaces.

In relation to the pedagogical evaluation it is important to note that it is fundamental for the teacher to know "how to attend" the expressibility of an apprentice without interrupting his "degree" of fluency because in the expressibility of the learner besides including linguistic

resources, emotional resources and their desire to belong and be recognized as a member of the new language community.

The annotated above it is added that the process of teacher evaluation when becoming a mechanical act, breaks with the circularity of the communicative act. That is to say, while the learner performs the illocutionary act (Austin, 1962, 1979, 1982) of English phrases with communicative intention, by means of the evaluative process the intention is rejected and the act of emitter of the learner becomes a purely evaluative act And noncommunicative. From what can be suggested that from the Austin´s notion of perlocutionary act, consequences or effects that the illocutionary acts have on the listener; the teacher, not being located in the same communicational plane of the learner, does not react communicatively but pedagogically, thus distorting the Communicative act, at the same time that deforms the interactivity when intervening the communicative act correcting with a "that's right" or "that's wrong". That is, evaluation becomes an obstacle to expressibility in the classroom. The essence of communicative intention, for the above case, is not to listen to that's right or that's wrong, but to communicate, to express, to be heard: circularity of communication.

Teaching devices for convergence in the same plane of action to the teacher-learner-context in the communicative act in the classroom.

According to Verón (1993), expressibility from social semiotics parts from three assumptions:

● It has the unity of being a singular event, not universalizable. The apprentice with his own linguistic skills expresses communicative experiences or intentions.

- It has space-temporal unity, the illocutionary act is exposed to a listening in a living scenario (context) and in the time of today. Then, that unit can be found and is functional as an illocutionary force.

- It has unity within the idiomatic tissue. Expressibility expands communicational states.

From the above it is inferred that the discursive production, the circulation and the consumption (recognition) must be in the same plane so that they constitute unit. In the same line of thought, this unity can be considered in the idea of the exchange of voices expressed by Ducrot (Ducrot, 1980; 1985): "Every speech is similar to a theatrical performance, expressed through voices. Every speech is intensely dialogical. The speaker is represented as well by splitting in voices.

Also, Goffman, (Ervin; 1981) in his linguistic theory "Footin" suggests the need for alignment of the speaker with the listener in linguistic interaction. Other authors propose a critique of the conception of a unitary speaker or of a unitary listener (Wallace,). It requires an alternation of voices, a polyphony (Grice, 1975), there must be a continuous movement of appropriation and attribution in verbal activity (Ducrot, 1985). In other words, expressiveness must have an illocutionary force that requires the listener's responses in accordance with what is expressed. However, if these responses do not occur on the same plane, there are obstacles in expressibility.

There are pedagogical tools to progressively promoted expressibility and recognize the different movements of socio-cultural contexts of the English learner. However, if one takes into account that textbooks have the disadvantage of having been produced for "universal audiences", some texts are written abroad and used for teaching in different countries. Hence, the teacher must have a pedagogical ability based on a design that facilitates creative and cognitive ability to re-elaborate the texts and give the learner linguistic tools that allow him to remain in

communicative state with verbal and / or scriptural resources each time. That is, the teacher must have the pedagogical ability to move away from the text to enter the context.

Therefore, language should not be discussed solely in terms of an "ideal speaker" or structure, but in terms of its occurrence and its variations. Expressibility must be understood in the functioning of the language in the context of a context, within the social and cultural life of the learner. The cognitive-pragmatic distance must be avoided and an analysis of the expressibility that combines the linguistic elements that produce effects that transcend the grammatical and constitute part of the social reality of the learner.

Language is a fully social institution (Veron, 1993). This also suggests that it is necessary to construct a pedagogical design for the teaching of English as a foreign language that can understand that the entities that configure the language are psychic entities that belong entirely to the social (Veron, 1993). Reception complement and consume the communicative act, without a "consumption" of the speech, the expressibility is failed. And this is in danger not only the communicative act but also the pedagogical process.

From the above, it can be suggested that there is a line that gives relevance to language as a social institution, starts in Comte, continues with Saussere and continues with Witney (Veron, 1993). A pedagogical design of the teaching of English as a foreign language must be based on the principle of sociability that underlies that line of language, which although it must meet the educational requirement of the evaluation, can not be lost in that evaluation. Language is the only social institution whose being is exhausted in its communicative function (Veron, 1993), feelings do not remain enclosed in the subjective order; on the contrary, these are already part of the social, because they are experienced to be communicated (Veron, 1993). From the above, it can be suggested that the expressiveness of the learner contains an emotional, experiential and

cognitive "load" that with communicative intention is allowed to be heard from an illocutionary act.

On the other hand, and in relation to didactic skills, it should be noted that it is fundamental for the teacher to know how to attend to the expressiveness of an apprentice without interrupting his or her degree of fluency. Because the teacher has to recognize that the expressibility in addition to including linguistic resources, it counts the emotivity of the learner and his desire to belong and to be recognized as a member of the new linguistic community.

Conclusion

The pedagogical design must interpret that the language transmits models of life (Halliday, 1982) and that the apprentice by virtue of his learning has to "act" not only as a member of a new linguistic community, but also, as a participant in the Cultural forms of this new society. In pedagogical design the teacher has to understand and perhaps engage as creator of a social man (Halliday, 1982) in a new linguistic community.

It can be concluded that is relevant for teaching English as a foreign language the use of discourse analysis by the relation of power of teaching the language, because language undertakes simultaneously cognitive, linguistic (Deza, 2006), and social, which allows the interaction of teachers, students in particular contexts, especially in the pedagogical-didactic context. In addition, to understand how students interact within a given context (Richards, Jack C., 2006) and how from this new worlds that frame multiculturalism and allows the concrete results in a didactic intention of learning English as foreign language.

Now, looking at the language in the context in which speech acts occur (Searle, 1999) can be translated as the possibility of constructing new worlds (Austin, 1962) with the use of English in the classroom. Worlds that are filled with a cultural variety (Březinka, 1990), with possibilities to express and communicate one's context (Richards, J., Lockart, C., 1994). With an analysis of discourse, speech is strengthened (Cummins, 2002), expressibility is increased, the communicative intention of the speech act is fulfilled (McCarthy, 1991).

The pedagogical design in its framework of understanding must understand that the use of language not only embraces the idea of issuing new sounds, but also the linking of man to a new society (Halliday, 1982). Language transforms social being (Halliday, 1982). The linguistic

behavior of the learner has some correspondence with the context, with changes of scenarios (Halliday, 1982). This implies that the pedagogical design has to serve the speaking subject beyond the phonetics, syntax and semantics that make up the discourse production process (Halliday, 1982), or discursive operations (Veron, 1993). The pedagogical design has to "insert", in addition to the learner's discursive action, the process of communicative circularity of a real experiential context that is a way to legitimize expressibility, give "reality", and give illocutionary force to the learner's expressibility. Now, it is understandable that the evaluative process should not be neglected. But this, it must be, underlying and not overriding the act of expressibility. For if the latter happens, then the "instinct of sociability" (Veron, 1993) in the new language community is not potentialized in the learner. Since "instinct" leads to the development of expressibility, while an overlie "evaluation" restricts the act of speech.

However, this instinct of sociability, applied to the teaching of English as a foreign language, must be permanently preserved in a continuous emission-reception relation, since if the principle of circularity is broken, the principle of sociability is destroyed and This inactivates the instinct of expressibility in the new idiomatic community because the grammars of recognition are distorted, which denature the deeply social nature of language. Language is a fully social institution (Veron, 1993).

Finally, it must be understood that the discourse is a fabric and expressibility is a particular and individual way of participating in the construction of that fabric. Hence, discursiveness as a fabric is not linear, and then specific tools are required to enable the teacher to "recognize" the non-linearity of the learner's discourse. So that it allows him to give continuity to the learner's expressibility, not only in the universe of the textual, but also of the extra-textual ones. Neither the pedagogical nor the didactic nor the evaluative action must interrupt under any pretext the

communicative action or communicational circularity by virtue of the "defects" or "deficiencies" of the learner's expressibility. For a pedagogical design that takes into account the theory of discourse analysis, the teacher must recognize that the apprentice belongs to a culture and must circulate through different socio-cultural settings from which to build his discourse. However, it is essential that the learner is also able to make discourse of his / her own family, cultural and historical context to participate actively of the conversational turn.

References

Allwright, D. (1988). *Observation in the Language Classroom, Applied Linguistics and Language Study*, Londres, Longman.

Austin, J .L. (1962). *How to do things with words: the William James*. Lectures Harvard University, United Estates.

Austin, J. L. (1979). *Philosophical Papers*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Austin, J. L. (1982). *Como hacer cosas con palabras*. Paidos, Barcelona.

Ayer, A. J. ([1936] 1965). *Lenguaje, verdad y lógica*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.

Brezinka, W (1990). *Conceptos básicos de la ciencia de la educación*. Barcelona, España: Herder.

Buck, G. *Assessing Listening*. Cambridge University Press. 2001

Coulthard, M. (1977). *An introduction to discourse analysis.* London, Inglaterra: Longman.

Cowan, J. L. (1961; 2001). *"Wittgenstein's Philosophy of Logic". Philosophical Review*, vol. 70.

Cruttenden, A. (1986). *Intonation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.

Cummis, J. (2002). *Leguaje, Poder y Pedagogía: niños y niñas bilingües entre dos fuegos*. Madrid, España. Ediciones Morata.

Deza, P (2006). *"Tres décadas de Retórica contrastiva español-inglés. Un poderoso instrumento para mejorar la competencia discursiva escrita de los estudiantes de ELE"*. Barcelona, España.

Erling, B. (1984) *"Language Games and Contexts of Meaning: Wittgenstein and Anders Nygren"*, Journal of the American Academy of Religion.

Ervin; 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania

Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R (2005). *Análisis Crítico del Discurso: En: El Discurso como Interacción Social II*. Barcelona, España: Gedisa.

Fanselow, J. (1987). *Breaking Rules. Generating and Exploring Alternatives in Language Teaching, Longman*. New York and London

Freeman D, and Johnson K. *Reconceptualizing the Knowledge- base of Language Teacher Education*. Source: TESOL Quarterly. 1998

Gadamer, H. G. (1977). *Verdad y Método*. Vol. I. Fundamentos de una hermenéutica filosófica. Salamanca: Sígueme.

Goleman, D (1997). *Emotional intelligence*. Nueva York, Estado Unidos: Bantam Books.

Grice (1991). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press. Incluyen las Williams James Lectures de 1967.

Hacker, P.M. (2005), Wiitgenstein's Place in Twentieth Century Analytic Philosophy, Blackwell, Oxford.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning*. London, Inglaterra: Edward Arnold y Baltimore: University Park Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1982) *Lenguaje como semiótica social*. Fondo de Cultura Económica de México.

Hernández Sampieri, M., Fernández Collado, C. y Baptista Lucio, M. (2014). *Metodología de la investigación.* Mexico: McGraw Hill/Interamericana Editores.

Hierro, S. J. (1986). *Principios de filosofía del lenguaje*. Madrid: Alianza.

Hunter, J. F. (1980*) "Wittgenstein on Language and Games".* Philosophy.

Jacorzynski, W. (2011). *La filosofía de Ludwig Wittgenstein como una nueva propuesta para la antropología y las ciencias sociales.* Sociológica (México).

Keyt, D. (1964). *Wittgenstein's Picture Theory of Language*. Philosophical Review, vol. 73.

Levison, A. B. (1964). *"Wittgenstein and Logical Laws*", Philosophical Quarterly.

Longacre, R. E. (1985). *Sentences as combinations of clauses. En Language typology and syntactic description.* Editado por Timothy Shopen, 2.235-86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M. y Sato, S. (1983). *"Classroom Foreign Talk Discourse: Forms and Functions of Teachers Questions", Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition, Rowley*. Massachusetts, Newbury House.

Lynch, T. and Mendelsohn, D. (2002). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. ED Schmitt, Norbert New York: Oxford.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics.* 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maykut, P. S. & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide.* London, UK: The Falmer Press.

McCarthy, M. (1991) *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Language Teaching Library

Nuyts, J. (1991). *Aspects of a cognitive-pragmatic theory of language; on cognition, functionalism, and grammar*. Amsterdam, Países Bajos: John Benjamins.

Oswald, D. (1980) *Analyses pragmatiques, communications.* Vol 32, pp.11-60.

Grice, P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*

Perelman, C and Olbrechts-Tyteca, L (1989). *Tratado de la argumentación: la nueva retórica.* Madrid, España: Gredos.

Richards, J., Lockart, C. (1994). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge, CUP. Versión castellana (1998).

Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Languaje Teaching Toda*y. New York, United Estates: Cambridge University.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1983). *Intentionality: An essay in the Philosophy of Mind*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Searle, J. R. (1999) *Expression and meaning studies in the theory of speech acts.* Cambridge University Press. United States.

Searle, J. (2001). *Actos de habla*. Madrid: Cátedra.

Sinclair, J. y Coulthard, M. (1992). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. London, Routledge.

Spielman, R. (1981). *Conversational analysis and cultural knowledge*. Notes on Linguistics 17.7-17.

Tomlin, R. S. (1987). *Coherence and grounding in discourse*. Amsterdam, Países Bajos: John Benjamins.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and context. London*. Inglaterra: Longman.

Veron, E. (1993). *La Semiosis Social, fragmentos de una teoría de la discursividad*. Bercelona, España. Editorial: Gedisa.

Wipf, J. (1984) *Strategies for Teaching Second Language Listening Comprehension*. En: Foreign Language Annals, 17.

Wittgenstein, L. (1961). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Wittgenstein, L. (2001). *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus*. Madrid, España. Editoria: Alianza

Wittgenstein, L. (1999). *Investigaciones filosóficas.* Barcelona: Altaya.