A Web-Based Approach to Strategic Learning of Speech Acts[1]

Andrew D. Cohen & Noriko Ishihara

June 2005

Table of Contents

Abstract

When learners engage in self-access web-based learning – whether as part of a distance learning course, as supplemental work in a traditional course, or as a result of autonomous learning – an opportunity arises for the instructional units to provide the learners strategy training at the same time. This study focused on the benefits of fine-tuning strategy training for pragmatic use of a foreign language, drawing on a federally-funded curricular material development and research project. The project involved the development of self-access, web-based instructional units for five speech acts in Japanese: apologies, compliments/responses to compliments, requests, refusals, and thanks. The content for the curricular materials was largely based on empirical-based information from the research literature. Strategies specific to the learning and use of speech acts in Japanese were extracted from Japanese and English pragmatics studies and were built into the units. Twenty-two third-year intermediate Japanese learners participated in a one-semester study to determine the impact of these self-access web-based materials on the learning of Japanese speech acts and the viability of fine-tuned web-based strategy training.

The materials were found to have at least some impact, especially for those students who demonstrated more limited ability in speech act performance at the outset. In addition, the strategies-based approach to speech acts was for the most part perceived by learners to be beneficial. Averaged pre- and post-measure ratings of speech act performance tended to vary according to speech act, with the Request unit appearing to be the most effective. E-mail journaling from learners produced positive feedback regarding the value of the curriculum and additionally, the value of the norm-based nature of the materials. The content also helped to clear up misconceptions about language and culture. As to be expected with such a pioneering venture, the feedback revealed certain technological problems, many of which were rectified during and after the course of the study.

A speech-act by speech-act analysis revealed that clusters of strategies were found to contribute to effective learning and performance of the respective speech act. When looking closely at the performance of just one successful user of speech acts on the speech act of apology, it was found that her journaling regarding the learning and use of apologies provided more helpful insights into her rated speech act performance than did her responses on the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory*, which was meant to measure learners' frequency of use and sense of success in using speech act strategies in general.

With regard to the multiple-rejoinder discourse completion task (DCT) that was as an indirect measure of speech act performance, it was found that the instruments did occasionally have reactive effects. In other words, learners were not always seen to provide responses that were perfectly suitable for the subsequent turn in the discourse, even after training in the use of this format. It was also found that the raters of the DCT did not necessarily pay adequate attention to rating this goodness of fit of responses within the discourse context. Finally, it was found that Ishihara, who served as a researcher external to the Japanese Department, assumed multiple roles as a support person for the students in their learning of pragmatics. While she spent much time dealing with the technical problems arising from the use of the site, she reinforced learner's pragmatic awareness and made efforts to avoid oversimplifying the norms for pragmatic behavior in Japanese. She was also called on repeatedly to revisit underlying cultural reasoning offered in the materials in the spirit of "explanatory pragmatics" and to show the learners how such underlying cultural ideologies were encoded in Japanese speech acts.

Introduction

The Learning of Speech Acts

Ever since the concept of language functions was included as part of the notional-functional syllabus some 30 years ago (see, for example, Wilkins, 1976), language educators have been grappling with the challenge of attempting to get learners to acquire complex second- or foreign-language (L2) functions[2]. A major focus has been that of *speech acts,* namely, those patterned, routinized phrases used regularly to perform a variety of functions such as "requesting," "refusing," "complimenting," "greeting," "thanking," and "apologizing." Learners of a language not only need to learn the correct words and forms, but also the strategies for learning what to use them for, when to use them, how to use them, and how they may be combined with other speech acts. Speech acts may also be direct, such as the request from a daughter to borrow her parents' car for the weekend ("Hey, dad, can I take the car this weekend?") as opposed to the more indirect approach between friends ("Hey, Joe. How are things going? I was wondering if you might be able to lend me your car for a few hours this weekend. Something important has come up and…"). Depending on the language and culture, making a request to borrow a car may entail knowing the relative age, status, gender, and other information about the interlocutor.

One of the most perplexing areas of language instruction is that of instilling within learners a sense of appropriate language behavior, and especially speech act behavior. Learners of a language can have all of the grammatical forms and lexical items and still fail completely at conveying their message because they lack necessary pragmatic or functional information to communicate their intent (see Wolfson, 1989). Over the period of a decade or more, research in interlanguage pragmatics has identified how learners' and native speakers' pragmatic use of language may differ; more recently, interventional studies have examined the effects of instruction on the developmental process of learners' pragmatic ability. With increasing evidence regarding the benefits of explicit instruction in pragmatics (see, for example, Rose & Kasper, 2001), there seems to be some consensus as to the potential effectiveness of formal instruction in pragmatics and practical efforts at teaching L2 pragmatics has begun to appear (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Mayhan-Taylor, 2003).

It has often been pointed out that teaching pragmatics should be research-based rather than dependent on the native speaker's, instructor's, or curriculum writer's intuition (e.g., Kasper, 1997; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Schmidt, 1993). A number of descriptive studies in interlanguage pragmatics have shown that the way individuals speak is sometimes different from the way they believe they do. Even native speakers' intuition about their own pragmatic use of language is not always accurate because language is often used unconsciously and automatically (Bardovi-Harlig, Hartford, Mahan-Taylor, Morgan, & Reynolds, 1991; Boxer & Pickering, 1995; Rose & Kasper, 2001; Schmidt, 1993). Therefore, it is all the more important to make use of findings from empirical studies in order to better inform instructional input for the learner of the language.

---

[2] For the purpose of this paper, we will use L2 to refer both to second- **and** foreign-language, although there is a marked difference, especially with regard to the acquisition of speech acts. We would posit that the learning of speech acts is easier in an L2 environment (where the learner is surrounded by rich input) than in an FL one (where contact with the language may be far more reduced).

But what does it actually mean to use empirically-based content in a pragmatics curriculum? In the case of English and Japanese, a series of speech acts (such as requests, refusals, compliments, responses to compliments, apologies, and thanks) have been investigated in a number of cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics studies which have highlighted similarities and differences in speech act realization in the two languages. Concrete descriptions and examples of these similarities and differences or annotated abstracts can be viewed in an on-line database on speech acts (http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/) designed for teachers, researchers, curriculum writers. To illustrate a few of the empirical underpinnings, here are four features of Japanese speech acts in contrast with English: (1) directness/indirectness in requests as being largely dependent on the relative status of the interlocutor (Nakagawa, 1997; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 1999; Rose & Ono, 1995); (2) variation relative to age, status, and familiarity with the interlocutor rather than the intensity of the speech act (e.g., severity of imposition) (Baba & Lian, 1992; Hill, Ide, Ikuta, Kawasaki, & Ogino, 1986; Mizutani, 1985, 1989; Sasaki 1995); (3) the selection of reasons to use in a refusal in light of who the interlocutor is (Ikoma & Shimura, 1993; Kawate-Mierzejewska, 2002; Laohaburanakit, 1995; Moriyama, 1990; Naitou, 1997); and (4) a tendency to deflect or reject a compliment (Barnlund & Araki, 1985; Daikuhara, 1986; Koike, 2000; Terao, 1996; Yokota, 1986). Rather than relying strictly on our intuition as native speakers (Cohen of English and Ishihara of Japanese) and as learners (Cohen of Japanese and Ishihara of English), we drew extensively from the above empirical studies and from others as well as sources for the instructional input. (For more details on the process of the empirically-based curricular development, see Ishihara, 2005).

The Role of Language Learner Strategies

The literature on language learning has begun to focus on strategies for teaching speech acts (or more specifically, speech act *sets*, to emphasize our more discoursal approach) to second language learners (see, for instance, Bardovi-Harlig & Mayhan-Taylor, 2003). While this trend is encouraging, we have not seen a commensurate parallel focus on the strategies for **learning** and using the more complex speech acts[3]. Some thirty years after Rubin (1975) first called attention to learner strategies, there is now a general consensus among language educators that a factor common to successful language learners is their ability to be strategic. This consensus is increasingly supported both by descriptive studies (e.g., Vandergrift, 2003) and interventionist studies as well (e.g., Macaro, 2001; Cohen, Weaver, & Li, 1998) that have demonstrated that learners who use strategies (especially the metacognitive ones) produce better results in their language learning than students who are less strategic.

Since a good place to view strategies in action is through their application to specific tasks, and since the performance of tasks usually calls for the use of numerous

---

[3] While there may be overlap between strategies that teachers use for instruction regarding speech acts and those strategies that students actually use to learn them, the differences may be great. For example, teachers may provide learners with a chart for remembering the strategies to be used in requesting and have each learner turn to a partner and make one or two requests based on material in the chart. For some learners this instructional strategy may work. Some may use the chart, but in a way different from that recommended by the teacher. For others, they may find such a chart confusing and the task mindless. They may prefer to learn how to request from making a series of requests of native speakers outside of the classroom (e.g., at a local Japanese restaurant), without referring to the chart and the accompanying task.

strategies, strategies can probably best be viewed not as isolated processes, but rather in chains or clusters of such processes which are consciously selected. In the case of strategy chains, the learner deploys the strategies in a more or less predictable sequence, where the use of one strategy leads to another. In the case of strategy clusters, a learner uses a group of strategies, perhaps simultaneously, in the performance of a given task (see Macaro, 2004, for more on strategy chains and clusters). While there may not be a consensus at present as to the best way to define and classify strategies, there is a growing realization that learners – especially those interested in achieving high levels of competence in an L2 – need more finely-tuned and focused sets of strategies for the purpose of learning and using complex language material, such as in speech acts. Although there are increasing efforts to use a styles- and strategies-based approach to instruction whereby teachers not only teach language but also train their students to be more strategic language learners (e.g., Cohen & Weaver, 1998, 2004; Macaro, 2001), there has not been as yet much if any real effort to apply this technology to supporting learners in the learning of speech acts. It is also important to note that while learner strategies may reflect in some cases strategies that are used by the instructional materials as well or by individual teachers, the strategies that learners employ are often different. So, for example, the teacher or the instructional material might list out a series of supporting moves for a request with the intention that the learner will simply commit these moves to memory, but the learner may prefer to add on such moves gradually through using them individually in request situations.

The Role of the Internet

Finally, in recent years, books have begun to appear which critically appraise the advantages of using the internet as a vehicle for providing students with more autonomous language learning opportunities, which allow them to work independently. In a two-year ethnographic study of the uses of the Internet in four language and writing classes in Hawaii, Warschauer (1999) interviewed students and teachers, performed classroom observations, and analyzed students' texts. He collected numerous testimonials from students as to the advantages of electronic communication in language learning.

Perhaps one of the best qualities of web-based learning is that technology allows learners to work independently with their own initiative and proceed at their own pace using as much or as little electronic resources as they need. On-line materials can be used either as a supplementary or major part of a regular language course, or as a tool for completely self-guided learning. With linguistic scaffolding, optional tasks, and learner-directed feedback built into the curriculum, learners in any setting can take advantage of the web-based resources for learning of speech acts. For example, online exercises are suitable for practicing lower-level skills (Derewianka, 2003), such as learning formulaic expressions for requesting and developing automaticity, and for performing observational tasks which help to enhance the learners' ability to notice contextual factors that influence L2 use (e.g., relative status and age, level of acquaintance, gender, and magnitude of imposition of a request) (see Schmidt, 1993, regarding "noticing"). Web resources can also capitalize on technology that attracts the learners' attention, triggers noticing, provides explanation, and/or allows easy review of a relevant point. Heightening the learners' awareness as to these points can be

achieved, for example, through the use of highlighted text or fonts in various colors, styles, and sizes; through links; and through pop-up windows (Derewianka, 2003).

A Web-Based Curriculum for Strategic Learning of Speech Acts

With funding from the Office of International Education to the Language Resource Center at the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA), University of Minnesota, a project was initiated to determine the effects of providing foreign language speakers of Japanese and Spanish strategies-based materials for learning and using speech acts more successfully while communicating in those two languages – the former a less-commonly-taught language (LCTL) for much of the U.S. and the latter a more-commonly-taught language (MCTL). This paper focuses on the first phase of this project involving Japanese and reports on the effects of web-based strategy training in the development of pragmatic ability. The project had as its aim to enhance learners' development and use of language learning strategies, to provide guidance in the more complex pragmatic language use that is difficult to "pick up" without instruction, and to facilitate learning through web-based materials as a convenient vehicle for language learning. It was our intention that the web-based self-access units for learners would enhance the learning of speech acts, which in turn would make the learners more effective communicators in Japanese.

In the current mixed-method study using both a pre-experiment for learner performance and qualitative analysis of learner production and feedback, we asked the following research questions:

1. How does the delivery of instructional material on Japanese speech acts through strategy-focused and web-based modular units influence the learning and use of these speech acts?

2. Are there clusters of strategies that contribute to effective learning of speech acts?

3. How might rated speech act performance for a successful student relate to reported speech act strategy use and reported experiences in learning speech acts on the web?

4. What might be the reactive effects of a multiple-rejoinder discourse completion task?

5. What role might a support person play for a self-access speech act internet site?

Methods

Participants

Of the original 27 students in their third-year of Japanese language study at a Midwestern university who agreed to participate in the study, two subsequently withdrew from the study and three dropped the Japanese language course altogether. Hence, the study sample consisted of twenty-two learners (to be referred to in this report by pseudonyms). This study used a pre-experimental design in that there was no control group, largely because all the available learners of Japanese at the selected

university participated in the experiment. Consequently, the focus was on the differential effects of the treatment on these learners, rather than on comparing those who studied web-based speech act material with those who did not. Informal teacher ratings of their students put them in a range from novice high to intermediate high according to ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines for Speaking (1999), most learners falling into the category of intermediate[4].

A *Learner Background Survey* (see below) provided demographic information on the students. All were native speakers of English, with two also being heritage speakers of Vietnamese and Thai respectively. There were 14 males and 8 females, with most being between 18 and 23 years of age. Thirteen of them were Japanese majors; six of them having an additional major as well. Nine of the learners had studied Japanese in high school (three for more than two years, three for one to two years, and three for a year).

While the majority of the participants had studied four semesters of Japanese at the college level, one student had five semesters and three had fewer (three, two, and one semester respectively). Nineteen learners had studied at least one other language (Spanish, French, Russian, Korean, or Chinese), six had studied two, and one had studied three. An additional three students had not studied any foreign language formally. Four had studied in Japan for six weeks to six months and one of them had also studied in the Netherlands. Another learners had vacationed in Japan for a few weeks. Two had family members in Japan (whose parent or parents were Japanese), although they did not grow up hearing or speaking the language at home. Twelve had traveled outside of the United States to countries other than Japan for a vacation, class trip, or other types of tour (e.g., honeymoon, band tour). Six had not been outside the country at all. The advantage of obtaining these demographic data is to avoid running the risk of assuming that a sample of students of Japanese in the Midwest will somehow be monolithic in nature. To the contrary, we see they were actually quite varied in their backgrounds and that this variety would help to explain variability in the results of the study as well. All students were assigned pseudonyms for the purposes of this study.

The Intervention

The curricular materials used for this study were developed specifically for intermediate learners of Japanese during the spring and summer of 2003. The curricular materials were designed by Ishihara under the direction of Cohen. Ishihara received initial technical training and further trouble-shooting support from the technology staff at the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition

---

[4] The ratings constituted an informal assessment of learners' speaking ability by teachers untrained in the ACTFL guidelines (one of the instructors rating Novice High to Intermediate Mid; the other from Intermediate Low to Intermediate High). Prior to the study, the learners had completed at least 300 hours of instruction covering the first 20 chapters of the textbook *Genki* (Banno, Ohno, Sakane, Shinagawa, & Tokashiki, 2001) or were assessed to have equivalent proficiency in Japanese by the Department. Although these are impressionistic ratings, we consider them adequate for our purposes because the learners' general level of proficiency, focusing on areas other than pragmatic control, may not correlate with their pragmatic ability. Therefore, we limited ourselves in this study to examining the impact of the strategy training on their pragmatic ability rather than investigating the relationship between learners' grammatical proficiency and pragmatic development.

(CARLA) and from the Language Center at the University of Minnesota[5]. Prior to this curriculum project, Ishihara had created empirically-based materials on giving and responding to compliments in English (Ishihara, 2003) and had implemented them in her own classes with positive results (Ishihara, 2004). She had also been involved in the development of a speech act database on the internet[6]. Since her experience in teaching language had been with ESL/EFL not Japanese, she drew heavily on empirical information regarding the realization of Japanese speech acts.

The self-access, web-based materials for students of Japanese assembled on a new site were composed of an introductory modular unit for raising pragmatic awareness and five speech act units (i.e., apologies, compliments/responses to compliments, requests, refusals, and thanks; accessible at http://www.iles.umn.edu/introtospeechacts/). All units were pilot-tested by several intermediate-to-advanced learners of Japanese and their input, along with that of colleagues, was incorporated into a revision of the materials before use in the fall of 2003. The curricular materials were incorporated on a trial basis into the third-year Japanese course curriculum at the participating university in 2003-2004, with three units included in the instructional materials during the Fall of 2003 and two in the Spring of 2004.

The Japanese speech act material included in the modular units was based largely on empirical findings from research reports in order to ensure the authenticity of the language material, rather than relying exclusively on the curriculum writer's intuitions. The components of the curriculum included:

1. A description of each situation, intended to highlight its *sociopragmatic* nature (Thomas, 1983) – that is, what made it appropriate for the speaker to perform the speech act in question in that culture, given the relative age of the interlocutors, their gender, their role relationships and relative social status, and their level of acquaintance.
2. Pragmatic awareness-raising tasks and explicit feedback on L2 pragmatic norms.
3. Naturalistic audio sample interactions.
4. Language structure-focused exercises with lexical and grammatical information, intended to instruct learners as to the appropriate *pragmalinguistic* use of those forms in the given sociopragmatic situation (Thomas, 1983).
5. Suggested strategies for pragmatic use and norms of the L2.
6. Practice in producing output.
7. Self-evaluation and immediate feedback.
8. An annotated bibliography of studies used to create each speech act unit.

---

[5] There was also input from Japanese language instructors at a local university and from other native speakers of Japanese, who provided linguistic samples for the learners. In addition, Elite Olshtain (School of Education, Hebrew University) provided invaluable feedback as curriculum advisor for the project through two timely visits to Minnesota.
[6] The above-mentioned website constructed by Cohen and Ishihara is the precursor to this learner-focused project, and provides teachers, researchers, curriculum writers, and learners basic information and examples of six speech acts in a variety of languages. The website is housed at the University of Minnesota's Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition at: http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/.

More information and rationale for curricular decisions can be found in Ishihara (2005) and in the preface of the materials for researchers at: http://www.iles.umn.edu/introtospeechacts/ ForResearchers.htm.

As a homework assignment for the course, all 22 participants studied the introductory unit. In addition, two speech act units were randomly assigned to each of the three class sections of the third-year course. In this way, six students studied the "thanks" and "compliments/ responses to compliments" units, eight did the "apologies" and "compliments/responses to compliments" units, and another eight did the "requests" and "refusals" units.

Instrumentation

Instrumentation for this study included four measures[7]:

1. The ***Learner Background Survey***, which was created specifically for this study, consisted of 13 items such as learners' gender, age, major, and year in college. Language-related items included those on learners' native and dominant languages, experience studying other languages, Japanese language learning experience, traveling and living experiences outside the U.S., self-evaluation of the students' four skills in Japanese, and the frequency with which the students used Japanese when performing a series of activities. (The main results from administration of this survey were reported under "Participants" above.)

2. The ***Speech Act Strategy Inventory*** (Cohen & Ishihara, 2003) was specially constructed for this study and was tailored to investigate learners' general use of strategies specifically for learning and using speech acts in a second/foreign language (see Appendix A). The strategies were extracted from the six-unit curricular materials used for the intervention (see below for more details), although learners studied only three units during the semester when the study was conducted. For each item, learners were asked to rate on a five-point scale the frequency with which they used the speech act strategy, as well as their perceived sense of success in using the strategy.

3. The ***Speech Act Measure*** was a measure of the learners' speech act performance, consisting of a speech act discourse completion task (DCT) with each vignette calling for multiple rejoinders for which the students were to produce written responses as if they were spoken (see Appendix B for sample vignettes[8]). The students received 10 or11 situations for each of the two speech acts that they studied in the corresponding section of the Japanese language course, which meant that there were three versions of the measure, consistent with the speech acts that the given students were assigned. Participants were asked to write what they would say in interacting with native Japanese speakers in Japan without paying too much attention to

---

[7] The study actually included a fifth measure, a learning style survey, but the instrument had not been validated and the results were inconclusive, so it was decided not to report on those findings in this article.
[8] The complete measure is available from Ishihara upon request.

mechanics. For each situation, contextual variables such as relative age and status, level of acquaintance (close, somewhat close, or distant), and the intensity of the act (e.g., magnitude of imposition) were manipulated and described bilingually. In order to obtain a more robust data set, the learner needed to fill in up to three rejoinders for each of the situations, which were presented first in Japanese, followed by an English translation – in order to make sure that the students fully understood the situation.

4. The ***Reflective E-Journaling*** was designed as an opportunity for the students to provide semi-structured journal entries regarding their learning experiences with the speech act just studied. The format for elicitation of the information was semi-structured so that there would be a semblance of comparability across the e-mail responses, while at the same time not imposing researchers' categories or points of view on the learners. Also, the students were instructed to write as much or as little as they wanted to about any given issue. They were asked to provide information on the following:

   a. Insights that they had gained from using the web-based materials,
   b. Issues and confusions they had about the materials,
   c. Attitudes regarding the utility of the speech act strategies and the presentation of the material (e.g., color coding according to the level of importance of the strategy, and the summary chart),
   d. Technological problems,
   e. The strengths and weakness of the materials overall, and suggestions for improvements, and
   f. Their experience using the speech acts in authentic outside-of-class contexts.

Data Collection Procedures

All instruments were administered by Ishihara to small groups of students in established sessions outside regular class time, with no time constraints. Twenty-seven participants completed the *Learner Background Survey*, the *Learning Style Survey*, the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory*, and the *Speech Act Measure*. The *Learner Background Survey* and the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory* took only five to ten minutes, whereas the *Learner Background Survey* required approximately 20-30 minutes, and the *Speech Act Measure* typically 40 to 50 minutes. The twenty-two learners who participated in the full study signed a consent form for participation in the study and completed these three pre-measures in small groups, for which they received a modest stipend.

A subset of volunteers (18 participants) agreed to participate in the reflective journaling e-mailed to Ishihara after they had studied each of the two speech act units. While most provided 1-2 pages of prose for each of their two e-journaling entries, a few submitted as many as 4 pages. After each deadline, Ishihara compiled some of the questions participants included in their e-journaling and responded to them collectively on the course listserv.

After the submission of the second reflective journal entry, 22 learners completed the identical version of the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory* and the *Speech Act Measure*

described above. (See Table 1 for the summary of data collection procedures and intervention.)

Table 1: Data Collection Procedures and Intervention

	Date	Types of data collected	N	Intervention
1	Sep. 3-9, 2003	● Learner background ● Speech act strategy repertoire (through *SA Strategy Inventory*) ● Speech act performance (through *Speech Act Measure*)	27	
				Speech Act Introductory Unit
				1st Speech Act Unit Class 1: Thanks (n=6) Class 2: Apologies (n=8) Class 3: Requests (n=8)
2	Oct. 15, 2003	● E-journaling on the first speech act just studied	20	
				2nd Speech Act Unit Class 1: Com/Resp (n=6) Class 2: Com/Resp (n=8) Class 3: Refusals (n=8)
3	Nov. 24, 2003	● E-journaling on the second speech act just studied	18	
4	Nov. 24 - Dec. 4, 2003	● Speech act strategy repertoire (through SA *Strategy Inventory*) ● Speech act performance (through *Speech Act Measure*)	22	

Data Analysis Procedure

In order to determine impact of the intervention on the learners' rated speech act performance, gain score analysis of the pre-post measure ratings of the learners' DCT performance was conducted. Two Japanese native speakers did the ratings, the first a non-teacher (Rater 1) and the second being a Japanese instructor (Rater 2). The reason for having both a teacher and a non-teacher as raters was in order to assure a broader base for assessing the students' output, since learners would most likely also need to communicate with non-language teachers in authentic contexts. The two raters were not given pre-determined evaluating criteria but asked to rely on their own intuitions in providing a holistic rating on a six-point scale for learner performance in each speech act situation. The raters viewed the learners' pre- and post-measure responses side-by-side as they rated them, although they were not told which was which. For each rejoinder within a given vignette, they were asked to take notes on what was either inappropriate or incorrect, the degree to which such inappropriateness or inaccuracies mattered for pragmatic appropriateness, and on what they perceived as better (or just merely different) in comparing the two versions. The rated results were

tallied separately for each of the five multiple-rejoinder DCT speech measures, with learners who had at least a 2.0 rated increase considered to have gained on that speech act, and those with at least a 2.0 rated decrease considered to have lost. Otherwise, the learners were considered to have remained the same.

Along with the quantitative analysis, some of the data were also analyzed qualitatively. Learners' pre- and post-measure speech act performance, that is, their improvements and instances of potential pragmatic failure, were analyzed in-depth and compared with the data from other sources (the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory* and the *Reflective E-journaling*) for convergent validity. Learners' comments in the reflective e-journaling were interpreted using inductive and deductive coding of the themes that emerged and were triangulated with findings from other sources. While the deductive analysis was guided by already established themes (e.g., technical difficulties encountered), the inductive part of analysis was based on the themes that emerged from the data themselves (e.g., insights gained about speech acts) rather than from predetermined categories or theories.

Results

Research Question #1: *How does the delivery of instructional material on Japanese speech acts through strategy-focused and web-based modular units influence the learning and use of these speech acts?*

Findings from Pre-Post Comparisons on the Speech Act Measure

Before reporting the findings, let us say a word about the raters. The Japanese language teacher rater used a wider range of scores in her ratings than did the non-teacher rater, due most probably to her higher level of sensitivity to appropriate use of language than in the case of the non-teacher rater. As stated above, the decision to purposely have both a teacher and non-teacher as raters meant that we were opening up the rating process to the possibility of discrepancy in identifying changes in speech act performance from pre- to post-measurement, which is what occurred with one-third of the ratings (interrater reliability=.49, using Spearman's *rho*). The two raters' scores were averaged in order to generate gain scores in the 9 discrepant cases. Even with the occasional discrepancies, the two raters agreed completely as to the speech act unit in which students showed the most gain, the second most, and so forth. The discrepancy in ratings may also have resulted from our data analysis procedure of using a holistic rating without pre-determined evaluating criteria. We used the holistic approach because we felt that it best reflected how learners are evaluated in authentic situations (see the Limitations section below for more discussion of this point). So the bottom line here is that these ratings must be taken as suggestive of pre-post similarities and differences, rather than as definitive measures. Nonethess, we felt that the ratings give enough of a sense of speech act performance that they are worthy of report.

As Table 2 indicates, for apologies and compliments/responses to compliments, the results showed a spread from gain to loss, with the majority of the learners of compliments staying more or less at the same level. With regard to refusals, requests, and thanks, learners tended to remain the same or gain points, with only one showing

loss (on requests). It is noteworthy that those who had the highest rated gain scores were those who had somewhat lower scores (in the mid-teens) in the pre-measure, whereas those who were seen to improve the least tended to be the higher achievers at the start. As Table 2 indicates, the mean gain score was positive across all five speech acts (average +1.74), with requests showing the highest average gain (+2.88) and compliments the least (+0.86). Despite the average gain, the results seemed to show that the effects of the intervention were mixed since in the case of two speech acts (compliments and refusals) there were more students experiencing no change than there were those who gained.

Table 2

Learners' Performance on the Five Speech Act Measures

	Apologies (5 items) (N=8)	Compliments/ Responses (6 items) (N=14)	Refusals (5 items) (N=8)	Requests (5 items) (N=8)	Thanks (5 items) (N=6)
Mean gain score	+1.06	+0.86	+2.00	+2.88	+1.92
Learners with a rated gain of 2 or more points	Karin (+8) [13→21] Ronda (+7.5) [15→22.5] Joan (+2.5) [13→15.5]	Bill (+7.5) [15→22.5] David (+6.5) [14.5→21] Jay (+6) [18→23] Travis (+6) [21→27]	Danielle (+8) [16.5→24.5] Jerry (+6.5) [12.5→19] Collin (+2.5) [21.5→24]	Jerry (+10.5) [12.5→23] Danielle (+7.5) [17→24.5] Leslie (+7) [13.5→20.5] Meg (+2) [18→20]	Bill (+7) [11.5→18.5] Neal (+2) [16.5→18.5]
Learners with little or no pre-post change	David (+1) [13→14] Martin (+0.5) [19→19.5]	Walter (0) [25→25] Linda (-0.5) [27.5→27] Joan (-0.5) [21→20.5] Stuart (-0.5) [21.5→21] Neal (-0.5) [23.5→23] Ronda (-1)[22.5→21.5] Tom (-1) [21.5→20.5]	Sally (+1.5) [22→23.5] Meg (0) {22→22} Brad (-0.5) [22.5→22] Leslie (-0.5) [19→18.5] Barry (-1.5) [11.5→10]	Brad (0) [20.5→20.5] Barry (0) [10→10] Sally (-0.5) [23→-22.5]	Walter (+1.5) [18→19.5] Ellen (+1) [22.5→23.5] Linda (0) [22.5→22.5] Jay (0) [15.5→15.5]

Learners with a rated loss of 2 or more points	Travis (-2) [20→18] Stuart (-3.5) [20→16.5] Tom (-6) [25→19]	Martin (-2) [16.5→14.5] Karin (-3) [22.5→19.5] Ellen (-5) [28→23]		Collin (-3.5) [24.5→21]	
Learners with positive gain scores	3	4	3	4	2
Learners with little or no gain	2	7	5	3	4
Learners with negative gain scores	3	3	0	1	0

There are several possible explanations for why learners of requests appeared to experience the highest mean gain scores. The students had studied requests in the second year of their Japanese program and this material was also recycled in a more fine-grained manner in the third-year. In addition, there was more empirical information available to us with regard to requests than with regard to the other speech acts. Consequently, the request unit was the best informed of the various units and the most sensitive to the problems that learners would tend to have with this speech act, which appears to have had some impact on the students' performance. Nonetheless, there were three students who showed no measurable gain, and one who lost points in the post-measure. Hence, we would have to say that this, the most effective of the instructional units, still had a mixed impact. We will consider various reasons for why this might have been the case in responding to Research Question 2 below, and also in our Discussion that follows.

As noted above, the unit that seemed to show the lowest rated gain was that of compliments and responses to compliments. In part, this result could be attributed to the fact that there were just two rejoinders for each situation in the *Speech Act Measure*, while there were three for the other speech acts. Whereas the justification for the multiple-rejoinder approach was, as pointed out, to allow a more robust data set, the speech act of compliment simply did not lend itself to a three-rejoinder format. In addition, there were just three items assessing compliments and the same number assessing responses to compliments, in contrast to the five items for the other speech acts. So it is possible that not enough data were elicited through the DCT measure for this speech act in order to assure adequate measurement of rated gains.

Learners' Feedabck from Reflective E-Journaling

The *Reflective E-Journaling* provided a vehicle for finding out how the curricular materials were received by the learners. In order to determine what the learners thought about the curricular materials, we performed a content analysis of the learners' comments in their e-journaling regarding the learning of Japanese pragmatics.

The value of the curriculum

With regard to the value of the curriculum, 13 learners out of 18 (72%) explicitly stated that they appreciated the cultural/pragmatic points that they were able to learn from the curriculum:

Martin: We focus on grammar the most in courses so we can produce proper sentences, but we seldom get a chance to practice the practical use of such phrases. Having a variety of situations with a detailed description of what elements are important and relevant to the speech used helps a lot. It helps to know what to take into consideration, such as the age of the person, the situation, and the level of formality.

Three (17%) of the learners did not explicitly mention this feature but showed evidence of pragmatic learning by demonstrating increased pragmatic knowledge. Two (11%) discussed some learning but were also greatly frustrated by technological problems encountered mostly by using types of computers that were not recommended for use.

The empirical, detailed, and norm-based nature of the materials

Regarding the strengths of the materials, five learners (28%) mentioned that they liked that the materials were based on empirical evidence, offered concrete details, provided a system of rules for pragmatic behavior, or gave statistics or survey results as to the patterns of use by native speakers.

Brad: I would say the number one biggest strength of the materials is the way the subject matter is approached. You aren't just told what is correct, but it is approached scientifically analyzing why and how these certain speech acts come about. This is probably the best way to learn something in my opinion.

Numerous examples (through audio files), Romanization of the Japanese, the provision of transcripts, and the availability of explanations

A vast majority of learners appreciated the abundance of speech samples and cultural explanation offered throughout the materials. Regarding the strengths of the materials, 15 learners (83%) responded, indicating that they liked the audio files, Romanization, translation, abundant examples, and/or the explanations provided throughout the materials. Twelve learners (67%) volunteered to discuss their cultural learning and the other six learners (33%) demonstrated raised pragmatic awareness.

Neal: I would say the major strength of these exercises lies in the recordings of the example dialogs. It really helped to hear natural speakers speak in proper intonations and observe status. I did, however, have a hard time understanding some of the Japanese when it was spoken at natural speed. This is not your

problem though. I believe anyone who had a problem with it, like myself, should try harder.

Misconceptions about language and culture that were eliminated through studying the material

Three learners (17%) mentioned the misunderstandings that they had had about Japanese language or culture that were cleared up through the use of the materials.

Jeff: I found it interesting that the magnitude of the favor does not determine the language used. I had a little misunderstanding there. I was under the impression that, as in English, the size of the favor makes a difference. Very interesting and that helped a lot.

Although this comment is a rather simplistic depiction of pragmatic variation (because the magnitude of imposition does sometimes influence use of Japanese), this learner seemed to have understood the point conveyed by some of the exercises that other relational factors, like age and status, are likely to play a more significant role in determining the way that the language is used.

Insights applied to other speech acts

Two learners (11%) discussed insights that could be applied to more than one speech acts.

Danielle: This unit reinforced that politeness levels are **always** important in Japanese, and especially in speech acts. One must always be cognizant of the relative status between oneself and one's interlocutor. I see a pattern among the speech acts of forewarning one's interlocutor of the content of one's next utterance, which is not something very common in English.

Prior use of the speech act outside of the classroom

With regard to the authentic use of speech acts in Japanese, approximately one-third of the participants had past experience in using the speech acts outside the classroom. The participants had more experience with requests (37%) and compliments/responses to compliments (31%) than with other speech acts (e.g., 22% for apologies). All who had used the speech acts before recognized the value of the materials or wished that they had studied this material before going to Japan. Some reported successful speech act interaction with their instructors. All who speculated regarding their speech acts use in the future indicated that the materials would be of help:

Sally: Learning about refusals was very helpful. I felt that when I was in Japan, I did not know an appropriately polite way to turn people down. Seeing the use of hesitant phrases and the need for an explanation/excuse (even a vague or

made-up one) was helpful to me. I also thought the contrast shown between a very polite refusal to someone of higher status versus a shorter, more honest reply to a friend was a good thing to see examples of.

In response to whether they had used the two speech acts that they studied in authentic contexts out of class, one learner (5%) did not acknowledge the need to learn L2 speech acts.

> Leslie: No [implying: *I haven't had any opportunities to use the speech acts with native speakers.*] Other than my teachers, all my Japanese friends are really close to me, and I never really ask them for anything anyway. They usually offer whatever I want or need of them before I even have to ask, yet they never ask anything of me that I need or want to refuse.

This appears to be a rather naïve comment, but we need to acknowledge it all the same. This particular learner used an outdated computer and encountered numerous technological difficulties. Therefore, in this exceptional case her motivation to learn speech acts was fairly low.

Technological issues

Aside from this particular learner who encountered technological difficulties, seven other learners (39%) – mostly those using types of computers not recommended for use – also experienced minor or occasional technological problems (e.g., Japanese fonts turning into unreadable symbols, inaudible files, and lengthy loading time). Two types of exercises were often reported to be user-unfriendly due to the technological limitations of the software programs used to develop exercises. Two students (11%) were especially annoyed and the following comments convey the frustration of one of them:

> Jay: The technical difficulties in this one [the unit on compliments/responses to compliments] were, if anything, worse than the Thanks Speech Act technical difficulties. Topping the list of problems that need fixing is the static making the majority of the sound clips totally impossible to understand… I'm talking about entire dialog sessions that are entirely drowned out by a long series of crackles… Getting the full benefits of the Speech Acts [materials] is impossible if nothing works properly.

In addition, an unexpected and uninformed change in URL on the part of the server in mid-semester resulted in temporary confusion and some unsent learner responses. The FormMail system that allowed learners to send their responses to some of the exercises to a teacher's/researcher's account increased the burden on the teachers' side as well. These issues exemplify technological challenges that can jeopardize autonomous learning that would otherwise be effective and efficient. In order to minimize the risk of such occurrences in on-line learning, Ishihara repeatedly revised the materials based on the various suggestions learners provided for technological improvements.

Despite the technological glitches, it should be pointed out that nine of the learners who participated in the *Reflective E-Journaling* (50%) reported that they had no or no major technical trouble.

> Neal: There were no major technological problems regarding this exercise for me. If someone has problems doing the exercises on their computer at home, they could do them at school in a computer lab. I did all the exercises at school and I had absolutely no problems whatsoever. I thought the website was very well done and very easy to use.

Other themes emerging from the Reflective E-Journaling

There were numerous other themes that were identified in this qualitative analysis of the *Reflective E-journaling*. Among them were the following:

- The value of authentic materials, but the accompanying challenge of having to deal with non-simplified vocabulary and grammatical structures as well.
- The value of immediate feedback.
- The benefit of using inductive reasoning to learn and of self-evaluation, but the disadvantage of not getting individual feedback from a teacher.
- The learners coming to grips (sometimes frustratedly) with limitations in their pragmatic ability.
- Learners facing the issue of their nonnative status and their own national/cultural identity – the issue of how native-like they needed to be in their Japanese speech act performance.
- A shortcoming of self-access, namely, that learners sometimes overlooked important information in the materials because no instructor was there to point it out.

Research Question #2: *Are there clusters of strategies that contribute to the enhanced performance of speech acts?*

In order to get a sense of just how strategy clusters might work in speech act performance, we compared the pre-post speech act responses of the two students who appeared to make the greatest gains from pre- to post on the speech acts that they studied through self-access to the website (Table 2). From an analysis of the strategies identified as being used by learners in their speech act DCT performance, there emerged a picture of how strategy clusters might contribute jointly to the effective performance of the respective speech acts. This description is found in the left column in Table 3 through Table 7. The right column in these tables presents those strategies that the two students with the greatest gains e-journaled themselves as using. So the tables offer a comparison of what the raters observed and what the learners themselves reported through their e-journaling. Since there was no separate *Speech Act Strategy Inventory* for each speech act, it did not prove useful for this fine-tuned strategy cluster analysis. The use in the tables of the same font and color across the columns is meant to indicate that the same strategy or portion of the set of strategies was both observed in ratings and reported by the learner, except in the case of the use

of the New Times Roman font in black for strategies that were not cross-validated by the two measures. The comprehensive list of strategies provided to learners can be found in Appendix C. (For a more extensive and refined taxonomy of learner strategies for acquiring speech acts, see Cohen, 2005.)

Performance of Apologies

We start our description of the clustering of strategies in speech act performance by looking at the findings on apologizing. Table 3 provides a comparison of the strategies seen to be used by learners who were rated to have gained the most (Karin and Ronda) in comparison to the strategies the learners themselves reported through e-journaling to have used. As we can see, there was a relatively good fit between the two, with both sources suggesting that learners with the most gain were those who reported making a strategic effort to fit their apology expressions to the interlocutor and the situation, paid attention to repetition of the apology if necessary, and used incomplete sentences and hesitation phenomena.

**Table 3: Strategies Contributing to Improved Performance of Apologies
by the Two Learners with the Highest Rated Gain Scores**

Strategies used by learners showing the most gain in rated speech act performance (Karin & Ronda)	Strategies reported in those learners' reflective e-mail journaling
• Using appropriate apologizing expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (more appropriate variety in apology expressions) (Str#1). • Using the expression of an apology the appropriate number of times (Str#2). • Using incomplete sentences. • Using appropriate intensifiers (Str#4). • Using semantic strategies of apologizing: the promise of non-recurrence, an expression of dismay, Str#6. • Using an appropriate level of politeness throughout the interaction (Str#3). • Using –*te shimatte* to indicate the lack of intention to do something perceived as offensive by the other person. • Using an appropriate tone of voice (intensifiers) (Str#7). • Using formulaic expressions.	• Using appropriate apologizing expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (Str#1). • Using the expression of an apology the appropriate number of times (Str#2). • Using an appropriate tone of apology (Str#7). • Presenting an appropriate reason in an appropriate manner (Str#2).

* Note that *"Str#1" = Strategy #1,* and that the numbers correspond to those in the summary chart of speech act strategies in the materials.

Let us take a more detailed look at a highly successful learner's response to one speech act situation – the learner we have called Ronda. This situation was one of five on the Apology DCT measure:

On your way to the part-time work, you realize that you have totally forgotten about the meeting that your new supervisor, Kitagawa-san (a man in his 40's who just moved from another branch) had asked you to attend. By the time you arrive, the meeting probably will have ended. You hurry to work and apologize to him.

アルバイト先に向かう途中で、あなたは新しい上司の北川さんから出席するようにと言われていたミーティングを忘れていたことに気づきます。北川さんは他の支店から移ってきたばかりの４０代の男性です。アルバイト先に着く頃にはそのミーティングは恐らく終わってしまっているでしょう。あなたは急いで職場に行き、北川さんに謝ります。

As seen below, Ronda's pre-measure performance was rated three ("fair") on the scale of one to six. Her responses appear in blue, and the translation is provided in single quotes:

You: 北川さん、おそくなってすみませんでした。'Mr. Kitagawa, I'm sorry for being late.'*

Kitagawa-san: 先週お知らせしてあったでしょう。 'I told you about it last week.'

You: 私はわすれて、すみませんでした。'I'm sorry. I forgot.'

Kitagawa-san: ここにも予定表が張ってあるから必ず今度から確認して下さいね。'The schedule is also posted right here. In the future, please check the schedule.'

You: すみませんが、今どおぼえますよ[i]。'I'm sorry, but I'll remember next time.'

[[i] Inappropriate response implying that she will fix the problem next time, not now.]

After the intervention, however, Rhonda responded to the same item in a much more fine-tuned manner. With the use of a number of strategies taught in the unit on apologies, her response to this item was rated six, "excellent." Features that were new in Rhonda's post-measure response appear in red:

You: 北川さん、ミーティングは・・・おそくなって しまって[i]、すみませんでした。
[[i] no intention for the offense, taught implicitly]
'Mr. K, about the meeting… I'm sorry I [[i] didn't mean to] be late.'

Kitagawa-san: 先週お知らせしてあったでしょう。 'I told you about it last week.'

You: ほんとうに[ii]すみません。わすれてしまいました[iii]。
[[ii] intensifier 'really,' Strategy #4]   [[iii] no intention for the offense]
'I'm [ii] really sorry. I [[iii] didn't mean to] forget.'

Kitagawa-san: ここにも予定表が張ってあるから必ず今度から確認して下さいね。
'The schedule is also posted right here. In the future, please check the schedule.'

You: きをつけます[iv]・・・もうしわけありません[v]。
[[iv] promise of non-recurrence, "I'll be careful," Strategy #6]
[[v] another formal apology expression, Strategy #1]
'I'll be careful…I'm sorry [lit. I have no excuse].'

Performance of Compliments/Responses to Compliments

As was shown in Table 2 which summarized rated performance across the five speech acts, Compliments/Responses to compliments was found to produce the least improvement among those learners to whom it was assigned. It was for this reason that an in-depth analysis of learners' compliments and responses to compliments was conducted in order to see why this was the case. As the strategy clustering for compliments/response to compliments suggests in Table 4 below, sociopragmatic information (e.g., about when it is appropriate to compliment someone or to deflect/reject a compliment) needs to be combined closely with practice in the accompanying pragmalinguistic structures for performing the compliment or responding to it, in order to ensure accuracy in performance. Just as Wolfson and Manes (1980) found that English compliments are highly formulaic, the same is true for Japanese compliments and for responses to compliments to a certain degree. For example, a number of learners negatively transferred the "I like/love …" structure that is simply not used in Japanese for those contexts (Daikuhara, 1986). Thus, they were scored lower for that in both the pre- and post-measures. Because the unit has that information in the annotated bibliography but not emphasized in the instructional content, most did not learn this point by using the materials.

Table 4: Strategies Contributing to Improved Performance of Compliments or Responses to Compliments by Learners with the Highest Rated Gain Scores

Strategies used by learners showing the most gain in rated speech act performance (Bill & David)	Strategies reported in those learners' reflective e-mail journaling
• Using appropriate complimenting expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (by using more varied adjectives) (Str#1). • Abiding by cultural norms for complimenting (Str#3). • Attempting to phrase a compliment appropriately according to the interlocutor. • Using semantic strategies	• Using appropriate complimenting expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (Str#1). • Abiding by cultural norms for complimenting (by phrasing a compliment appropriately according to the interlocutor) (Str#3). • Using semantic strategies ("compliment response strategies," Res. Str#3).

("compliment response strategies," Res. Str#3).	• Using an appropriate level of politeness throughout the interaction (Str#2).

Also in the pre-measure, in order to refuse compliments some learners used a formulaic response that they had learned in the regular Japanese course and this was given full credit. In the post-measure, on the other hand, they tried to depart from the formulaic approach and to express themselves in a more creative fashion, sometimes using the semantic strategies taught in the materials, and yet producing for the most part inaccurate/inappropriate responses. For example, as shown in their e-mail journals, many learners were fascinated to learn about the ways they should phrase compliments for a teacher. Instead of saying "I like your lecture" or "your lecture was good," which would have sounded inappropriately evaluative, they were instructed to use a Japanese equivalent of "I learned a lot from your lecture," a more humble approach. Their journal indicated that many of them learned about why the compliment was phrased that way, which was provided in the instructional unit. However, none actually learned the linguistic forms in Japanese (e.g., *benkyouni/tameni narimashita* 'it was informative/ beneficial to me') that were taught and exemplified repeatedly in the materials. Instead learners literally translated "I learned a lot," which turned out to be a pragmalinguistic error in Japanese (e.g., *senseikara takusan naraimashita*).

Similarly, in complimenting and responding to compliments, seemingly minor linguistic inaccuracies (e.g., particles and phrasing) can lead to a negative perlocutionary effect (that is, the interlocutor will not perceive that the speech act was accomplished as intended). Learners often tended to "play it safe" with the formulaic expressions and received full credit for them in the pre-measure, but they later departed from these safe approaches to try out other semantic strategies taught in the materials. And consequently their post-measure responses were often rated inappropriate because of subtle linguistic inaccuracies which happened to bring some undesired change in pragmatic tone (e.g., *hontouwa* 'the truth is' used wrongly for *hontouni* 'really', *souja nai/arimasen* 'that's not true' (strong inappropriate denial) for *sonnakoto nai/arimasen* 'that's not true' (appropriate rejection of compliments). These examples show that failure to produce linguistically accurate compliments and responses to compliments can create a gap between the *intended illocutionary force* (i.e., what learners intended to communicate) and the *actual illocutionary force* on the hearer (i.e., the result or effect the communication has on the other person in that given context), which may lead to potential pragmatic failure. This point underscores the importance of the pragmalinguistic material, which can make or break a speech act realization.

Although we do not have direct evidence of the actual processes that the students used in learning and using the speech act strategies (since we did not collect verbal report data while learning or use were in progress), some learners did discus this process in their reflective journaling. One learner, Travis, reports how he came to use more varied compliment response strategies (e.g., thanking, questioning, and disagreeing) by means of the strategy of "using appropriate compliment response according to the interlocutor":

Travis: One interesting thing I noticed is that for Exercise 10, I immediately shot down the compliments and didn't really thank my friends. Then in the [sample] response you should first question the compliments and then accept them,

perhaps by saying thanks. I then realized that I need to be a bit more careful about how I respond to compliments. It seems like up until this point in my Japanese classes I've been trained to shoot compliments down as soon as I hear them. But, it looks like there are times to accept them and say thanks like this "Compliments" speech act unit shows…

Performance of Requests

In general, learners showed more improvements in making requests than in the other speech acts, as can be seen in Table 2 above. Consistent with Jeff's quote (above), both of the learners who showed the most gain (Jerry and Danielle) also commented on the pragmatic norms in Japanese that were different from those in English for making requests, and how they learned to become more effective at using the appropriate strategies for making supportive moves and for downgrading their requests. Learners also emulated the hesitant tone of speech exhibited in the sample dialogues and demonstrated this newly-acquired knowledge in their written DCT responses on the post-measure. As was largely the case for compliments and responses to compliments, these students were mostly aware of their own learning, as they demonstrated through their e-journaling.

**Table 5: Strategies Contributing to Improved Performance of Requests
by Learners with the Highest Rated Gain Scores**

Strategies used by learners showing the most gain in rated speech act performance (Jerry & Danielle)	Strategies reported in those learners' reflective e-mail journaling
- Using appropriate request expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (Str#1) - Using downgraders to minimize the imposition of the request (Str#4). - Using a semantic strategy ("pre- and post-request strategies") (Str#5). - Using an appropriate tone of voice (Str#6). - Using an appropriate level of politeness throughout the interaction (Str#3)	- Using appropriate request expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (selecting an appropriate level of politeness for a request expression based on the interlocutor rather than the magnitude of the imposition (Str#1). - Using downgraders to minimize the imposition of the request (Str#4). - Using a semantic strategy ("pre- and post-request strategies") (Str#5). - Using an appropriate tone of voice (Str#6).

Performance of Refusals

Similarly in refusals (see Table 6 below), the students who improved the most (Danielle and Jerry) were those who increased their repertoire of semantic strategies with regard to refusals (e.g., providing a reason for the refusal, offering an alternative, apologizing or stating regret) and used them more appropriately. In this unit, the importance of a hesitant tone of voice was stressed by means of pragmalinguistic exercises for practicing tone and for leaving the refusal utterance incomplete. Among the three learners who mentioned their learning of the strategy of "telling a white lie," one learner in his reflective e-journaling discussed a sense of dismay and resistance to the use of this strategy – a strategy that seems to be more often used in Japanese than in English as a face-saving strategy for both the speaker and the hearer (Kubota, 1996; Moriyama, 1990).

**Table 6: Strategies Contributing to Improved Performance of Refusals
by Learners with the Highest Rated Gain Scores**

Strategies used by learners showing the most gain in rated speech act performance (Danielle & Jerry)	Strategies reported in those learners' reflective e-mail journaling
• Using an appropriate level of politeness throughout the interaction (Str#3). • Using an appropriate tone of voice (speaking hesitantly and leaving the sentence incomplete) (Str#5). • Using appropriate refusal expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (Str#1). • Using semantic strategies ("strategies of refusals") (Str#4).	• Using an appropriate level of politeness throughout the interaction (Str#3). • Using an appropriate tone of voice (Str#5) • Alerting the hearer as to the upcoming refusal (Str#5) • Leaving the refusal sentence incomplete (Str#5). • Using a white lie as a face-saving strategy (Str#2).

Performance of Thanking

For the speech act of thanking, the learners who had the highest rated gain scores (Bill and Neal) did not volunteer to participate in the e-journaling (see Table 7 below). Therefore, we were unable to triangulate the learners' rated performance with their own self-report in the journaling for this speech act. However, learners improved in the use of several semantic thanking strategies (e.g., complimenting, apologizing, expressing surprise and delight), in the appropriate repetition of "thanking" expressions, and in giving a more sincere tone through the use of an intensifier (e.g., *hontouni* 'really', *sugoku* 'very'). Although some formulaic thanking expressions (e.g., *gochisousama deshita* 'thank you for the meal (or any sort of food or drink)') and related expressions (e.g., *ogotte kurete* 'for treating me') were not explicitly brought to the learners' attention in the materials, they were used appropriately in the post-measure.

Table 7: Strategies Contributing to Improved Performance of thanks

by Learners with the Highest Rated Gain Scores

Strategies used by learners showing the most gain in rated speech act performance (Bill & Neal)	Strategies reported in those learners' reflective e-mail journaling
• Using semantic strategies ("pre- and post-thanking strategies") (Str#4) • Using an appropriate number of thanking expressions (repetition) (Str#2). • Using an appropriate tone of voice (intensifiers) (Str#6). • Using formulaic expressions.	*[Note: Information not available – the learners with the most gain did not participate in the e-journaling.]*

#3: How might rated speech act performance for a successful student relate to reported speech act strategy use and reported experiences in learning speech acts on the web?

Let us now take an in-depth look at one successful learner as a way of demonstrating how responses on the speech act strategy inventory and self-report through the *E-journaling* can relate to rated speech act performance. In response to the first research question above, it was reported that Rhonda was one of the students who most improved in her speech act performance (7.5 points). As can be seen in Table 8 below, her apologies exhibited a number of improvements. While after the intervention she still made minor pragmalinguistic errors (i.e., literal translation of English phrases into Japanese – e.g., the equivalent of "I'm returning this book" and "I'm sorry I woke up late"), her performance generally approximated native norms.

Contrasting her performance with her responses to the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory* (Table 9, third column), however, we see that only two of her improvements were confirmed by her own self-perception (use of repetition and use of appropriate level of politeness). Moreover, the use of appropriate level of politeness partially contradicted her self-report. While she perceived some increased sense of success in adjusting her language according to her degree of acquaintance with the interlocutor (i.e., how socially/psychologically close she was to the hearer), she reported paying less frequent attention to the social status and role of the interlocutor in the post-measure than she had at the outset of the study. It was not possible to compare three of the improved features in her performance, as the strategy inventory was designed to investigate learners' use of speech act strategies in general, not specifically as related to apologies. Therefore, some strategies specific to one or few of the speech acts were not included in the inventory (see Appendix D for a revised sample).

Table 8: Match and mismatch between Ronda's improvements in her performance of apologies and self-reported use of strategies and sense of success from the Speech Act Strategy Inventory

	Ronda's Improvements on the Post-measure	Ronda's Self-Report on the Strategy Inventory
Matching features	• Repetition of the expression of apology (Str#2). • Use of appropriate level of politeness (Str#3).	• Increase in frequency and sense of success. • Increase in success in paying attention to level of acquaintance.
Mismatching features	• Use of intensifiers (Strategy #4). • Use of appropriate level of politeness (Strategy #3). • Use of incomplete sentences (although it does not always enhance appropriateness).	• Decrease in frequency in the use of intensifiers. • Decrease in frequency in paying attention to politeness level and social status, and role. • No reported change in frequency/success in the use of incomplete sentences.
	• Use of various expressions of apology appropriate for the situation (e.g., *gomen* [*nasai*]*, sumimasen, moushiwake arimasen*, Strategy #1). • Semantic strategies (strategies for apologizing: promise of non-recurrence, expression of dismay, Str#6). • Use of *…te shimatte* to indicate lack of intention for the offense (discussed but not stressed in the materials).	No corresponding item on the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory.* (This is due to the fact that the inventory was designed to investigate learners' use of speech act strategies in general. Therefore, it was not tailored to a specific speech act.)

On the other hand, Ronda's journaling seemed to better match her improvements in rated speech act performance. Components of Ronda's e-journal entry included:

- Cross-linguistic analysis of semantic strategies in L1/L2.
- A question as to what constituted an appropriate reason for an apology.
- Attention to appropriateness, not just grammar.

- Positive evaluation of color-coding of speech act strategies and the summary chart.
- Technical problems she encountered.
- Questions about logistics (the time she should spend, the instructions).
- The value of audio files, transcripts, and vocabulary notes.
- A request for vocabulary notes.

The following excerpts from Ronda's journaling on apologies demonstrated her cross-cultural/linguistic examination of L1 and L2 and her heightened pragmatic awareness:

> *Some of the key insights I learned were the amount of apologies that are required for a good apology, which seems different than American apologies. The reason given in American apologies are usually lengthy, and the apology portion seems shorter. It seems to be the opposite in Japanese apologies. American apologies sometimes don't have the "acknowledgement of responsibility" component, sometimes people will try to place the blame elsewhere, which I didn't see at all in Japanese apologies. The components in Japanese apologies all seem present in American apologies as well, but the degree, length and importance placed on these components seem different and their importance in the apologies is weighed differently.*

In the example where her pre- and post-measure apology item was closely analyzed (pp.15-16), the only potentially problematic aspect of her post-measure performance was the reason that she gave for the apology that she forgot the meeting. But Ronda was aware of the issue and in her journaling she wondered whether forgetting could be a reasonable excuse:

> *The speech acts were quite clear and I learned quite a bit about Apologies. I am unsure what to do in the instance that I don't have an appropriate reason for whatever I am apologizing for, such as "I forgot we were supposed to meet for lunch". I forgot is the truth, but maybe this is not an appropriate reason? Most people usually have a reason for whatever they are apologizing for, however some are within their control, such as "I have too much work to do therefore I cannot go out to lunch with you today." Is that insulting to the listener? Or does it depend on the degree of infraction? (i.e., canceling a lunch vs. canceling a meeting with a professor). "I forgot" can imply the listener is not important enough to remember in some instances. I don't think I would ever use "I forgot" when canceling an important meeting even if it was the truth.*

In order to facilitate comparison of the findings from the three data sources we have for Ronda, Table 11 provides a listing of her improved speech act performance as assessed through the *Speech Act Measure*, her comments in the *Reflective E-journaling* on apologies, and her self-report as to her frequency of use and perceived success at using speech act strategies. (Blue font is used to indicate matches and red font signals mismatches.) It appears that in this particular case the journaling, specifically on the speech act of apology, helped to explain Ronda's rated speech act performance better than did her responses on the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory*, which was meant to measure learners' frequency of use and sense of success in using

speech act strategies in general. It may also be that this learner's pragmatic self-perception might not have accurately reflected all the changes in her performance.

Table 9: Speech Act Measure and Self-Report

Ronda's Improvements on the Post-measure	Ronda's Self-Report in the *Reflective E-Journaling*	Ronda's Self-Report on the Strategy Inventory
• Various apology expressions (Str#1). • Intensifiers (Str#4). • Semantic strategies (strategies for apologizing: promise of non-recurrence, expression of dismay, Str#6). • Repetition of the expression of apology (Str#2). • Using the appropriate level of politeness (Str#3). • *–te shimatte* to indicate lack of intention to commit the offense. • Incomplete sentences.	• Cross-linguistic analysis of semantic strategies in L1 and the L2. • Question about what constitutes an appropriate reason for an apology. • Attention to appropriateness, not just grammar.	• Less frequent use of intensifiers. • More frequent use of and increased sense of success when using repetition in her expression of apology strategy. • Some increased sense of success in adjustment of contextual factors and decreased use of attention to contextual factors.

#4: What might be the reactive effects of a multiple-rejoinder discourse completion task?

This research question asked whether learners' performance of speech acts was in any way an artifact of the way the speech act measure was constructed, and if so, to what extent. The speech act measure took the form of a written multiple-rejoinder discourse completion task, which consisted of the description of a situation that the learners imagined themselves to be in and a dialog between the learner and his/her interlocutor with two to three rejoinders for the learner to fill in. Learners were asked to read these prepared turns in the dialog ahead of time so as to provide responses that would fit smoothly into the discourse. Assuming that learners may not always provide responses that are perfectly suitable for the following prepared turn, our question was whether the students, after practicing speech act exchanges a number of times in this format in the web-based materials, learned to produce responses that in fact fit the dialog better than when they first approached the task. Therefore, we should note that this analysis was made only regarding the goodness of the fit in the discourse, and not

with regard to the pragmatic appropriateness of the responses, which was already studied in Research Question 1.

Let us take one learner's post-measure response to a request item for example. In this item, our given learner, Jerry, was to imagine himself in a college classroom waiting for the class to begin when he remembered not having informed his boss at a part-time job of his schedule that week. The learner turns to a close friend, Satomi, sitting next to him to borrow her cell phone for a quick call. One of the most improved learners, Jerry responded as follows:

> You: あの、さとみ、ちっとおねがいがあるんだけど… *Ano Satomi, chitto onegaiga arundakedo...* 'Um, Satomi, I have a small favor of you.'
>
> Satomi: ああ、いいけど、急用？ (Oh, sure. Is it urgent?)
>
> You: はい。ぶちょうにはやく電話をしていかなんてはいけないから。ちょっと使っていい？ *Hai. Buchouni hayaku denwawo shite ikanantewa ikenaikara. Chotto tsukattemo ii?* 'Yes. I have to call my section chief right away, so can I use [your phone] for a second?
>
> Satomi: じゃあ、これ。 終わったら電源切っといてね。 (Here you go. Turn it off when you're done, OK?)
>
> You: は。たすかるよ。 *Ha. Tasukaruyo.* '[Yeah], thank you [that helps me].'

In this example, our intention was for the learner to make a request in his very first turn, which would match the Satomi's compliance to the request in her rejoinder. However, Jerry made only a precommitment ('I have a small favor of you') in the first turn. He made the request at the end of the second turn instead ('so can I use [your phone] for a second?), which sounded slightly awkward in juxtaposition to the rejoinder ('Here you go') since there was no sign of compliance to the request prior to it. However, considering the relatively small magnitude of the imposition, the equality of their social status, and the familiarity between the interlocutors, in general Jerry's responses were pragmatically highly appropriate (e.g., no use of honorifics, use of downgraders and hedging, and provision of a precommitment, a reason for the request, and an expression of gratitude). Due to the fact that his responses did not fit that well into the discourse of the rejoinders as provided, Jerry deserved a less-than-perfect score for this analysis (say, a three, or "fair," on the scale of one-to-six) rather than the "6" he received from both raters. On the other hand, his score for pragmatic appropriateness would rightly be high (say, five or "very good").

Because of the purpose of this analysis, the raters should only have paid attention to goodness of fit in the discourse, and not to the pragmatic appropriateness of what they wrote.   However, as can be gleaned from the detailed examination of the major discrepancies in scores (see the extended note for Table 12 below), raters at times were addressing different factors in their ratings, despite our best efforts to train them to base their ratings on the same criteria. Consequently, the ratings were not as valid as they might have been. Learners were penalized, for example, for linguistic mistakes, for leaving a rejoinder slot blank, and for giving a response lacking in appropriateness, although these phenomena were not intended to be reflected in this

particular rating category. Moreover, raters did not always provide reasons for their scores. Although they had been asked through oral interaction to provide reasons, this was not written in the instructions.

Table 10: Gains from Pre to Post in the Goodness of Fit in the Discourse

Total gain (points)	Apologies (5 items)	Compliments/ Responses (6 items)	Refusals (5 items)	Requests (5 items)	Thanks (5 items)
Rater 1	3	0 (compliments) -8 (responses)	3	0	-4
Rater 2	2	5 (compliments) 6 (responses)	5	7	6

Note: Details of the major discrepancies in scores:
Rater 1 (non-instructor), compliments/responses (-8):
  ✧ Linguistic mistakes penalized the rating (although this should not be penalized here) (-2).
  ✧ Leaving a rejoinder slot empty (although this should not have been penalized) (-4).
  ✧ Rater 1's personal judgment that Ishihara didn't agree with (-3).
  ✧ No reason provided for other pluses and minuses.
Rater 2 (Japanese instructor), requests (+7):
  ✧ More/less appropriate utterances (although this should not have been penalized/credited) (+3).
  ✧ No reason provided for other pluses and minuses.

In fact, Ishihara conducted analysis independently from the two official raters and also had problems deciding whether to penalize learners when their utterances did not fit perfectly into the discourse because this lack of consistency sometimes occurs in discourse between native speakers as well. For the particular item completed by Jerry as seen above, appropriate non-verbal behavior, such as pointing or even just looking at the friend's phone during the presentation of the pre-commitment, would perfectly convey his intention for the request. Appropriateness of this sort of non-verbal behavior cannot be measured through a written DCT. In fact, for this item both raters assigned full points for goodness-of-fit, while Ishihara assigned a score of three ('fair"). This kind of inconsistency is one weakness with a rating system of this nature. At the same time, this problem is most likely common to rating systems that attempt to evaluate sociocultural behavior.

There are other factors that might have come into play as well:

1. The lack of clear benchmarks for how to rate. While there were multiple samples of anchor items with which to compare their ratings, there still may not have been enough.
2. A lack of ample time spent calibrating ratings across the two raters. While three hours was invested in rater training – discussing the two major rating tasks and calibrating the ratings for the two raters – this may not have been enough.
3. Fatigue after doing fifteen hours of ratings which could have led to momentary lapses.
4. Providing the students the English translation of all prepared turns, in response to a suggestion made by the Japanese instructors, may have in some ways prevented learners from fine-tuning their sensitivity to features inherent in the Japanese discourse.

The teachers were concerned that the learners' general level of language proficiency might not have been sufficient for them to produce any meaningful speech act interactions, especially at the time of the pre-measure, and for this reason recommended that we provide them with an English translation for each prepared rejoinder. However, this linguistic support might have simplified the task in that learners were able to depend on their L1 to provide a response that would fit smoothly in the discourse. Had learners been required to rely on Japanese rejoinders alone, they may have developed an ability to react to the discourse in a more sensitive manner. This remains an empirical question open to further investigation.

#5: What role might a support person play for a self-access speech act internet site?

During the intervention phase when the students engaged in self-access to the speech act units, Ishihara exchanged e-mail messages with some of them on a fairly frequent basis. The nature of the communication was largely technical. Also, both times that the participants submitted reflective journal entries Ishihara read all entries and compiled a six-page document, responding to the questions that the participants raised, reinforcing important points, and referring students to the information that they missed on the website. For educational purposes, these documents were e-mailed to all third-year learners (not just research participants) with permission from the research participants. However, it is unknown just how many students actually read them and how much they learned from them. (The edited version of the exchanges on general topics not specific to any speech acts can be viewed at: http://www.iles.umn.edu/IntroToSpeechActs/FAQ.htm.)

Based on the feedback that the participants provided both during and after the data collection for this study in the Fall semester, Ishihara made some improvements in the materials before the units were used again in the Spring semester, as had been previously planned. Revisions were also conducted during the Spring semester with support from a CARLA Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTL) Material Development Mini-Grant. Major improvements that were made on the basis of learner feedback included the provision of:

1. more vocabulary notes throughout the materials (requested by a majority of learners who were somewhat overwhelmed by the authenticity of the language),
2. links that enabled learners to revisit all comments pages initially designed as immediate feedback on the given exercise,
3. elaboration of the instructions to learners for how to conduct self-evaluation,
4. improvements in the logistics for getting the students' responses to the web-based exercises to their teachers, and
5. the addition of three different prefaces, addressed to students, teachers, and researchers respectively.

One of the questions posed to learners for their journaling responses dealt with any confusing aspects or unanswered questions they may have encountered. Learners' responses to this item indicated that ambiguities in the instructions had led to queries

concerning: (1) the use of the transcripts (that is, when they should best view the transcript and whether they should rely solely on the Japanese rather than depend on English translations), (2) the language that they should use for responses to the exercises, and (3) the amount of time they should take in completing each unit. There was also concern for resolving technical issues regarding the website. Responding to two of the exercise types caused technical difficulties, depending on the type of computer. Since this was largely due to the limitations of the software program (*Hot Potatoes*) utilized to create half of the exercises, these technical issues persisted. Learners seemed to take much more time than expected (several hours on the average, even though it was initially estimated to take only a few hours) and felt frustrated. The time the materials took made the assignments too large a commitment for many learners, since learning of the speech acts was assigned as self-guided homework and given only 3% of the entire course grade. Due to the perceived uncertainties of using this new technology, the Japanese instructors had decided not to assign any more credit to this component of the course.

Learners also asked content questions about comprehension and production of speech acts in Japanese in their journaling. Learners also addressed numerous issues of keen importance in the learning of pragmatics, and their queries opened meaningful discussions. For instance, in the first example below, a learner aptly pointed out the impact of "the magnitude of imposition" on the language form of a request, which was different in English. Ishihara used this interchange as an opportunity to reinforce this major teaching point in the Request unit, and at the same time to avoid generalizations and simplifications in the learning of speech acts.

> *Q: I found it interesting that the magnitude of the favor does not determine the language used. I had a little misunderstanding there. I was under the impression that, as in English, the size of the favor makes a difference. Very interesting and that helped a lot.*

> *A: I agree that it's a major difference between English and Japanese and this is one major point I wanted to communicate in the Request unit. However, it does **not** mean that the degree of imposition (size of the favor) doesn't matter at all in Japanese. It does, and it does change your language, but it won't normally change your tone drastically – factors like use or non-use of desu/masu style and/or other keigo.*

The point was revisited when another learner asked a relevant question in the second journal entry.

> *Q: Sometimes in the speech acts, I wasn't sure how "large" or "small" favors or refusals were treated differently. The language seemed quite similar to me (especially in asking favors when the magnitude of the favor is made to seem small).*

> *A: Yes, that's one of the point I was communicating in the speech act materials, especially the Request unit. Age/status difference affects language much more than the intensity of the act (how big/small a request you are making). In other words, Japanese is more relationally-bound rather than situationally-defined. But if you compare how a speaker makes minor and major requests speaking*

to the same person, you will probably see a series of extra strategies employed for the bigger request.

Another learner asked about whether a common excuse appearing in apologies in American English can be used in Japanese with the same effect. This was indeed a teachable moment to reinforce learners' understanding of a unique Japanese pragmatic norm that can also be applied to other speech acts.

Q: I am unsure what to do in the instance that I don't have an appropriate reason for whatever I am apologizing for, such as "I forgot we were supposed to meet for lunch". I forgot is the truth, but maybe is not an appropriate reason? "I forgot" can imply the listener is not important enough to remember in some instances.

A: Exactly. If another Japanese speaker told me s/he "forgot to meet me" for any kind of meeting, I would be a bit hurt. I'd say that most Japanese speakers would come up with a white lie not to hurt the hearer – something harmless and realistic such as traffic jam or sickness in the family (but I wouldn't kill my mom!). The point is that the excuse is something you didn't have a control over despite your wish or effort to avoid it.

The point that in Japanese a harmless little lie tends to be considered a strategy that saves face for the speaker and the hearer (Kubota, 1996; Moriyama, 1990) is also taught in the unit on refusals. This cultural norm was again further elaborated in response to the second e-journaling when a few learners felt resistant to this pragmatic norm due to their personal belief that "honesty is the best policy."

Similarly, other questions that learners posed through their journaling required additional explanation of pragmatic norms which were dramatically different in English. Whenever possible, Ishihara revisited underlying cultural reasoning offered in the materials in the spirit of "explanatory pragmatics" (Meier, 2003; Richards & Schmidt, 1983) and showed how such underlying cultural ideologies were encoded in speech acts in Japanese.

Q: In particular, this comment also seems a bit... harsh or maybe unexpected. "いやいや、まだ子供なんですよ" [iyaiya, mada kodomo nandesuyo 'no, no, s/he is still only a child']. The host's daughter was complimented and immediately shot down with "No, she's still pretty childish." What?? In English I'd expect to hear something more along the lines of "Yeah, we're proud of her [for studying so hard/being studios/intelligent]". Was this only said assuming that the daughter is out of the room?

A: I can see how shocking this might be for English speakers, but again I'd say it is just a trick to avoid self-praise – I'll quote someone [in your class] to explain this once again – "while English speakers will form a bond by complimenting somebody (nice hair), it is [often] considered unbecoming to accept a compliment right away in Japanese culture… Japanese speakers consider the family a part of themselves, thus making it unbecoming to compliment a family member too much on any given thing." Parents can say this sort of things even

in the presence of their children, and although children (especially in their teens!) may not like it, they probably understand why their parents say it and that they may not really mean it.

As can be seen from these examples, most learners utilized the *Reflective E-Journaling* as an opportunity not just to ask surface questions but also to raise important issues in the learning of pragmatics. Other dialogs between the learners and Ishihara were on issues such as complexity of and difficulty in learning pragmatic norms, the pros and cons of certain teaching approaches adopted in the materials (e.g., self-exploratory learning and self-evaluation), and the issue of learner identity and how it plays out in a Japanese-speaking community.

While Ishihara noted the richness that abounded in the learners' reactions and perceptions and dutifully developed ongoing dialogs with the learners during the course of the research study, her status as an outside researcher imposed a certain constraint on her role. For instance, even though she prepared her responses to learners' questions and followed up on their learning, as a researcher external to the Japanese Department, at best she could only post her responses on the course listserv. It is not even clear to us whether learners had read her responses when they were busy with tasks and assignments from their regular curriculum. Therefore, the addition of this pragmatics curriculum, rather than its "integration" in a true sense, and Ishihara's status as an outsider precluded further extended dialog on the intriguing issues raised by the learners.

Discussion

Summary of Findings

This study found that a strategies-based approach to the learning of Japanese speech acts on the web had have at least some impact, especially for those students who demonstrated more limited ability in speech act performance at the outset. It is also fair to say that the learners generally perceived the strategies-based approach to the learning of speech acts as being beneficial. Averaged pre- and post-measure ratings of speech act performance tended to vary according to speech act, with the Request unit appearing to be the most effective. The *Reflective E-Journaling* from learners produced positive feedback regarding the value of the curriculum and the value of the norm-based nature of the materials in particular. The content also helped to clear up misconceptions about language and culture. As to be expected with such a pioneering venture, the feedback revealed certain technological problems, many of which were rectified during the course of the study.

A speech-act by speech-act analysis revealed that clusters of strategies were found to contribute to effective learning and performance of the respective speech act. When looking closely at the performance of just one successful user of speech acts on the speech act of apology, it was found that her journaling provided more helpful insights into her rated speech act performance than did her responses on the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory*, which was meant to measure learners' frequency of use and sense of success in using speech act strategies in general.

With regard to the multiple-rejoinder discourse completion task that was used as an indirect measure of speech act performance, it was found that the instruments did occasionally have reactive effects. In other words, learners were not always seen to provide responses that were suitable for the subsequent turn in the discourse, even after training in the use of this format. It was also found that the raters of the DCT did not necessarily pay adequate attention to rating this goodness of fit of responses within the discourse context. Finally, it was found that Ishihara, who served as a curriculum writer/researcher external to the Japanese Department, assumed multiple roles as a support person for student learning. While she spent much time dealing with the technical problems arising from the use of the site, she reinforced learner's pragmatic awareness and attempted to avoid oversimplifying the norms for pragmatic behavior in Japanese. She was also called on repeatedly to revisit underlying cultural reasoning offered in the materials in the spirit of "explanatory pragmatics" and to show the learners how such underlying cultural ideologies were encoded in Japanese speech acts.

Limitations

The relatively small sample size precluded the formation of a control group since the main concern was to have as many learners as possible sample the web-based self-access materials. Also, the number of students accessing materials for any given speech act was reduced in order to obtain information on all five of the speech act units. In addition, the use of a written discourse completion measure did not allow for the evaluation of all the strategies taught in the intervention (e.g., tone of voice, bows, judgment as to what to thank for/compliment on, use of white lies, and judgment of frequency of compliments). Furthermore, it was not possible to evaluate some of the supportive moves due to the limited number of situations and the fact that in the multiple-rejoinder DCTs, half the turns had fixed rejoinders.

In addition, it would appear that the rating system might have relied too much on raters' intuitions. In addition, when learners departed from the routine expressions to be more creative, they might have made pragmalinguistic errors that resulted in them receiving lower ratings. For example, responses to compliments require pragmalinguistic accuracy, such as the accurate use of particles – an area which the raters would be likely to spot and take points off for. Moreover, this study raises the question as to obtain an authentic evaluation of pragmatic ability. How should subjective differences between raters be dealt with in assessing pragmatic ability and who should be the raters in the first place?

Another factor that could have detracted from the potential effects of the speech act materials was that completion of the two units only counted for 3% of the course grade, partly because the teachers felt that students might have technical difficulties accessing the materials. Furthermore, the three percent was evaluated on the basis of whether learners completed the assignment and not on how well they did it or how well they performed on the pre-/post-measures. The pragmatics component was simply an add-on to the existing curriculum, and the large portion of the content was not introduced or reviewed in the classroom instruction. The low-stakes nature of the speech act component of the course appears to have demotivated some learners. For example, when Leslie's computer broke down while she was using the web-based materials, she ended up not completing the rest of the assignment. The majority of the

learners expressed in their course evaluations that they received too little credit for this assignment and that they needed classroom follow-up.

A final limitation of this study was the fact that only one version of the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory* was administered to students working with all five speech act units. In retrospect, it became clear that while some of the strategies generalized across all speech acts (e.g., strategies for learning about speech acts), others were specific to given speech acts (e.g., the strategy of appearing hesitant or even disfluent). In other words, the current strategy inventory was too general to measure learners' perceived use and sense of success with any **specific** speech act. It is our sense that some descriptive power was lost by not focusing in on those strategies linked to the speech act at hand. For this reason, we revised the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory* for use with individual speech acts (see Appendix D for a *Strategy Inventory for Refusals*).

Potential Revisions of Research Instruments for Future Use

Based on the limitations of the current study, we have reflected on the validity and reliability of our research instruments, which resulted in the following revisions of the two instruments for future use: the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory* and the *Speech Act Measure.*

The Speech Act Strategy Inventory

One major change we have made to the *Speech Act Strategy Inventory* is categorization of relevant strategies: for example, speaker-addressee relationship strategies (which are about the impact of contextual factors, Items 1-4), strategies focusing on language forms and non-verbal cues (5-11), monitoring strategies (12-15), compensatory strategies (16-17), and learning strategies (18-20). (See Appendix D for the revised inventory.) Originally, strategy items on the questionnaire were not grouped, but rather were presented in the inventory in a random manner. Because Ishihara had to group the items anyway in analyzing learners' tendencies in speech act performance/learning, we have decided to already create categories of strategies. Additionally, we did not see any particular reason why we should hide these categories from learners. Although our newly devised categories are neither rigid nor mutually exclusive, they loosely group related areas of strategies for general speech act performance.

Moreover, the analysis of the learners' responses to the inventory suggested that we would need to tailor this inventory to each speech act in order to obtain more valid self-report. As discussed above, we have found that learners' rated performance correlated in disparate ways with the results of this generic inventory. The results may have been different had the students responded to strategy inventories focusing on the strategies that they studied. In fact, some strategies referred to in this inventory were not taught at all in some of the web-based units that learners studied. For example, speaking hesitantly (item #12 in the original inventory) does not apply to thanks and compliments (although it sometimes could to responses to compliments). So this particular item has little or no meaning to learners who studied the units on Thanks and Compliments, as was the case for six of the students. It is possible that a strategy inventory specifically tailored to each act might allow for more fine-grained analysis of how learners' self-reported use of speech act strategies and perceived success at

performing the respective speech acts relate to their rated speech act performance.

If such a strategy inventory is to be used on a pre-post-intervention basis, we might suggest that instead of using a new blank inventory in the post-measure, learners return to the same version that they already filled out, and mark any changes in strategy frequency or perceived success in another color. In the current study, we did not observe any striking pre-post differences, and we suspect that this may have been due to the fact that the learners could not remember what their pre-intervention responses were.

The Speech Act Measure

Each item in the *Speech Act Measure* included two or three rejoinders in order to elicit extended speech act discourse from learners, which meant more robust data for analysis than a single-slot DCT would elicit. Therefore, in future research we might want to provide even more rejoinders for each situation. Giving more rejoinders would potentially elicit more speech act performance from learners, which may help to simulate extended discourse better than at present, and allow for more valid evaluation of learners' speech act ability. For example, it may be possible to construct a relatively valid measure of requests, even with several multiple rejoinders because continuous hedging or non-compliance can elicit various supportive moves from learners. (See Appendix E for a sample vignette for a possible revised Request DCT.)

However, we should note sensitivity of the impact of contextual factors. When the request is for someone close and the magnitude of the request is relatively small, for example, a prolonged dialog with several rejoinders becomes unnatural. It would inevitably make the learner sound distantly polite or make the addressee seem unnaturally non-compliant. Therefore, the optimal length or number of rejoinders may be dependent on certain contextual factors in each vignette.

Unlike with requests, which are more amenable to an extended DCT dialog, the giving of compliments appears difficult to extend into a three- or more-turn vignette. To do so would force learners to give a third compliment, which may or may not be appropriate in a given setting. Or learners could shift topics, but that would seem artificial in the limited discourse or may not even match the prepared response. This issue of appropriate number of turns for a speech act situation clearly has implications as well for how we are to interpret DCT results across speech acts because different speech acts may yield different kinds of data.

Also for the speech act of giving and responding to compliments, which yielded the least improvements in rated speech act performance, we could in future research consider eliminating the giving of the compliments and focus just on responding to them. In Japanese, it is on the response side that cultural differences between Japanese and English speakers become most obvious. If we wish to continue to measure compliments, then our recommendation would be to increase the number of items in the measure so that we have a sufficient number of items (at least 5) for both the giving of and responding to compliments.

A matter of general concern for DCT construction is the potential highlighting of key contextual factors in the situational description of a speech act measure. In pilot-testing of our *Speech Act Measure*, one learner indicated that he would have liked to see important contextual elements in bold. Ishihara did not act on this suggestion because she felt that it might give away the factors to be attended to in the Japanese

response. However, since some learners seemed to occasionally miss or forget important information, this suggestion is perhaps worth reconsidering in the preparation of future speech act measures. Also, as discussed above, it may be counter-productive to provide English translations for the given rejoinders (and just provide *furigana*, pronunciation help, or Romanizations instead), so as to avoid the possible reactive effects that these translations have on the discourse.

Suggestions for Further Research

In future research, hopefully such studies would be conducted with a control group, with more participants, with a longer time line. Since there are not enough longitudinal studies examining extended instructional effects on learners' pragmatic ability (Rose & Kasper, 2001), it would be beneficial to also have a mechanism for follow-up in order to determine if the material learned is retained. In addition, as noted above, we would recommend having a speech act strategy inventory for each speech act. Along those lines, Appendix D provides a set of strategies meant to be used by learners of refusals in Japanese. The sample inventory in Appendix D also includes suggested changes for the instructions accompanying the instrument.

Given that pragmatic ability involves pragmatic control beyond just an utterance of a given speech act, it might also be beneficial to further investigate the reactive effects of using multiple-rejoinder DCTs. We would be exploring whether the artificial nature of the discourse situation has a reactive effect on the replies that learners give. DCT-elicited data have been shown to differ from naturally occurring interactions (Galato, 2003). Although a careful analyses of the students' pre-post output did not reveal any decidedly unnatural interactions (i.e., by being "forced into" a series of response patterns), in principle this is a possible spin-off effect of such an instrument. Perhaps what helped to obviate any reactive effects of the measure was that at the request of the Japanese instructors, students were also given an English translation of the interlocutor's responses for each DCT situation. One way to investigate the effect of any imposed constraints such as these would be through collecting verbal report data while the learners are responding in writing to the situations, or afterwards if they respond orally (as in Cohen & Olshtain, 1993). The use of verbal report would also provide a more clear connection in the process of learning and using of speech act strategies.

On another issue, while the e-journaling conducted in this study allowed for interpretations of findings from the study which would not have been possible without this feature, there would be room for more extensive such exploration in future studies to get beyond the concepts, ideas, and understandings of speech act learning as conceived by the investigators, to more fully explore those of the learners (i.e., the *etic* vs. the *emic* approach). Finally, a logical next step would be to conduct a study such as this one in a **second** language setting, where learners are likely to be more in need of sociolinguistic competence. Since it might be assumed that motivation to use the speech act material would increase, as would the use of strategies to bring it about, the results could provide added insights into the utility of the self-access web-based units.

Pedagogical Implications

One pedagogical implication of this study is that one size does not fit all in that some learners found the materials more engaging than did others. On the other hand, the results seem to support the notion that speech act curricular materials that are empirically-grounded do fill an important gap. In other words, focus on culturally appropriate use of language rather than on grammatical accuracy or fluency seems to fall through the cracks where most L2 curricular efforts are concerned. Since the pragmatic success of many interactions depends on appropriate realization of speech acts, efforts such as the current one appear to have an important place. Also, it was seen that having a strategic overlay has its place. In other words, it may not be enough just to provide content. Rather, students need tips on how to use this content knowledge most effectively.

While this study showed (especially at the pilot phase) that not using the right equipment or user-unfriendly technology can indeed demotivate students and hamper learning, it might be that the internet can potentially be used as a valuable tool in complementing what students receive in language class with out-of-class support to refine their knowledge in given pragmatic areas. In our case, the instruction was given completely on the self-access basis, without much further or individualized support. Considering that the focus of the materials on pragmatics was most likely new to learners, in-class instructional support in addition to individual on-line learning might have been more facilitative (as suggested in the student evaluation of this assignment), or may even be necessary to bring about truly impressive improvement in performing speech acts. This has further implications for teacher education – with regard to preparing teachers to incorporate pragmatics more extensively into the curriculum and to evaluate learners' performance accordingly.

Conclusion

The teaching of speech acts so vitally involves both language and culture that interactions using them may have a high impact. In other words, it may be crucial for language learners to be shown that they cannot just transfer their native language and culture approaches to performing a given speech act into the L2 situation. And especially in high-stakes situations, the appropriate use of a request, an apology, or even "just" extending thanks may make a difference between obtaining the desired results in that speech community or not. Many learners in this study were most grateful that these differences were pointed out to them and in a most rigorous way. It would remain for a wider spectrum of language teachers to "buy into" this view and to consider accommodating the explicit teaching of such pragmatic information within their course syllabus, and for curriculum writers and technology experts to enhance the delivery of such programs to facilitate their use by learners.

References Cited

Baba, T., & Lian, L. C. (1992). Differences between the Chinese and Japanese request expressions. *Journal of Hokkaido University of Education, 42*(1), 57-66.

Banno, E., Ohno, Y., Sakane, Y., Shinagawa, C., & Tokashiki, K. (2001). *Genki: An integrated course in elementary Japanese*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching pragmatics*. Washington DC: Office of English Programs, U.S. Department of State. Retrieved November 28, 2003, from World Wide Web: http://exchanges.state.gov/education/ engteaching/pragmatics.htm.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Hartford, B. A. S., Mahan-Taylor, R., Morgan, M. J., & Reynolds, D. W. (1991). Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversation. *ELT Journal, 45*(1), 4-15.

Barnlund, D. C., & Araki, S. (1985). Intercultural encounters: The management of compliments by Japanese and Americans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 16*(1), 9-26.

Boxer, D., & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the Presentation of Speech Acts in ELT Materials: The Case of Complaints. *ELT Journal, 49*(1), 44-58.

Cohen, A. D. (September, 2005). Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 2*(3).

Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 33-56.

Cohen, A. D. & Weaver, S. J. (1998). Strategies-based instruction for second language learners. In W. A. Renandya & G. M. Jacobs (Eds.), *Learners and language learning* (pp. 1-25). Anthology Series 39. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, 1998.

Cohen, A. D. & Weaver, S. J. (2004). *Styles- and strategies-based instruction: A teachers' guide.* Revised version of CARLA Working Paper Series #7. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.

Cohen, A. D., Weaver, S., & Li, T-Y. (1998). The impact of strategies-based instruction on speaking a foreign language. In A. D. Cohen, *Strategies in learning and using a second language* (pp. 107-156). Harlow, England: Longman.

Daikuhara, M. (1986). A study of compliments from a cross-cultural perspective: Japanese vs. American English. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 2*(2), 103-134.

Derewianka, B. (2003). Developing electronic materials for language. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 199-220). London: Continuum.

Golato, A. (2003). Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics, 24*(1), 90-121.

Hill, B., Ide, S., Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A., & Ogino, T. (1986). Universals of linguistic politeness: Quantitative Evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics, 10*(3), 347-371.

Ikoma, T., & Shimura, A. (1993). Eigo kara nihongoeno pragmatic transfer: "Kotowari" toiu hatsuwa kouinitsuite [Pragmatic transfer from English to Japanese: The speech act of refusals]. *Nihongokyouiku [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching]*, 79, 41-52.

Ishihara, N. (2003). Giving and responding to compliments. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & R. Mahan-Taylor (Eds.), *Teaching pragmatics*. Washington DC: Office of English Programs, U.S. Department of State. Retrieved November 28, 2003, from World Wide Web: http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics.htm.

Ishihara, N. (2004). Formal instruction on the speech act of giving and responding to compliments. *Minnesota and Wisconsin Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 21*. 37-70.

Ishihara, N. (2005). *Web-based curriculum for pragmatics instruction in Japanese as a foreign language*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota, submitted for publication.

Kasper, G. (1997). The role of pragmatics in language teacher education. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & B. Hartford (Eds.), *Beyond methods: Components of second language education* (pp. 113-136). New York: McGraw Hill Company.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Koike, H. (2000). "Home"eno hentouni kansuru fukuji bunkateki hikaku: Taijin kankei betsu, seibetsu, sedaikan [A comparative study of responses to compliments in terms of subcultures: Interpersonal relations, sex, and generations]. *Shinshuu Daigaku Kyouiku Gakubu Kiyou [Journal of the Faculty of Education], 100*, 47-55.

Kawate-Mierzejewska, M. (2002). *Request-refusal interactions in telephone conversation.* Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Japanese Society for Language Sciences, Nagoya University, Japan.

Kubota, M. (1996). Acquaintance or fiancee: Pragmatic differences in requests between Japanese and Americans. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 12*(1), 23-38.

Laohaburanakit, K. (1995). Refusal in Japanese: A comparison of Japanese textbooks

and actual conversation data. *Nihongo Kyouiku [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching], 87*, 25-39.

Macaro, E. (2001). *Learning strategies in foreign and second language classrooms*. London: Continuum.

Macaro, E. (2004). *Fourteen features of a language learner strategy. Working Paper No. 4.* Auckland, NZ: Centre for Research in International Education, AIS St Helens. http://crie.org.nz/research_paper/1Ernesto_Macaro_WP4.pdf. http://www.crie.org.nz/research_paper/2Ernesto_Macaro_WP4.2.pdf. http://www.crie.org.nz/research_paper/3Ernesto_Macaro_WP4.3.pdf.

Mizutani, N. (1985). *Nichi-ei Hikaku: Hanashi Kotoba no Bumpoo [Comparison of Japanese and English spoken languages]*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Mizutani, N. (1989). Taiguu hyogen shidouno houhou [Teaching politeness in Japanese]. *Nihongo Kyouiku [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching]*, 69, 24-35.

Moriyama, T. (1990). 'Kotowari' no houryaku: Taijin kankei chouseito komunikeishon [Strategies for refusal: Interpersonal adjustments and communication]. *Gengo [Language], 19*(8), 59-66.

Naitou, M. (1997). Nihongono taiguu hyougen "irai" "kotowari": Nihongo bogowashato nihongo gakushuushatono koodono sai [Japanese politeness in requests and refusals: Differences in code between native speakers and learners of Japanese]. In M. Hubbard, T. Sakamoto, & J. Davis (Eds.), *Nihongo kyouiku ibunkano kakehashi: Miura Akira sensei koki kinen ronbunshuu [Progress in Japanese Linguistics and pedagogy: A collection in honor of Professor Akira Miura's 70th birthday]* (pp. 101-115). Tokyo: Arc.

Nakagawa, Y. (1997). Nihongo Iraino Hyougen: Iraino sugorateji to nihongo kyouiku. [Expressing requests in Japanese: The strategies for expressing requests and teaching Japanese]. *Kyoto University of Foreign Studies Academic Bulletin L,* p. 218-227

Rinnert, C., & Kobayashi, H. (1999). Requestive hints in Japanese and English. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*(9), 1173-1201.

Rose, K. R. & Kasper, G. (Eds.) (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, K. R., & Ono, R. (1995). Eliciting speech act data in Japanese: The effect of questionnaire type. *Language Learning*, *45*(2), 191-223.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly, 9*(1), 41-51.

Sasaki, M. (1995) Irai hyougenno taisyou kenkyuu: Eigono irai hyougen [Contrastive anlysis of requests: English and Japanese requests]. *Nihongogaku [Japanese Linguistics], 14*, 61-68.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning, and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Terao, R. (1996). Home kotobaeno hentou sutairu [Response styles to compliments]. *Nihongogaku [Japanese Linguistics], 5*(5), 81-88.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 91-112.

Vandergrift, L. (2003). Orchestrating strategy use: Toward a model of the skilled second language listener. *Language Learning, 53*(3): 463-496.

Warschauer, M. (1999). *Electronic literacies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wilkins, D. A. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. London: Oxford University Press.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Cambridge: Newbury House/HarperCollins.

Wolfson, N., & Manes, J. (1980). The compliment as a social strategy. *Papers in Linguistics: International Journal of Human Communication, 13* (3), 410-451.

Yokota, J. (1986). Homerareta tokino hentouni okeru bokokugo karano shakai gengogakuteki teni. [Sociolinguistic transfer from the native language in the responses to compliments]. *Nihongokyouiku [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching], 58*, 203-223.

Appendix A

Speech Act Strategy Inventory

Developed by Andrew D. Cohen & Noriko Ishihara
CARLA, University of Minnesota, August 2003

As you become a proficient speaker of a foreign language, you develop an enhanced sense of the speech that is appropriate for given situations. You almost inadvertently begin to keep track of what the preferred things are to say so as not to offend anyone. You learn that successful speaking is not just a matter of using the correct words and forms—but that it means using whatever strategies are necessary for learning what to use them for, when to use them, and how to use them. Particularly challenging for language learners are those patterned, routinized phrases used regularly to perform a variety of functions or *speech acts*, such as requests, refusals, compliments, thanks, and apologies.

The following is an inventory of the strategies that you may use in performing or comprehending speech acts.

For each of the following 20 strategies, **in the left column** please circle the number corresponding to the **frequency** with which you use the strategy:

5 – I always use this strategy.
4 – I often use this strategy.
3 – I sometimes use this strategy.
2 – I use this strategy on occasion.
1 – I never use this strategy.

For each of the following 20 strategies, **in the right column** please circle the number corresponding to your **sense of success** at using the strategy:

5 – I use this strategy with great success.
4 – I use this strategy with success.
3 – I use this strategy with some success.
2 – I use this strategy with little success.
 1 – I use this strategy with no success.

---

1. I **listen to others** carefully to see how they perform speech acts in order to learn from them how to do it.

      frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

2. I **inquire from natives/near-natives** of the language and culture as to the appropriate way to perform speech acts.

      frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

3. I draw on **written publications** for explanations of how Japanese language and culture deal with various speech acts.

      frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

4. I consciously endeavor to **make and revise hypotheses** regarding the appropriate way to perform speech acts.

      frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

5. I adjust my language according to my **level of acquaintance** with the other person (intimate, close friend, distant friend, acquaintance, stranger).
           frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

6. I take **age** into account when performing speech acts in Japanese.
           frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

7. I adjust the **politeness level** of my language given my **social status** in relation to the person(s) I am speaking to.
           frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

8. I adjust my language according to my **role** in relation to the other person in a Japanese speech act.
           frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

9. I make use of **intensifiers** (e.g., "really," "so," and "very") to ensure that my feelings are appropriately expressed.
           frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

10. I use certain words (e.g., *just, a little*) to **reduce the force of the speech act** to make it sound more likely acceptable.
           frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

11. I use a **tone of voice** that is appropriate for the given speech act situation.
           frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

12. I **speak hesitantly** so as to appear humble when the speech act calls for it.
           frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

13. I **purposely leave my utterance incomplete** when the speech act calls for it.
           frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

14. I **use non-verbal signals** (e.g., bowing and eye contact) to help in the delivery of speech acts.
           frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

15. I **monitor and adjust my responses** to the speech acts to fit a given situation.
           frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

16. I **use repetition** of one or more things I say in order to achieve the appropriate effect in my Japanese speech act performance.
           frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

17. I do my best to say what a native would to **close** a given speech act interaction.

      frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

18. I make sure that my speech act performance abide by Japanese cultural rules and is not simply a **translation** from the way I would perform it in English.

      frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

19. I **warn the other person** before performing a speech act I may do incorrectly in order that they will not take offense.

      frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

20. I **clarify my intentions** when realizing I have made errors in speech act delivery (e.g., by rephrasing, repeating, or explaining myself).

      frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

Appendix B

Speech Act Measure (Samples)

An Apology

You were planning on going to brunch this morning with your close friend, Jun, but as you wake up, it is already 40 minutes past the time you were supposed to be at the restaurant. You call your friend's cell phone and apologize:

あなたは今朝仲のよい友達のじゅんさんと一緒にブランチに行く約束をしていましたが、目が覚めると約束の時間を40分も過ぎています。あなたはじゅんさんの携帯に電話をかけて謝ります。

<u>Jun</u>: はい、もしもし。(Hello.)

<u>You</u>:

<u>Jun</u>:　ずっと一人で待ってるんだけど。(I've been waiting all alone.)

<u>You</u>:

A Compliment

One of your closest friends, Reiko, takes you to a Japanese drawing class at a local community center. You have never tried this kind of drawing but are curious as to what it is like. As you circulate around the class, you are very impressed with one student's work. He is about your age, and although you don't know him, you compliment him on his drawing:

とても 親しい 友達の 礼子 さんが コミュニティー センターの 日本画の クラスに あなたを 連れていってくれます。 あなたは 今まで に日本画 を 描いたことは ありませんが 、 どんなものなのか 興味をもっています。 クラスを巡回していると、あなたと同年代でとても上手な人がいます。知らない人ですが、あなたはその人の絵をほめます。

<u>You</u>:

<u>Student</u>: いやいや、そんなことない。(Oh, no, that's not true.)

<u>You</u>:

<u>Student</u>: そうですか、それは嬉しいですね。(Really? I'm happy to hear that.)

A Response to a Compliment

At your part-time work in a clothing store, your colleague Takahashi-san, a woman in her 40s overhears your conversation with a customer. After the customer leaves, she approaches you and tells you that your use of *keigo,* honorific language, sounded so much better now.

アルバイト先の 洋服店 で 一緒に 働いている ４０代の 女性、高橋さんが、あなたと お客さんの やりとりを 偶然 聞きます。 その お客さんが 帰った 後で 、 高橋さんが 近くに 来て 、 あなたの 敬語の 使い方が とても うまくなったと 言ってくれます。

Takahashi-san: 敬語 うまくなったわね。いまの 人と 話してるの が 聞こえたの。(Wow! Your *keigo* is amazing now. I just overheard you talk with that guy.)

You:

Takahashi-san: いやー、本当に上手だったわよ。(That was really something!)

You:

A Request

You belong to a small tennis club at your university. You usually practice on a school tennis court, but next weekend you are going to have a tennis match with another team out of town. You do not have a car, and since the destination is far from the nearest station, you need a ride. You find out that another club member two years senior to you, Akira, is going to drive there. Although you are not exactly on his way, you think he lives closest to you. Besides that, you definitely don't want to miss the match. Since you talk to him frequently, you decide to ask him to give you a ride.

あなたは 大学の 小さなテニス部に 所属しています。 普段は 学校の コートで 練習しますが、 来週末は 他の 町の チームと の 試合があり ます。 あなたは 車を もっていませ んが 、 その 試合の 場所は 最寄り駅から遠く、 だれかの 車に 乗せていって もらわなければなりません。 そんな 時 あなたは 2年上の 先輩の 今井あきらさんが 車で 行くと 聞きます。 あなたの 家は 通り道では ありませんがそれでも 彼の 家が一番 近いようです。それに あなたは絶対その試合に出たいと 思って いますし、よく話を する仲なので、 頼んでみようと 思います。

You:

Akira: うん、行くつもりだけど。(Yeah, I'm planning on going.)

You:

Akira: ああ、他に池田としんちゃんも乗っていく予定なんだけどそれでもいい？(Sure, I'm also going to pick up Ikeda and Shin-chan. Is that okay with you?)

You:

A Refusal

When you come home, your host mom's friend, Kawada-san, is visiting her home. As you talk with her, you find that she loves international cuisine. She asks you if you could teach her how to cook typical American home dishes. You want to help her, but you don't have much confidence in cooking and decide to decline her request.

あなたがホストファミリーの家に帰ってくると、ホストのお母さんの友人の川田さんが家に遊びにきています。川田さんは世界の料理が好きで、今度何か典型的なアメリカの家庭料理をおしえてくれないかと頼んできます。あなたは協力したいのですが、料理にはあまり自身がないので断ろうと思います。

Kawada-san: あのね、私、いろんな国のお料理の作り方覚えるの大好きなのよ。今度、アメリカの家庭料理でも、教えてもらえないかしら？ (Well, I love learning how to cook international food. Do you think you could teach me how to cook American home dishes some other time?)

You:

Kawada-san: いや本当に何か簡単なものでいいのよ。 (Oh, no, something really easy would be just fine.)

You:

Thanks

A classmate and good friend, Shinichi, has just finished looking over the final paper you wrote in Japanese. Shinichi has helped you with your Japanese several times before, but he is always willing to spend enough time to help you. You are truly grateful and say to him:

クラスメートで仲のよい伸一君があなたが日本語で書いた期末レポートを見てくれました。伸一君は以前に何度も日本語を見てくれたことがあり、いつもたっぷり時間を費やしてくれます。あなたは本当にありがたく思い、終わったところで彼に言います。

You:

Shinichi: いやいや、そんなたいしたことしてないから。(Oh, no, it's really nothing special.)

You:

Shinichi: ううん、気にしなくていいよ。またいつでも言って。(Never mind. Let me know any time.)

You:

Appendix C

List of Strategies Specific to the Learning and Use of Speech Acts in Japanese

The strategies in red are core apologizing strategies, without which your utterance wouldn't be recognized as an apology. The strategies appearing in blue are particularly important supporting strategies that can enhance or expand upon your apology. The strategies you see in black are additional strategies that can also help learners perform the particular speech act, but they are not essential. Those in green are general strategies that can be applied not only to apologies but also to other speech acts.

Apologies
(also available at: http://www.iles.umn.edu/Apologies/Apologies.htm)

1.	Making the apologizing statement • Making the apologizing statement (all exercises) • Using appropriate apologizing expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (Ex. 1, 2, 9, 10, all others)
2.	Abiding by the cultural norms for apologizing • Using an appropriate number of apology expressions (Ex. 1, 2, 9, 10) • Using the overlapping concepts and expressions of apology and thanks (Ex. 3) • Presenting an appropriate reason in an appropriate manner (Ex. 9, 10)
3.	Using an appropriate level of politeness throughout the interaction (Ex. 2, 4, 5, 9)
4.	Using an appropriate intensifier (Ex. 6, 9)
5.	Using the past tense of certain apology expressions to conclude the interaction (Ex. 9)
6.	Using strategies of apologizing • Making an apologizing statement (all exercise) • Providing a reason (Ex. 1, 7, 9.10) • Acknowledging responsibility (Ex. 7) • Offering a repair (Ex. 7, 9, 10) • Showing consideration for the hearer (Ex. 7, 10) • Using an expression of dismay (Ex. 7, extras) • Promising non-recurrence (Ex. 1, 7) • Communicating a lack of intention to cause the infraction (Ex. 9)
7.	Using an appropriate tone of voice • Speaking hesitantly in formal apologies (Ex. 1, 8) • Leaving sentences incomplete (Ex. 8) • Using intensifiers and pronouncing them emphatically (Ex. 6, 8, 9) • Using appropriate eye-contact and bows in formal apologies (Ex. 8)

Compliments/Responses to Compliments
(also available at: http://www.iles.umn.edu/Compliments/Compliments.htm)

<u>Giving Compliments:</u>

1.	Making the complimenting statement • Making the complimenting statement • Using appropriate complimenting expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (Ex. 3, 4, 6, 9, all others)
2.	Using an appropriate level of politeness throughout the interaction (Ex.1. 2, 9, 10)
3.	Abiding by the cultural norms for complimenting

	• Phrasing a compliment appropriately according to the interlocutor (Ex. 1, 9) • Maintaining an appropriate distance (Ex.1, 2, 9) • Avoiding complimenting family members at the presence of a third party (Ex. 5) • Adhering to the typical frequency of compliments (Ex. 8)
4.	Using an appropriate tone of voice • Using intensifiers and pronounce them emphatically • Extending the compliment again if rejected (Ex. 8)

Responding to Compliments:

1	Making the response statement • Making the response statement • Using appropriate response expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (Ex. 6, 7)
2	Using an appropriate level of politeness throughout the interaction (Ex. 6, 10)
3	Using pre- and post-response strategies • Disagreeing with a compliment (Ex.. 6) • Thanking (Ex.. 6, 7, 10) • Providing no answer or shifting topics (Ex. 6, 7) • Providing positive comments (Ex. 7) • Questioning (Ex. 7, 10) • Returning a compliment (Ex. 7) • Offering background information (Ex. 7) • Shifting credit to others (Ex. 7) • Expressing surprise (Ex. 7) • Downgrading (Ex. 7) • Making a joke (Ex. 7) • Disagreeing (Ex. 7) • Doubting the sincerity of compliments (Ex. 7)

Requests
(Also available at: http://www.iles.umn.edu/Requests/Requests.htm)

1.	1. Making the request statement • Making the request statement (all exercises) • Using appropriate request expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (Ex. 4, 5, 6, all others)
2.	2. Abiding by the cultural norms for requesting • Selecting an appropriate level of politeness for a request expression based on the interlocutor rather than the magnitude of the imposition (Ex. 1, 2, 7, 8, 11, 12)
3.	Using an appropriate level of politeness throughout the interaction (Ex. 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12)
4.	Using downgraders to minimize the imposition of the request (Ex. 1, 7, 8, 9, 11)
5.	Using pre- and post-request strategies • Offering a reason for the request (Ex. 1, 9, 11, 12) • Getting a precommitment (Ex. 2, 9, 12) • Identifying the topic (Ex. 2, 11) • Checking availability (Ex. 2, 12) • Reinforcing the request (Ex. 8, 9) • Promising to repay/pay back (Ex. 8)

	• Showing consideration for the hearer (Ex. 8, 9, 12) • Getting attention (Ex. 9, 11, 12) • Offering reward or compensation (Ex.9, 12) • Expressing apologies and/or gratitude (Ex. 7, 8, 9, 11, 12)
6.	Using an appropriate tone of voice (Ex. 10) • Speaking hesitantly (Ex. 10, 11, 12) • Downgrading the imposition of the request by use of certain phrases and pronounce them emphatically (Ex. 1, 7, 8, 9, 11, same as above) • Using hints • Using bows in formal requests

Refusals

(Also available at: http://www.iles.umn.edu/Refusals/Refusals.htm)

1.	Making the refusal statement • Making the refusal statement (all exercises) • Using appropriate refusal expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (Ex. 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, all others)
2.	Abiding by the cultural norms for refusing • Using generic reasons when appropriate (Ex.2, 3, 5) • Using a white lie as a face-saving strategy (Ex.2, 3, 5) • Speaking honestly with close friends (Ex.2, 3, 5) • Making 'ritual refusals' before accepting an offer (Ex. 6)
3.	Using an appropriate level of politeness throughout the interaction (Ex. 1, 2, 5, 9)
4.	Using strategies of refusals • Making the refusing statement (all exercise) • Providing a reason for the refusal (Ex. 1, 2, 5, 7, 9) • Offering an alternative (Ex. 5, 7, 9) • Apologizing/Stating regret (Ex. 7, 9) • Promising future acceptance (Ex. 7) • Making an unspecific reply (Ex. 7) • Postponing a response (Ex. 7) • Stating positive feelings (Ex. 7)
5.	Using an appropriate tone of voice • Alerting the hearer as to the upcoming refusal • Speaking hesitantly (Ex. 8, 9) • Stating positive feelings

	• Apologizing • Leaving the refusal sentence incomplete (Ex. 4, 8) • Using bows in formal refusals (Ex. 8)

Thanks
(Also available at: http://www.iles.umn.edu/Thanks/Thanks.htm)

1.	Making the thanking statement • Making the thanking statement (all exercises) • Using appropriate thanking expressions according to the interlocutor and the situation (Ex. 3, 6, 9, all others)
2.	Abiding by the cultural norms for thanking • Using the overlapping concepts and expressions of apology and thanks (Ex. 1, 8) • Using the multiple functions of expressions of thanks (Ex. 4) • Thanking for a previous favor when appropriate (Ex. 6) • Using an appropriate number of thanking expressions (Ex. 1, 2, 7)
3.	Using an appropriate level of politeness throughout the interaction (Ex. 2, 8, 9)
4.	Using pre- and post-thanking strategies • Complimenting (Ex. 5) • Apologizing (Ex. 5) • Expressing surprise and delight (Ex. 5) • Promising to repay (Ex. 5) • Expressing a lack of necessity or obligation (Ex. 5) • Emphasizing the depth of gratitude (Ex. 5, 6, 7, 8)
5.	Using the past tense of certain thanking expressions to conclude the interaction (Ex. 5)
6.	Using an appropriate tone of voice • Using intensifiers and pronouncing them emphatically (Ex. 7, 8, 9) • Using bows in formal thanks (Ex. 7, 9)
7.	Using some strategies for responding to thanks (accepting thanks, denying thanks, providing further help/invitation) (Ex. 10)

Learning Strategies for All Speech Acts (available at any links above)

1.	Finding an informant (a native or non-native expert of the culture) who can answer your questions regarding sociolinguistic or sociocultural norms in the target language/culture.
2.	Listening to other speakers carefully to observe the cultural norms and language of their speech. Making your own hypotheses or hunches regarding appropriate use of the target language and being willing to renew them as necessary.
3.	Finding resources that can inform you of the target language and culture.

Appendix D

The Speech Act Strategy Inventory
(Revised for the Speech Act of Refusals)

Developed by Andrew D. Cohen & Noriko Ishihara
CARLA, University of Minnesota, August 2003

As you become a proficient speaker of a foreign language, you develop an enhanced sense of the speech that is appropriate for given situations. You almost inadvertently begin to keep track of what the preferred things are to say so as not to offend anyone. You learn that successful speaking is not just a matter of using the correct words and forms—but that it means using whatever strategies are necessary for learning what to use them for, when to use them, and how to use them. Particularly challenging for language learners are those patterned, routinized phrases used regularly to perform a variety of functions or *speech acts*, such as requests, refusals, compliments, thanks, and apologies.

The following is an inventory of the strategies that you may use in performing or comprehending speech acts.

For each of the following 20 strategies, **in the left column** please circle the number corresponding to the **frequency** with which you use the strategy:

For each of the following 20 strategies, **in the right column** please circle the number corresponding to your **sense of success** at using the strategy:

5 – I always use this strategy.
4 – I often use this strategy.
3 – I sometimes use this strategy.
2 – I use this strategy on occasion.
1 – I never use this strategy.

5 – I use this strategy with great success.
4 – I use this strategy with success.
3 – I use this strategy with some success.
2 – I use this strategy with little success.
1 – I use this strategy with no success.

Speaker-Addressee Relationship Strategies

1. I adjust my language according to my **level of acquaintance** with the other person (intimate, close friend, distant friend, acquaintance, stranger).
frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

2. I take **age** into account when performing speech acts in Japanese.
frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

3. I adjust the **politeness level** of my language given my **social status** in relation to the person(s) I am speaking to.
frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

4. I adjust my language according to my **role** in relation to the other person in a Japanese speech act.

frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

Strategies Focusing on Language Forms & Non-Verbal Cues

5. I make use of **intensifiers** (e.g., "really," "so," and "very") to ensure that my feelings are appropriately expressed.

        frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

6. I use certain words (e.g., *just, a little*) to **reduce the force of the speech act** so that it sounds more acceptable.

        frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

7. I use a **tone of voice** that is appropriate for the given speech act situation.

        frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

8. I **speak hesitantly** so as to appear humble when the speech act calls for it.

        frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

9. I **purposely leave my utterance incomplete** when the speech act calls for it.

        frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

10. I **use repetition** of one or more things I say in order to achieve the appropriate effect in my Japanese speech act performance.

        frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

11. I **use non-verbal signals** (e.g., bowing and eye contact) to help in the delivery of speech acts.

        frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

Monitoring Strategies

12. I **monitor and adjust my responses** to the speech acts to fit the specifics of the given situation.

        frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

13. I make an effort to **close** a given speech act interaction in the way I think a native would.

        frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

14. I check to see that my speech act performance abides by **Japanese cultural rules** and is not simply a translation from the way I would do it in English.

        frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

15. I consciously **revise my hypotheses** regarding the appropriate way to perform speech acts based on my observation of others or the feedback I get.

        frequency   5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

Communication Strategies

16. I **warn the other person** before performing a speech act I may do incorrectly in order that they will not take offense.

    frequency 5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

17. I **clarify my intentions** to my conversation partner(s) by rephrasing, repeating, or explaining myself when I sense or anticipate problems with my speech act performance.

    frequency 5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

Learning Strategies

18. I **listen to others** carefully to see how they perform speech acts in order to learn from them how to do it.

    frequency 5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

19. I **inquire from natives/near-natives** of the language and culture as to the appropriate way to perform speech acts.

    frequency 5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

20. I draw on **written publications** for explanations of how Japanese language and culture deal with various speech acts.

    frequency 5—4—3—2—1   success 5—4—3—2—1

Appendix E

A Revised Request DCT Situation

You belong to a small tennis club at your university. You usually practice on a school tennis court, but next weekend you are going to have a tennis match with another team out of town. You do not have a car, and since the destination is far from the nearest station, you need a ride. You find out that another club member, Akira Imai, who is two years senior to you, is going to drive there. Although you are not exactly on his way, you think he lives relatively close to you. Besides that, you definitely don't want to miss the match. Since you talk to him frequently, you decide to ask him to give you a ride.

> あなたは大学の小さなテニス部に所属しています。 普段は学校のコートで練習しますが、 来週末は他の 町のチームとの試合があります。 あなたは車をもっていませんが 、その 試合の場所は最寄り駅から遠く、 だれかの車に乗せていってもらわなければなりません。 そんな時あなたは2年上の先輩の今井あきらさんが車で行くと聞きます。 あなたの家は通り道ではありませんがそれでも彼の家が一番近いようです。それにあなたは絶対その試合に出たいと思って いますし、先輩とはよく話をする仲なので、頼んでみようと思います。

You:

Akira: うん、行くつもりだけど。(Yeah, I'm planning on going.)

You:

Akira: ああ、他に池田としんちゃんも乗っていく予定なんだけど、ちょっと車の中せまいんじゃないかなぁ。(Well, I'm also going to pick up Ikeda and Shin-chan as well. That may make it too crowded in my car.)

You:

Akira: みんなのうち寄るからそれなりに時間もかかるけどそれでもいい？ (I'm picking them up at their homes so it'll take quite a bit of time. Is that okay?)

You:

Akira: よし、じゃあまず君のとこ行くよ。７時ごろになると思うけど出る前に電話するよ。 (OK, then, I'll come pick you up first. It's probably going to be about 7, but I'll call you before I leave.)

You:

Akira: うん、じゃあそのときに。(OK, see you then.)

You: