

Table 3
 Situation 3: Restaurant

Directness Levels	Native English		Non-native English		Native Korean	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Mood Derivable	0	0	1	6.7	0	0
2. Performative	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Locution Derivable	1	6.7	0	0	0	0
4. Want Statement	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Suggestory Formula	0	0	1	6.7	0	0
6. Preparatory	7	46.7	9	60	8	80
7. Hints	7	46.7	4	26.7	2	20
Supportive Moves						
1. Preparator	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Precommitment	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Apology	0	0	1	6.7	1	0
4. Grounder	12	80	14	93.	9	9
5. Disarmer	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Promise of Reward	0	0	0	0	0	0

+dominance

-social distance

In Situation 3, the requester (customer) has authority over the requestee (waiter). In addition, the requester has a definite right to make his or her request. Consequently, it is both unlikely that the request will be perceived as an imposition by the requestee and as a particularly difficult undertaking by the requester. In such a situational environment, it would seem likely that the subjects would feel licensed to use imperatives, but on the contrary, all three groups conformed to the usage of the least direct strategies—Preparatory and Hints. The nonnative English group commonly used the same pattern as the native English group—*Can/Could you...?* However, two of the native speakers began their requests with the consultative device—*Do you think you can...?* whereas none of the nonnative speakers used this form. Although nonnative speakers used almost the same amount of Hints, native speakers again differed in their request structure. While nonnative speakers used simple strong hints—*I ordered steak to be well done*—, some native English speakers began their strong hints with—*I think/believe I ordered this to be well done*.

Due to the varying social factors of this specific situation, the request may be performed by speakers without their using an abundance of supportive moves. In all three groups, most subjects used only Grounders for each request.

In Situation 4, the request is highly face-threatening act in both English and Korean, because the requestee has no fixed obligation to fulfill it, and the requester and requestee are non-intimates. However, the next door neighbor is disturbing the requester; thus the requester has a definite right

Table 4
Situation 4: Loud Music

Directness Levels	Native English		Non-native English		Native Korean	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Mood Derivable	0	0	4	26.7	0	0
2. Performative	0	0	1	6.7	0	0
3. Locution Derivable	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Want Statement	5	33.3	1	6.7	4	40
5. Suggestory Formula	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Preparatory	10	66.7	9	60	6	60
7. Hints	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supportive Moves						
1. Preparator	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Precommitment	1	6.7	1	6.7	0	0
3. Apology	2	13.3	2	13.3	3	30
4. Grounder	15	100	15	100	10	100
5. Disarmer	0	0		0	0	0
5. Promise of Reward	0	0		1	6.7	0

-dominance

+social distance

to ask the neighbor to turn down the music. Taking all of these factors into consideration, the requester must be able to be polite yet show his or her displeasure firmly. Nonnative English speakers were more direct in their requests than were both the native English group and the native Korean group. This deviation from both groups might signal a lack of grammatical proficiency on the part of the non-native English group. Among the native English speakers, 33% used Level 4=Want Statement and phrased their requests similarly: *I would appreciate it if you'd turn it down.* The remaining 67% requests at Level 6=Preparatory Conditions and used the routine: *Do you mind turning down the music a little?*

The native Korean group also used Want Statements (*It would be nice if you lowered your music.*) and Preparatory Conditions (*Could you calm down more?*). However, in the nonnative English group, only one subject used a Want statement whereas 27% requested at the most direct level=Mood Derivable (*Please turn down the music.*). Although the requesters are being disturbed, this use of imperatives might seem rude to a native English speaker. In contrast, nonnative speakers' usage of Preparatory Conditions was similar to that of native speakers (NNS=60%, NSE=67%). However, nonnative speakers failed to show their displeasure clearly by using the routine *Can/Could/Will you...?* instead of *Do you mind...?* Although *Do you mind...?* is considered a mitigator on the internal level, in this type of situation it can show that the speaker is not happy with the actions of the hearer.

In some cases nonnative speakers are either too forceful and in others not forceful enough. The cause of these deviations might be due to their unfamiliarity with the routines: *Do you mind if..* and *I'd appreciate it if..*

Table 5
Situation 5: Getting Off Work Early

Directness Levels	Native English		Non-native English		Native Korean	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Mood Derivable	0	0	1	6.7	1	10
2. Performative	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Locution Derivable	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Want Statement	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Suggestory Formula	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Preparatory	15	100	7	46.7	4	40
7. Hints	0	46.7	7	46.7	5	50
Supportive Moves						
1. Preparator	4	26.7	0	0	0	0
2. Precommitment	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Apology	0	0	5	33.3	33	0
4. Grounder	15	100	15	100	10	100
5. Disarmer	1	6.7	0	6.7	0	0
6. Promise of Reward	6	40	32	0	5	50

+dominance

-social distance

In Situation 5, all of the native English respondents used Preparatory conditions to request. The most commonly used expressions in this level were mitigated with consultative devices: *Would it be alright to...?* and *Do you think I could...?* Although 47% of nonnative speakers also used Preparatory conditions, again they limited these requests to *Can I...?* even though native Korean speakers used phrases that were comparable to the English consultative forms (*Is it alright to...?*)

Both nonnative English speakers and native Korean speakers were less direct. Nonnative speakers' usage of Hints (47%) is most likely the result of negative transfer since the native Korean speakers also commonly used this level of directness (50%). Most of the Hints seem as though they are simply declarations, and the subjects do not appear to be making requests (*I need to go there/I have to pick my mother up at the airport/I wish to go*). However, it is the responsibility of the requestee (boss) to make a final decision and give his or her approval. Therefore, in essence, these strong hints act as requests.

How, then, does this situation differ from Situation 1 (Asking a Professor for an Extension)? Even though the requestees in both situations have authority over the requester, why do the requesters use Hints in Situation 5 but not in Situation 1? To answer this question, the researcher asked one native English speaker and one native Korean speaker which situation placed more of an imposition on the requestee. Both informants agreed that more of an imposition was placed on the boss rather than the professor. Therefore, it can be assumed that Korean speakers in both groups used Hints to be less direct and more polite. However, in the United States,

Table 6
Situation 6: Baby-sitting

Directness Levels	Native English		Non-native English		Native Korean	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Mood Derivable	1	6.7	9	60	6	60
2. Performative	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Locution Derivable	4	26.7	20	0	0	0
4. Want Statement	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Suggestory Formula	1	6.7		20	2	20
6. Preparatory	2	13.3	0	0	2	20
7. Hints	7	46.7	0	0	0	0
Supportive Moves						
1. Preparator	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Precommitment	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Apology	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Grounder	14	93.3	4	26.7	5	50
5. Disarmer	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Promise of Reward	3	20	2	13.3	2	20

+dominance

-social distance

stating what one would do, have to do, or hope to do, rather than explicitly asking for permission might seem rude to the requestee. Native English speakers in "Getting Off Work Early" differed from their answer in "Asking a Professor for an Extension" in that they used more consultative devices (mentioned above) when requesting.

Native English and non-native English speakers used the same types of supportive moves as they did in "Asking a Professor an Extension." Neither of the two Korean groups used Preparators before a request whereas 27% of native English speakers used Preparators such as: *I have a request to make./Can I ask you something?* Again, both Korean groups used Apologies before making the request (NNS=33% and NSK=30%). Perhaps nonnative speakers used Apologies because of their lack of Preparator usage. It seems necessary to make a supportive move (Apology or Preparator) before giving justifications (Grounders) and requesting in both native and nonnative English groups in this type of situation.

In native English speaker requests, the spread of directness levels was much more pronounced than it is in both Korean groups in Situation 6. Nonnative English speakers were also much more direct in their requests as baby-sitters; 60% used imperatives (Mood derivable) whereas 47% of native English speakers used the least direct strategy—Hints (*It's time to go to bed.*) Usage of imperatives seems to be transfer induced; 60% of native Korean speakers as well requested at the Mood Derivable level.

All groups used only two supportive moves—Grounders and Promises of rewards. All but one of the native English speakers used Grounders (*Your parents are gonna be really mad at me*). Nonnative speakers and native

Korean speakers used Grounders much less frequently (27% and 50% respectively).

Negative transfer of pragmatic rules from Korean seems to play a major role in both directness level and external modification (Grounders) in this situation. This may be due to the factor of age. The significance of age difference is much more pronounced in Korea than in the United States. Perhaps adults in Korea do not feel a need to be indirect and to mitigate requests with all children. Most native English speakers avoided imperatives, gave justifications, and left room for negotiation when making requests to other people's children. If nonnative speakers use the same strategies as their native Korean counterparts, then a problem might arise in that American children might not be accustomed to such forceful language from their baby-sitter.

Conclusions

In all three language groups, request realizations are determined by the sociopragmatic features of the situational context. However, nonnative speakers deviated from native English speaker norms in some situations due to the effect of the pragmatic rules of Korean.

In analyzing the oral DCT requests of Situation 5 (Getting Off Work Early) and Situation 6 (Baby-sitting), examples of negative transfer in directness levels were found. In requesting to get off work early, nonnative speakers and native Korean speakers were much more indirect—which might seem rude to a native English speaker in this type of situation. In contrast, nonnative speakers were overly direct in asking a child to go to sleep.

Although not quantitatively tested, this study has not indicated an overuse of external modification as claimed by researchers in past studies (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain 1986: 47-61; House & Kasper 1987: 1250-1288). Rather, learners sometimes chose different types of supportive moves according to the situation which might have been a result of negative transfer. Situation 1 (Professor's Office) and Situation 5 (Getting Off Work Early), both requestee=dominant/imposition=high, required the most supportive moves from all three groups. Transfer from Korean might have come into play in nonnative speakers' non-use of Preparators and overuse of Apologies. In Situation 2 (Asking a Friend for Money), both Korean groups used more Grounders to justify their request for money.

A summary of findings concerning Korean learners of English in general is a difficult undertaking because the learners' request realizations in this study were highly variable according to the social context. One can not conclude from this study that Korean ESL learners are generally more direct or indirect or use more or less supportive moves. These findings have merely illustrated certain contexts in which Koreans deviate from native speakers.

Past research has indicated that formal instruction concerning speech acts and the social rules of language use can assist learners in communicating more appropriately in the target language (Olshtain & Cohen 1990: 45-65; Billmyer 1990: 6). Therefore, this type of study not only is useful in supplying teachers and materials developers with native speaker baseline data, but also indicates how and in what situations certain groups deviate from native speaker norms. It should therefore be a major goal to teach of relevant general cultural schemata and to make nonnative learners aware of differences between their own cultural schemata and those of native speakers.

References

- Beebe, L.M., & Cummings, M. (1994). Natural speech act data vs. written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. In J. Neu & S. Gass (Eds.) *Speech acts across cultures*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Beebe, L.M., & Takahashi, T. (1989). (in press). Do you have a bag?
- Beebe, L.M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1985). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. Krashen (Eds.) *On the development of communicative competence in a second language*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House, pp..
- Billmyer, K. (1990). 'I really like your lifestyle.' Learning how to compliment in English. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 6 (2).
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1991). Interlanguage pragmatics: The case of requests. In Phillipson, Kellerman, Selinker, Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.) *Foreign/Second language pedagogy: Multilingual Matters* 64.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1983). Interpreting and performing speech acts in a second language: A cross-cultural study of Hebrew and English. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*. Rowley: Newbury House, pp. 36-55.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1986). Too many words: length of utterance and pragmatic failure. *Journal of Pragmatics* 8: 47-61.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S.D. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrel, P.L., & Konneker, B.H. (1980). Politeness: Comparing native and nonnative judgments. *Language Learning* 31:17-30.
- Cohen, A.D., & Olshtain, E. (1980). Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: The case of apology. *Language Learning* 31:113-134.
- Edmonson, W., & House, J. (1991). Do learners talk too much? The waffle phenomenon in interlanguage pragmatics. In Phillipson, Kellerman, Selinker, Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.) *Foreign/Second language pedagogy: Multilingual Matters* 64.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of American English directives. *Language in Society* 5(1) 25-66.
- Fraser, B. (1978). Acquiring social competence in a second language. *RELC Journal* 9 1-21.
- Fraser, B. & Rintell, E. (1980). An approach to conducting research on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. *Discourse Analysis*. pp.75-83. Cambridge University Press.

- House, J. & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. In W. Loersch, & R. Schulze (Eds.). *Perspectives on language in performance*. Tuebingen: Narr: 1250-1288.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research*, 8(3): 203-231.
- Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. (1990). The learning of complex speech-act behavior. *TESL Canada Journal*, 7(2): 45-65
- Searle, J.R. (1975). A taxonomy of illocutionary acts. In Gunderson, K. (Ed.), *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Language*, 344-369. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Takahashi, T. & Beebe, L.M. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal*, 8 .131-155.
- Walters, J. (1979). Language variation as a tool in the assessment of communicative competence. *Multicultural Bilingual Education*, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Wolfson, N. (1981). Compliments in cross-cultural perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15 .117-124.

Julie Kim received her M.S. in TESOL and is currently a Ph.D. student at the University of Pennsylvania. Her research interests include second language acquisition, classroom discourse, and bilingual education.



Appendix A

Request Instrument

You will be asked to read six brief situations. I will play the person you are requesting to. Respond as much as possible as you would in an actual situation. Your responses will be tape recorded. Indicate when you've finished reading.

SITUATION 1:

You have a paper due in one of your classes next week. However, you will be very busy this week and don't have any time to write it. You go to your professor's office to ask for more time to write the paper.

How do you request an extension?

SITUATION 2:

You are at a record store with your best friend. There's a CD you really want to buy, but you don't have any money.

How do you ask your friend to lend you the money?

SITUATION 3:

At a restaurant you order a steak to be well-done. However, the waiter brings a rare steak.

What do you say to the waiter?

SITUATION 4:

You are trying to studying for an exam which will be given tomorrow. However, your neighbor, who is also a student from your school but you've never met, is playing music very loudly, and you can't concentrate. The library is closed, and there is no other place to study but in your apartment.

What do you say to your neighbor?

SITUATION 5:

Your mother will be visiting from out of town, and you want to pick her up at the airport. However, her flight arrives at 3:00 PM, but you have to work until 5:00 PM.

How do you ask you boss to let you out of work early?

SITUATION 6:

You are baby-sitting a four year old boy. He has been very energetic all night. You want him to go to sleep because you are tired, and it is one hour past his bedtime.

What do you say to the boy?