# Speech Act Data and the Teaching of English Speaking to Japanese Students

Reiko Ono

## Introduction

It is reported that, of the four English skills, the one which Japanese students want to learn the most and the one which they think they are the weakest in, is both speaking (Tsuchiya and Hirono, 2000). This paper, therefore, investigates the reasons why Japanese students are not good at speaking English and suggests effective ways of teaching it. Speaking ability in this study refers to communicative competence, which involves sociocultural ability, the speaker's ability to choose appropriate speech act strategies in a certain situation, and sociolinguistic ability, the speaker's skill to select appropriate linguistic forms to realize the speech act strategies chosen by the speaker (Cohen, 1996).

## 1. CCSARP and Second Language Teaching

Since speech act theory was proposed by philosophers such as Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), a number of cross-cultural speech act studies have been carried out in an attempt to apply their findings to second language teaching. One of the most influential studies of them is the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project, or CCSARP (Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper, 1989), which makes cross-linguistic comparisons of two kinds of speech act behavior, requests and apologies, by means of a discourse completion test, or a DCT, with 16 situations designed to elicit these speech acts. Within the framework

of CCSARP, the team members of the project conducted their own research focusing on the speech act realization of particular languages and/or native and nonnative varieties of the same language. Blum-Kulka (1989), for example, examined whether conventional indirectness in request had the same value across languages and cultures by looking at Australian English, Hebrew, Canadian French, and Argentinean Spanish. Results showed that conventional indirectness was the most frequently used request strategy in all the languages examined and that all these languages shared basic properties of conventional indirectness. However, results also revealed cross-linguistic differences in factors such as a choice of perspective (i.e. speaker oriented, hearer oriented, etc.) and the use of downgraders. [1] Blum-Kulka (1989), therefore, pointed out that "the universality of conventional indirectness should be regarded as a matter of shared pragmatic properties, rather than as a matter of cross-linguistic equivalence in form and usage" (37) and that "pragmatic adjustments" (65) between two codes were called for in learning or using a second language, as well as in translating conventional indirect strategies from one language into another, so as not to cause a serious breakdown of communication or

---

[1] Syntactic downgraders include *negation* (e.g. *Can't you . . ?*), *aspect* (e.g. I'm *wondering* if . . . ), *tense* (e.g. I *was wondering* if . . .) etc. and lexical and phrasal downgraders contain *politeness marker* (e.g. *please*), *downtoner* (e.g. Could you *possibly . . ?*) etc (See Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989).

"pragmatic failure" (65). Rintell and Mitchell (1989) compared the responses of both native and nonnative speakers of English elicited by means of a written DCT with those obtained by means of a role play method to see if there were any differences between written and oral speech act data. They found that the oral responses of nonnative speakers of English were longer than their written responses, the former containing more and longer supportive moves,[2] hesitations, and repetiton. Since such a difference was not found in the responses of native speakers of English, they considered that the difference in length between written and oral responses of nonnative speakers of English was due to their lack of fluency and of confidence in appropriateness when using English.

## 2. Method

In order to understand English speaking ability of Japanese students, I used six kinds of DCTs, each of which contained the same academic situations intended to elicit requests and apologies. The questionnaires included ten situations which students were likely to experience at university or college. For this paper, I chose four of them, which are listed below. These situations were aimed to elicit requests.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Professor / REPETITION: | | ask the professor to repeat the question in class |
| Classmate / REPETITION: | | ask the partner to repeat the question in pair work |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Professor / EXTENSION: | | ask the professor to give her an extension of homework |
| Classmate / DICTIONARY: | | ask a classmate sitting next to her to lend her a dictionary during class |

The description of Professor / REPETITION, for example, was as follows:

> Professor / REPETITION:
> During class, the professor asks you a question, the meaning of which you don't understand very well. You want her to repeat the question. What would you say?
> (See Appendix for the other three situations.)

As mentioned above, I administered six kinds of DCTs, which included three oral DCTs and three written ones. For this paper, I used four kinds of them, all three oral DCTs and one of the written ones, since my primary concern in this paper was to investigate English speaking ability of Japanese students. Table 1 shows DCT types and participants. DCT 1 and DCT 2 were conducted in English although Japanese was used for test instructions. The only difference between DCTs 1 and 2 was that DCT 1 was an oral test, while DCT 2 was a written one. DCT 3 was a Japanese version of DCT 1, that is, the language used for both test instructions and responses in DCT 3 was Japanese. I also administered an oral DCT to native speakers of English to compare the data of Japanese participants to that of native speakers of English. This test, DCT 5, was the same as DCT 1 except that test instructions were made in English in DCT 5.

---

[2] Mitigating supportive moves include *preparator* (e.g. I'd like to ask you something . . ), *grounder* (reasons, explanations, or justifications for the speaker's request, either preceding or following it) etc (See Blum-Kulka et al, 1989).

Table 1  DCT Types and Participants

| DCT No. | Oral/Written | Language used for test instructions | Language used for responses | Group Name | Native Language | Number |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DCT 1 | oral | Japanese | English | JLE | Japanese | 30 |
| DCT 2 | written | Japanese | English | JLE-w | Japanese | 20 |
| DCT 3 | oral | Japanese | Japanese | NSJJ | Japanese | 17 |
| DCT 5 | oral | English | English | NSE | English | 24 |

DCT = discourse-completion test; JLE = Japanese learners of English taking an oral DCT; JLE-w = Japanese learners of English taking a written DCT; NSJJ = native speakers of Japanese taking an oral DCT in Japanese; NSE = native speakers of English taking an oral DCT

The Japanese participants were 67 female first-year undergraduate students at a women's college in Kobe, Japan. They were divided into three groups, JLE (Japanese learners of English taking DCT 1, the oral test), JLE-w (Japanese learners of English taking DCT 2, the written test), and NSJJ (native speakers of Japanese taking DCT 3, the Japanese version of DCT 1, and responding in Japanese). JLE consisted of 30 participants; JLE-w, 20; and NSJJ, 17. DCT 1 was administered at a language laboratory to the JLE group, whose members were asked to listen to the tape-recorded descriptions of the situations and say what they would have said in English in each situation extemporaneously within a thirty-second time limit. I regarded the responses to this DCT, namely DCT 1, as data representing English speaking ability of Japanese students. These responses were then compared to written responses from DCT 2 (administered to JLE-w) to examine if there were any differences between oral responses made extempore and written ones formulated using ample time. Next the

English responses to DCT 1 were compared to Japanese oral responses to DCT 3 (administered to NSJJ) to see how different the performance in the target language was from that in the native language. Finally, all the responses by the Japanese participants were compared to oral responses by native speakers of English, or NSE, consisting of 24 undergraduate students (8 female students and 16 male students) at a college in Swarthmore, the United States. They completed DCT 5 orally at a language laboratory.

All the responses were analyzed according to the CCSARP Coding Manual, which had been developed to analyze speech act data in CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project) (Blum-Kulka et al, 1989) (See Section 1). In addition, all of the responses in English by JLE and JLE-w were evaluated by three native speakers of English and all of those in Japanese by NSJJ were evaluated by three native speakers of Japanese. Both the native speakers of English and those of Japanese had either MA or PhD degrees.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1. Reasons for JLE's use of direct strategies

Based on the CCSARP Coding Manual (Blum-Kulka et al, 1989) and Rose and Ono (1995), I categorized request strategies used for the responses into three levels of directness, or "the degree to which the speaker's illocutionary intent is apparent from the locution" (Blum-Kulka et al, 1989:278): *direct*, as in "(Please) repeat the question"; *conventionally indirect*, as in "Could you (please) repeat that?"; and nonconventionally indirect, or *hint*, as in "I don't quite understand your question."

Brown and Levinson (1987/1978) point out that a request is a speech act which threatens the hearer's negative face and that one of the strategies to minimize this face-threatening act (i.e. negative politeness strategies) is using conventionally indirect strategies in the request. Leech (1983) maintains that the higher the degree of request indirectness is, the easier the hearer can say "No" to the speaker making a request of the hearer, and that the speaker's attempt to make the hearer say "No" easily minimizes the hearer's imposition and thus raises the degree of negative politeness. For example, it is easier for the hearer to say "No" to "Can you answer the phone?" or "Could you possibly answer the phone?" than to "Answer the phone" or "I want you to answer the phone." The former involves conventionally indirect strategies whereas the latter, direct strategies. Conventionally indirect strategies, therefore, are generally considered to be more polite request strategies than direct ones.

Table 2 shows the frequency distribution of request strategies used for all the four situations. Note that the data of JLE (Japanese learners of English) and that of NSE (native speakers of English) are in bold Gothic type since my main focus is on comparing the request strategies chosen by JLE when using English to those employed by NSE. Overall, there was one big difference between the data of JLE and that of NSE, that is, while NSE overwhelmingly chose conventionally indirect strategies for all the situations, JLE selected direct strategies as well as conventionally indirect ones for every situation. For Professor / REPETITION, while 91.7% of NSE employed conventionally indirect strategies, 41.4% of JLE chose direct strategies and 27.6%, conventionally indirect ones. For Professor / EXTENSION, all the requests made by NSE were conventionally indirect, whereas a half of the requests made by JLE were conventionally indirect, a quarter of them being direct. For Classmate / REPETITION, while 75% of NSE chose conventionally indirect strategies (only 4.2%, direct strategies, and 20.8%, others), 63.3% of JLE used direct strategies, 20%, conventionally indirect ones, and 16.7%, others. And for Classmate / DICTIONARY, 95.8% of NSE employed conventionally indirect strategies (and 4.2%, hint); 53.1% and 46.9% of JLE, on the other hand, selected conventionally indirect strategies and direct ones respectively.

One of the reasons why JLE used direct strategies where almost all NSE chose conventionally indirect ones may be that English sentences realizing conventionally indirect strategies were so difficult for JLE to make that they had no choice but to use direct

strategies. Typical conventionally indirect requests involve the interrogative with modals such as "Could you do X?" and "Would it be all right if I did X?", whereas a typical form of direct requests is the imperative such as "(Please) do X," which is simpler than the interrogative with modals. The data of Professor / EXTENSION and Classmate / DICTIONARY can support this reason.

Especially for Professor / EXTENSION, where the hearer (i.e. the professor) is dominant, not only all NSE but also 94.1% of NSJJ (native speakers of Japanese responding in Japanese) selected conventionally indirect strategies; however, 25% of JLE, and 20% of even JLE-w (Japanese learners of English taking the written DCT), who had ample time to formulate requests, chose direct strategies.

Table 2   Percentage Frequency of Request Strategies for All Situations

| Situations | Groups | | Request Strategies | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | Direct | | Conventionally Indirect | | Hint | | Others | |
| | | | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n |
| Professor / REPETITION | JLE | n=29 | 41.4 | 12 | 27.6 | 8 | 6.9 | 2 | 24.1 | 7 |
| | JLE-w | n=21 | 71.4 | 15 | 28.6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | NSJJ | n=17 | 64.7 | 11 | 35.3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | NSE | n=24 | 0 | 0 | 91.7 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 8.3 | 2 |
| Professor / EXTENSION | JLE | n=16 | 25 | 4 | 50 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 4 |
| | JLE-w | n=15 | 20 | 3 | 73.3 | 11 | 6.7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | NSJJ | n=17 | 0 | 0 | 94.1 | 16 | 5.9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | NSE | n=24 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Classmate / REPETITION | JLE | n=30 | 63.3 | 19 | 20 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 16.7 | 5 |
| | JLE-w | n=19 | 63.2 | 12 | 26.3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 10.5 | 2 |
| | NSJJ | n=22 | 31.8 | 7 | 40.9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 27.3 | 6 |
| | NSE | n=24 | 4.2 | 1 | 75 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 20.8 | 5 |
| Classmate / DICTIONARY | JLE | n=32 | 46.9 | 15 | 53.1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | JLE-w | n=20 | 55 | 11 | 45 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | NSJJ | n=17 | 23.5 | 4 | 76.5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | NSE | n=24 | 0 | 0 | 95.8 | 23 | 4.2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

JLE = Japanese learners of English; JLE-w = Japanese learners of English taking a written DCT

NSJJ = native speakers of Japanese responding in Japanese; NSE = native speakers of English

JLE's tendency to choose direct strategies may also have been influenced by their native language, Japanese. For Professor / REPETITION, where 91.7% of NSE chose conventionally indirect requests, not only 41.4% of JLE and 71.4% of JLE-w but also 64.7% of NSJJ made direct requests. For Classmate / REPETETION, where 75% of NSE employed conventionally indirect strategies (and only 4.2% of them chose direct

ones), about 63% of both JLE and JLE-w selected direct strategies. Although 40.9% of NSJJ applied conventionally indirect strategies, 31.8% still used direct ones.

## 3.2. Polite vs. plain forms of requests in Japanese

In section 3.1., I provided the two possible reasons why JLE used direct strategies far more frequently than NSE for all the situations. One of them was that direct requests were syntactically easier for JLE to make than conventionally indirect ones, the other being that their native language, Japanese, influenced them to choose direct strategies. In this section, I will focus my attention on the latter, the influence of Japanese.

As discussed in 3.1., JLE's tendency to use direct strategies for Professor / REPETITION was due to the influence of their native language, Japanese, because NSJJ also preferred direct strategies (64.7%) to conventionally indirect ones (35.3%) when making requests in Japanese. For Classmate / REPETITION, the same kind of request situation, however, NSJJ preferred conventionally indirect strategies (40.9%) to direct ones (31.8%). Since, as I stated in the

previous section, conventionally indirect strategies are generally considered to be more polite request strategies than direct ones, I wondered why NSJJ had employed direct strategies to ask the professor, who had higher social status than them, for repetition of her question in spite of the fact that they had favored conventionally indirect strategies to ask the classmate, whose status had been equal to theirs, for repetition of her question.

In order to find the answer to this question, I investigated how both direct requests and conventionally indirect ones in Japanese made by NSJJ for Professor / REPETITION had been evaluated by the three educated native speakers of Japanese. The evaluators were provided the list of randomly ordered requests made by NSJJ and were asked to rate each request on a scale of 1 to 5 in terms of (a) *sociolinguistic appropriateness* (e.g. "*X shite kudasai*" [Please do X] vs. "*X shite kudasai masuka*?" [Could you please do X?]) and (b) *linguistic acceptability* (i.e. to what extent their requests are lexically, syntactically and semantically acceptable). Score 5 showed sociolinguistically the most appropriate and linguistically the most acceptable, and 1, the least appropriate and the least acceptable.

Table 3 Evaluation of Requests by NSJJ for Professor / REPETITION

|  |  | Socio. (5) | Ling. (5) | Total Scores (10) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Conventionally Indirect requests | n=6 | 3.89 | 3.78 | 7.67 |
| Direct requests | n=11 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 8.24 |

Socio. = Sociolinguistic appropriateness; Ling. = Linguistic acceptability

Figures in parentheses = highest scores

Table 3 shows the results of the evaluation of Japanese conventionally indirect and direct requests by NSJJ for Professor /

REPETITION. Here I wondered again why direct requests had been more highly evaluated than conventionally indirect

requests (8.24 vs. 7.67 points). I looked at each of the conventionally indirect and direct requests, therefore, and found two points. First, the direct requests made by NSJJ were rather polite because 63.6% of them ended with *kudasai*, as in "*mô ichido itte kudasai*" ('Please repeat that'), which indicated a polite request. *kudasai* is the polite imperative form of *kudasaru*, the honorific form of *kureru* ['give (me)'], and is used as an auxiliary. The rest of the direct requests (36.4%) included *onegaishimasu*, as in "*mô ichido onegaishimasu*" ('Once more, please'), which also showed a polite request. Second, not all conventionally indirect requests in Japanese were polite. That is, there were two kinds of

conventionally indirect requests in Japanese; one was polite, the other being plain. When I divided NSJJ's conventionally indirect requests into two, those with polite forms and those without them (i.e. plain forms), then the results turned out to be different from the ones in Table 3. A revised version of the results is shown in Table 4, in which the conventionally indirect requests with polite forms (<Polite>) are the most highly evaluated (8.33 points), the direct requests follow them (8.24 points), and the conventionally indirect requests with plain forms (<Plain>) are evaluated the lowest (7.00 points).

Table 4   Evaluation of Requests by NSJJ for Professor / REPETITION <Revised>

| Requests | Examples | | Socio. (5) | Ling. (5) | Total Scores (10) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Conventionally Indirect | *mô ichido itte <u>itadake</u>-masen ka?* | n=3 | 4.33 | 4 | 8.33 |
| <Polite> | 'Could you please repeat that?' | | | | |
| Conventionally Indirect | *mô ichido itte <u>morae</u>-masen ka?* | n=3 | 3.44 | 3.56 | 7.00 |
| <Plain> | 'Could you repeat that?' | | | | |
| Direct | *mô ichido itte kudasai.* | n=11 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 8.24 |
| | 'Please repeat that.' | | | | |

Socio. = Sociolinguistic appropriateness; Ling. = Linguistic acceptability ; Figures in parentheses = highest scores

The results shown in Table 4 imply that, in Japanese, requests with direct strategies can be used to express a certain level of politeness, while requests with conventionally indirect strategies are not always appropriate to show politeness. If conventionally indirect requests take polite forms, either honorific forms such as *kudasai masu/masen ka*,[3] as in "*mô ichido itte kudasai masen ka*?" ('Could

you please repeat that?'), or humble forms such as *itadake-masu/masen ka*,[4] as in "*mô ichido itte itadake-masu ka*?" ('Could you please repeat that?'), then they are polite and thus appropriate for situations such as Professor / REPETITION. If, however, conventionally indirect requests are in plain forms such as *kure masu/masen ka*,[5] as in "*mô ichido itte kure masen ka*?" ('Could you repeat that?'), and *morae-masu/masen ka*,[6]

---

[3] *masu*: formal auxiliary; *masen*: negative of *masu*; *ka*: sentence-final particle indicating the interrogative

[4] *itadake-*: humble form of *morae-* (See Note 6)

[5] *kure*: imperative form of *kureru*

[6] *morae-*: auxiliary following the *te*-form of verbs

as in "*mô ichido itte morae-masu ka*?", then they may not be as appropriate as direct requests with *kudasai,* as in "*mô ichio itte kudasai*." (See e.g. Makino and Tsutsui, 1989, 1995 for Japanese grammar.)

Table 5 summarizes the relationship between request strategies and politeness in Japanese for Professor / REPETITION and Classmate / REPETITION. As shown in this table, there are two types of conventionally indirect requests and two types of direct ones in Japanese. Note that the last two examples of the plain forms of conventionally indirect requests, "*mô ichido itte kure-hen*?" (*hen*: *nai* 'not' in Kansai dialect) and "*mô ichido itte kureru*?", and the plain direct request, "*mô ichido itte*" ('Repeat that'), are informal requests made for Classmate / REPETITION.

Table 5  Relationship between Request Strategies and Degree of Politeness in Japanese
for Professor / REPETITION and Classmate / REPETITION

| more polite ↕ less polite | *mô ichido itte* [more once say] もう一度言って | (I) get / receive (from someone) | | (someone) gives (me) | | Polite / Plain | Request Strategies Translation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *itadake-masen ka*? いただけませんか。 *itadake-masu ka*? いただけますか。 | humble | *kudasai masen ka*? くださいませんか。 *kudasai masu ka*? くださいますか。 | honorific | polite form | Conventionally Indirect 'Could you please repeat that?' |
| | | | | *kudasai.* ください。 | | | Direct 'Please repeat that.' |
| | | *morae-masen ka*? もらえませんか。 *morae-masu ka*? もらえますか。 | | *kure masen ka*? くれませんか。 *kure masu ka*? くれますか。 *kure hen*? (= *kure nai*?) くれへん。(= くれない。) *kureru*? くれる。 | | plain form | Conventionally Indirect 'Could you repeat that?' ' Can you repeat that?' |
| | | | | | | | Direct 'Repeat that.' |

The fact that there are two types of conventionally indirect requests and two types of direct ones in Japanese then may account for JLE's tendency to use direct strategies where almost all NSE employed conventionally indirect strategies. In Japanese, as described in Table 5, conventionally indirect requests with polite forms are the most appropriate where a high degree of politeness is required. In some situations, however, direct requests can be more polite and thus more appropriate to use than conventionally indirect requests if the former include polite forms but the latter does not. This can explain why 64.7% of NSJJ chose direct strategies for Professor / REPETITION and 40.9% of them used

— 28 —

conventionally indirect strategies for Classmate / REPETITION. When using English, however, JLE should have known that, for Professor / REPETITION, for instance, conventionally indirect requests such as "Could you please repeat that?" were more appropriate and were used much more frequently than direct requests such as "Please repeat that."

## 3.3. Application of the findings to teaching of English speaking to Japanese students

The results of this study have revealed that JLE tend to transfer their norms of Japanese to their target language, English, when using it. This may sometimes cause "pragmatic failure," however (Blum-Kulka, 1989:65). In the teaching of English speaking to Japanese students, therefore, it is suggested that teachers help their students with "pragmatic adjustments" (Blum-Kulka, 1989:65) between English and Japanese by showing them that there are some differences between the two languages in realizing speech acts and making them aware that the relationship between politeness and indirectness is not universal but varies from language to language and/or culture to culture.

It should be noted in addition that, in making requests in their target language, for example, learners may not be able to attain 'pragmatic success' if they only use a Head Act, the minimal unit required to realize a request. Although conventionally indirect strategies are considered to be more polite than direct strategies in English, using only Head Acts realizing the former will not always be sufficient. When looking at JLE's responses in English and evaluation scores given to them by the three educated native speakers of English, I found that the requests including both Head Acts and supportive moves (reasons, explanations, etc) had been rated more highly than those consisting solely of Head Acts. That is, for Professor / EXTENSION, for instance, requests such as "Excuse me, I did my homework, but my computer printer was broken, so I couldn't print my homework. So can I bring my homework tomorrow?" were rated much more highly than requests without any supportive moves such as "May I bring the paper tomorrow?" This suggests that when teaching English speaking to Japanese students, teachers should make them realize that the learning of English speaking does not mean memorizing and saying many single English expressions but involves learning many *sets* of English expressions on a discourse level and using them appropriately according to social contexts and/or situations.

## Conclusion

In this paper, I have investigated the reasons why Japanese students often violate pragmatic norms while speaking English and attempted to find effective ways of correcting their errors. By conducting three kinds of DCTs to elicit requests in English from both Japanese and American students and one DCT to elicit requests in Japanese from Japanese students, I have found that Japanese students tend to transfer their norms of Japanese to English when making requests in English. I have suggested, therefore, that English teachers help their Japanese students with "pragmatic adjustments" between English and Japanese and that they encourage their students to learn many sets of English expressions on a discourse level and use them appropriately.

For future studies, 'refusals', another kind of speech acts, should be researched for better understanding of English speaking ability of Japanese students and more effective ways of the teaching of English speaking to them.

This paper is based on the oral presentation with the same title by Reiko Ono and Yoshiko Jo for the Ninth International Conference on World Englishes held at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.A. from October 17th to 20th, 2002.

## References

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1989). Playing it safe: The role of conventionality in indirectness. In S. Blum-Kulka, House, J. and Kasper, G (eds.), *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. (pp. 36-70). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., and Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, and G. Kasper (eds.), *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. (pp. 1-34). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Brown, P., and Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. First published 1978 as part of Esther N. Goody (ed.): *Questions and Politeness*.

Cohen, A. D. (1996). Speech acts. In S. L. McKay and N. H. Hornberger (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. (pp. 383-420). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Makino, S., and Tsutsui, M. (1989). A *Dictionary of Basic Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Makino, S., and Tsutsui, M. (1995). A *Dictionary of Intermediate Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Rintell, E. M., and Mitchell, C. J. (1989). Studying requests and apologies: An inquiry into method. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, and G. Kasper (eds.), *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. (pp. 248-272). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

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

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

Tsuchiya, A., and Hirono, T. (2000). *shin eigo-ka kyoikuho nyumon*. [Introduction to new method of English teaching]. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

## Appendix: Descriptions of the Three Situations

Classmate / REPETITION:

You are working on a task with a partner during class. Your partner asks you a question, but you don't understand what she is asking. You want her to repeat the question. What would you say?

Professor / EXTENSION:

You did your homework assignment due today using your computer, but you cannot hand it in because your printer didn't work and so you couldn't print it out. You want the professor to give you an extension until tomorrow. What would you say?

Classmate / DICTIONARY:

You are doing exercises by yourself during class as other students are. In the exercises, you find a difficult word, which you want to look up in a dictionary. Since you didn't bring one with you, you want a classmate sitting next to you to lend hers to you. What would you say?