DEVELOPMENTAL ISSUES IN INTERLANGUAGE PRAGMATICS

Gabriele Kasper and Richard Schmidt

University of Hawai'i at Manoa

Unlike other areas of second language study, which are primarily concerned with acquisitional patterns of interlanguage knowledge over time, most studies in interlanguage pragmatics have focused on second language use rather than second language learning. The aim of this paper is to profile interlanguage pragmatics as an area of inquiry in second language acquisition research, by reviewing existing studies with a focus on learning, examining research findings in interlanguage pragmatics that shed light on some basic questions in SLA, exploring cognitive and social–psychological theories that might offer explanations of different aspects of pragmatic development, and proposing a research agenda for the study of interlanguage pragmatics with a developmental perspective that will tie it more closely to other areas of SLA.

The aim of this paper is to profile interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) as an area of inquiry in second language acquisition research. There is a need for such a profile because compared to the large body of research on nonnative speakers' use of pragmatic knowledge, few studies have examined the acquisition of pragmatic competence by adult nonnative speakers (NNSs). This dearth of research into pragmatic development is not found in studies of first language learning, where a rich literature exists on children's acquisition of pragmatic competence. That those interested in ILP have devoted little attention to developmental issues is also in marked contrast to the prominent role played by pragmatics in communicative language teaching and testing. Approaches to language instruction and assessment should be informed by theory and research on pragmatic development, but as yet ILP does not have much to offer to second language pedagogy.

To strengthen the connections between interlanguage pragmatics and SLA research at large, we will do the following: (a) review existing studies with a focus on

149

learning, (b) examine research findings in ILP that shed light on some basic questions in SLA, (c) explore cognitive and social–psychological theories that might offer explanations of different aspects of pragmatic development, and (d) propose a research agenda.

Interlanguage pragmatics, the study of the development and use of strategies for linguistic action by nonnative speakers, has a peculiar status in second language research. Unlike other areas of second language study, which are primarily concerned with acquisitional patterns of interlanguage knowledge over time, the great majority of studies in ILP has not been developmental. Rather, focus is given to the ways NNSs' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge differs from that of native speakers (NSs) and among learners with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. To date, ILP has thus been primarily a study of second language use rather than second language learning.

The main reason for the concern with language use over development derives from the disciplines with which ILP has predominantly aligned itself. ILP's main field of reference has not been second language acquisition research but empirical pragmatics, especially cross-cultural pragmatics. The research issues examined in ILP have thus essentially been the same as those studied in cross-cultural pragmatics (cf. Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989): What are the strategies and linguistic means by which particular speech acts are realized? Are such strategies universally available? What are the contextual factors that determine speakers' choices from speech act sets? What is the contextual distribution of realization patterns? How does contextual variation differ cross-culturally?

These questions are precisely those that have been asked in cross-cultural pragmatics. A further concern, however, which has been repeatedly raised in ILP, is the influence of learners' native language and culture on their production and comprehension of L2 speech acts. To date, the role of pragmatic transfer has been the only issue specific to interlanguage studies that has received sustained attention in ILP and, thus, aligns ILP with mainstream second language acquisition research.

EXISTING STUDIES WITH A FOCUS ON ACQUISITION

Cross-Sectional Studies

Developmental studies using pseudolongitudinal designs have examined the use of speech act realization strategies by learners at different proficiency levels. A consistent result of these studies is that learners have access to the same range of realization strategies as NSs, irrespective of proficiency level. This is documented in studies of request realization by Japanese learners of English (S. Takahashi & DuFon, 1989) and second language learners of Norwegian with a variety of L1 backgrounds (Svanes, 1989), the refusal strategies used by Japanese learners of English (M. A. Robinson, 1992; T. Takahashi & Beebe, 1987), and the performance of apologies by Danish EFL learners (Trosborg, 1987) and Japanese ESL learners (Maeshiba, Yoshinaga, Kasper, & Ross, 1996).

Proficiency effects were found for the frequency and contextual distribution of realization strategies. Thus, S. Takahashi and DuFon (1989) reported that, as their proficiency increased, Japanese learners of English in their study moved from a preference for more indirect requestive strategies to more direct, target-like realizations. A similar development is reported by Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985), who looked at the perception of directness and positive politeness by NNSs of Hebrew. In this study, however, it is not learners' L2 proficiency but length of residence in the target community that accounts for increasingly target-like perceptions of directness and positive politeness. In another study, Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986) noted that learners' use of supportive moves in request performance followed a bell-shaped developmental curve, starting out with an underuse of supportive moves, followed by oversuppliance, and finally a level of use approximating a target-like distribution. This pattern reflected increasing L2 proficiency. In their performance of apologies, advanced Japanese learners of English were found to approximate target use more closely than their intermediate colleagues (Maeshiba et al., 1996). In her study of assertiveness and supportiveness in NNS troubles talk, Kerekes (1992) found that proficiency influenced learners' perceptions of qualifiers (e.g., *I think, sort of*): With increasing proficiency, the learners' perceptions became more native-like. Proficiency interacted with gender, however: As a group, female, but not male, subjects perceived qualifiers in the same way as NSs and high-proficiency learners.

Finally, Scarcella (1979) and Trosborg (1987) have noted that the learners' repertoire of pragmatic routines and other linguistic means of speech act realization expands as their proficiency increases. It is not clear whether the greater variety of linguistic material is simply a reflection of expanded vocabulary and syntactic structures, or the more advanced learners have developed a better command of the pragmalinguistic potential of lexical and syntactic devices. Detailed form–function and function–form analyses are needed to throw light on this problem.

One drawback in the design of the pseudolongitudinal studies is that none of them involves subjects at the very first stages of interlanguage development. Some studies include only intermediate and advanced learners, and studies in which the lowest proficiency group is labeled "beginners" often refer to learners whose command of the target language is good enough to fill in a discourse completion questionnaire or engage in a role-play. Thus, if there are any early developmental patterns in IL pragmatic knowledge, the methods of data collection employed so far have not allowed them to show up.

Longitudinal Studies

To date, only a few studies have traced the development of adult NNSs' pragmatic competence using longitudinal data: Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1993), Billmyer (1990), Bouton (1992), Ellis (1992), Sawyer (1992), Schmidt (1983), Siegal (1994), and Wildner-Bassett (1984). Of these, Schmidt's, Ellis's, and Sawyer's studies report on early pragmatic development and will therefore be briefly summarized here. Schmidt (1983) observed an adult Japanese learner of English (Wes) over a period of

3 years. Apart from rudimentary classroom learning in Japan, Wes acquired English through sustained and expanding communicative interaction in an English-speaking environment without formal instruction. Ellis (1992) observed two boys, aged 10 and 11, who had arrived in London from Portugal and Pakistan, respectively, shortly before the beginning of the study. They did not speak any English at the outset of the observation period. Both learners received instruction in English and were observed during school lessons. The Portuguese boy was observed for 1 year and 3 months and the Pakistani for 2 years. Both Schmidt's and Ellis's studies focus on the development of directives in their learners' interlanguage.

Wes expressed his early directives through a limited number of conventionalized routines (*shall we go, can I have x*), which were not fully analyzed. He identified *-ing* incorrectly as a request marker (*sitting* for *let's sit*), relied on lexical cues such as *please* and *maybe,* and transferred Japanese norms of contextual appropriateness in both the choice and strategic realization of particular speech acts. By the end of the observation period, he frequently used imperatives, the incorrect *-ing* had disappeared, routines were used productively, and his directives were generally much more elaborated. However, some interlanguage-specific features remained, such as a limited number of alternative formulae and the overextension of formulaic expressions such as *can I,* which sometimes resulted in incorrect use (*Can I bring cigarette?* for *Could you bring me some cigarettes?*).

The directives produced by Ellis's subjects were initially characterized by propositional incompleteness (e.g., *me no,* and a little later *me no blue,* as requests for a blue crayon). Propositionally complete directives started out as formulaic (*leave it, give me*) but were soon used productively. Incomplete directives diminished drastically over time, although they still occurred at the end of the observation period. Modification (mitigation or aggravation) occurred infrequently, with external modification through supportive moves even less than internal modification. The internal downgrader was invariably *please;* upgrading was achieved by repeating or paraphrasing the request. The only supportive move used was the grounder (justifying the request).

Request strategies at different levels of directness appeared in a distinct order, similar for both learners. Direct requests (imperatives) came first and made up one-half to three-fourths of all the directives in the corpus. Conventionally indirect requests appeared soon after the direct ones, expressed almost exclusively by *can* (*I*) and occasionally by want statements or suggestion formulae. Nonconventional indirectness (hinting) was hardly used at all. Because of the preponderance of directness in the early stages, the request perspective was initially hearer-related (*[you] do x*). The speaker's perspective was expressed more frequently when conventionally indirect strategies emerged. A developmental pattern was apparent in the learners' requests for objects, as shown in the following examples:

Me no (blue)

Give me (a paper)

Can I have a rubber?

You got a rubber?

Miss I want (i.e., the stapler)

Tasleem, have you got glue?

Can I take book with me?

Can you pass me my pencil?

Can I borrow your pen sir?

(Ellis, 1992, pp. 16–17)

Can is thus used in analyzed form at the later stage. The more polite variety *could* does not show up at all in requests for objects.

Schmidt (1983) and Ellis (1992) emphasize the potential impact of the social contexts in which their informants acquire English, as well as the contexts and purposes of data collection on the observed developmental patterns. As Ellis cautions, although it is clear that his two informants did not make use of the full range of request strategies by the end of the observation period, it is not apparent (a) whether NS peers in fact employ a wider range of strategies under the same contextual conditions and (b) whether the learners perhaps use other request patterns outside the classroom.

Rather than tracing the interlanguage development of a particular speech act, Sawyer (1992) examined the acquisition of the Japanese sentence-final particle *ne* by 11 adult learners of Japanese. His informants had a variety of L1 backgrounds and were enrolled in a Japanese as a second language class. Data were collected during four interview sessions over a 1-year period. Relative to the general development of vocabulary and grammatical particles, *ne* developed considerably more slowly in these learners' interlanguage. Adopting the interviewers' use of particles as a baseline, it was found that the learners used grammatical particles somewhat *more* frequently than the NSs, whereas the interviewers used *ne* four times as often as the learners. Initially, *ne* hardly showed up in the learners' production at all. It first emerged in formulaic utterances that were highly frequent and salient in the input (e.g., *soo desu ne* as a backchanneling signal) and was only slowly extended to a limited number of more productive uses. Learners varied considerably in their use and development of *ne*.

It is evident from the studies by Schmidt (1983), Ellis (1992), and Sawyer (1992) that at the present stage of ignorance about acquisitional regularities, longitudinal designs have the greatest potential for uncovering developmental patterns in learners' acquisition of pragmatic competence. Such studies are sorely needed in order to tease out stable developmental patterns and variation due to contexts of L2 learning and use and to individual differences. Moreover, it is hoped that such studies will provide information about a number of central issues in SLA research as a whole.

In the next section, 14 such questions will be listed and the literature will be examined to see what answers it has to offer to these questions. In this way, we will be able to identify some initial progress and many gaps in our knowledge of ILP development.

BASIC QUESTIONS ABOUT SLA AND WHAT IS KNOWN ABOUT THE ANSWERS WITH RESPECT TO ILP

Are There Universals of Language Underlying Cross-Linguistic Variation and, If So, Do They Play a Role in ILP?

To the extent that strategies for linguistic action are universal, the second language learner's task is simplified. Clearly, there are some pragmatic universals underlying cross-linguistic variation. For example, in every speech community, adult NSs are able to infer indirectly conveyed pragmatic intent, to realize linguistic action indirectly, and to vary their choices of linguistic action patterns according to contextual constraints (Blum-Kulka, 1991). There are no reports of speech communities that lack the basic set of speech acts—in Searle's (1976) taxonomy, representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations—and it is difficult to imagine that any human population could communicate without them. The same is true for the individual speech acts examined in ILP to date: Requests, suggestions, invitations, refusals, apologies, complaints, compliments, and thanks have been shown to be available in the studied populations. However, nonuniversal speech acts do exist and are particularly common in the category of declarations because many of these speech acts are tied to specific institutional and hence culture-specific settings, such as legal systems, religions, or games. For instance, objections can only be sustained or overruled by a judge in an adversarial courtroom and, in order to call a player out, one has to be a referee in a game such as baseball. Where such institutional contexts do not exist, no social roles are available that would endow a person with the right to perform the acts in question, no social consequences would ensue, and so forth.

For some speech acts, sets of realization strategies (semantic formulae or speech act sets [Olshtain & Cohen, 1983]) have been identified by which these speech acts are regularly performed. For instance, the same conventions of means are available to implement apologies in English, French, German, and Hebrew (Olshtain, 1989), Thai (Bergman & Kasper, 1993), and Japanese (Maeshiba et al., 1996). For requests, the major realization strategies—direct, conventionally indirect, nonconventionally indirect—have been found in different varieties of English, French, Hebrew, and Spanish (Blum-Kulka, 1989), German (House, 1989), Danish (Faerch & Kasper, 1989), Japanese (S. Takahashi & DuFon, 1989), and Chinese (Zhang, 1995). However, particular strategies are tied more closely to culture-specific pragmalinguistic conventions (Blum-Kulka, 1989). For example, requesting by means of an ability question (*Can you return the videos?*) is not conventionalized in Polish, according to Wierzbicka (1985a). Among the complimenting strategies identified for different varieties of English (Miles, 1994), we do not find exclamatory questions (*What is this beauty!*), which are commonly used in Egyptian Arabic.

Cutting across specific speech acts, two types of pragmatic strategies are universally available: conveying pragmatic intent indirectly, and making use of routine formulae (Kasper, 1994). Whereas indirectness (hinting) was earlier seen as a politeness strategy (P. Brown & Levinson, 1987), Weizman (e.g., 1989) argues that it may not be the desire to be polite that motivates speakers to hint. In her analysis of

English, French, and Hebrew data, the primary function of opaquely conveyed requests is their deniability potential. However, there is little reason to assume that indirectness is used in the same way and for the same functions across speech communities.

As prepackaged formulae used to cope with recurrent social situations (Coulmas, 1981), pragmatic formulae are part of the lexicon of a particular language, and their emergence is tied to the communicative practices of a speech community. Routines differ cross-linguistically in both form and function, although Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) identified both structural and functional properties in routines that are good candidates for universality.

In P. Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, three contextual variables—social power, social distance, degree of imposition—act as universal constraints on linguistic action. To these, R. Brown and Gilman (1989) added "liking" as a fourth factor. Although it stands to reason that interlocutors anywhere match their linguistic action to their assessment of these factors, studies also show that these variables are composite constructs, made up of context- and culture-specific elements. Imposition, for instance, means something different in the context of different speech acts. In apologizing, imposition appears to mean "severity of the offense" (perceived by the perpetrator), subsuming the offender's obligation to apologize and the likelihood of apology acceptance (House, 1989; Olshtain, 1989). In requesting, legitimacy and likelihood of compliance were found to influence the choice of request strategies of Argentinian, Israeli, German, and Japanese speakers (Blum-Kulka & House, 1989; Morosawa, 1990); however, whereas Germans modified their requests differentially depending on urgency, Japanese respondents did not (Morosawa, 1990). Even when speakers vary their linguistic action patterns according to basic principles that hold across cultures, the relative impact of these patterns is contextually and culturally mediated (cf. Kasper, in press). In summary, although a number of basic principles of pragmatics may be universal and may facilitate the development of ILP, there are differences that must be learned at every level. Whereas learners may hesitate to transfer strategies that may be universal in some cases, a more common problem is that they assume universality (and transferability) when it is not present.

How Can Approximation to Target Language Norms Be Measured?

One reason that ILP has not had a developmental focus to date may be the lack of any common metric by which development can be measured. Off-line pragmatic comprehension, attribution of illocutionary force and politeness values to utterances, and the assessment of contextual factors have been measured by means of rating and ranking, multiple-choice, or paired comparison tests (Kasper & Dahl, 1991, for review). On-line pragmatic comprehension has been examined by means of latency measurement (S. Takahashi & Roitblat, 1994). NNS subjects' performance is usually measured against a native speaker norm.

Production of linguistic action can be assessed by comparing NNSs to NSs in their performance on production questionnaires (discourse completion tasks), on role-plays, and in (semi-)authentic settings. Of these three options, some version of a

production questionnaire has been by far the most frequently chosen (Kasper & Dahl, 1991). Rose (1994) has argued that production questionnaires may be culturally biased and that multiple-choice questionnaires are a more suitable option for Japanese respondents.

A multitrait multimethod approach to the assessment of pragmatic competence has been developed by Hudson, Detmer, and J. Brown (1995). Hudson et al. developed six forms of cross-cultural assessment for ESL, two forms each of discourse completion tests, oral language production (role-plays), and self-assessment. Focusing on the speech acts of requesting, refusing, and complaining, the instruments are currently being evaluated for reliability and validity. In the future, versions of these instruments will be developed and standardized for Japanese and Korean as second or foreign languages. However, even when reliable tests such as these are developed, problems will remain in using any instrument written in the target language to assess the development of ILP, because they will be sensitive to overall proficiency effects (those who are more proficient will be able to read the instruments better and respond nonrandomly), especially at lower levels. In some second language situations (e.g., English speakers learning Thai or Arabic), learners may have developed a high level of pragmatic competence without even having learned the script in which such instruments are written.

What has barely been addressed in the literature is the issue of norms. The assumption underlying most studies is that NS norms are an adequate target for NNSs. If this were the case, any difference between NS and NNS pragmatic comprehension or production would have to be seen as potentially problematic, indicating a deficit in the NNSs' pragmatic competence. But this assumption is questionable in two ways. First, total convergence to NS norms may not be desirable, either from the NNSs' or from the NSs' point of view: NNSs may opt for pragmatic distinctiveness (sometimes, always, or depending on context) as a strategy of identity assertion; NSs may prefer some measure of divergence, as it can be understood as a disclaimer to full membership in the target community. Optimal convergence rather than total convergence appears to be a more realistic and desirable goal (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991); how this highly context-sensitive construct can be measured is not clear at this time (cf. Kasper, 1995, in press, for discussion). Second, simply identifying differences does not inform us which of those differences may matter in interaction. Some differences between NS norms and L2 performance may result in negative stereotyping by NS message recipients, whereas others may be heard as somewhat different but perfectly appropriate alternatives.

Does the L1 Influence the Learning of a Second Language?

The global answer in ILP is the same as in interlanguage phonology or syntax: It does indeed, but differentially so. All ILP studies using L1 and L2 baseline data, including studies of requests, suggestions, invitations, refusals, expressions of disagreement, corrections, complaints, apologies, expressions of gratitude, compliments, and indirect answers, find some transfer effects. However, studies have not always been clear about what is transferred: learners' assessments of the social

situation and the contextual variables in it, their assessment of whether it is appropriate to carry out a certain speech act, the strategies by which a linguistic act can be realized, the linguistic forms by which such strategies can be implemented, or the appropriateness of particular matches between the social situation and strategy choice. Whereas positive and negative transfer has been shown to occur at the levels of sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic knowledge (Kasper, 1992), little is known about the conditions under which learners are likely to transfer or not to transfer. Transferability of L1 pragmatic knowledge was initially investigated by Olshtain (1983) and has more recently been examined in much detail by S. Takahashi (1992, 1995).

Is Pragmatic Development in a Second Language Similar to First Language Learning?

Because there is little research on early pragmatic development in adult L2 learners, comparison to acquisition of pragmatic competence in the L1 is difficult. A study comparing pragmatic development in L1- and L2-acquiring children (Ervin-Tripp, Strage, Lampert, & Bell, 1987) suggests that children rely more on contextual cues than on linguistic form in understanding requests, in both the L1 and the L2. In an earlier study, Ervin-Tripp (1977) reports that indirectness (specifically, indirect question directives and affirmative requestive hints) is acquired late by English-speaking children. Preston (1989, p. 166) claims the same for the L2, asserting that indirect speech acts are underutilized in even advanced IL varieties. Yet there is evidence that for Japanese learners of English the direction in the development of requests, for instance, is from indirect to direct (S. Takahashi & DuFon, 1989).

In a theoretical account of pragmatic development, Bialystok (1993) proposes that children and adults face different learning tasks. Whereas basic socialization and the acquisition of pragmatic strategies are happening at the same time in the L1, L2 learners "do not begin with a childlike naiveté about the social uses of language" (Bialystok, 1993, p. 47). The child's primary learning task is to develop analyzed representations of symbolic knowledge, that is, to accumulate the representations of speech act sets. Although adult L2 learners also need to develop more analyzed representations (by acquiring new representations or restructuring existing ones), their primary task is to develop executive control over already available knowledge representations. For instance, learners have to be able to direct attention selectively to the literal or intended meaning in indirect requests, sarcasm, and irony, or the markers of politeness. Bialystok (1993) argues that "adults make pragmatic errors, not only because they do not understand forms and structures, or because they do not have sufficient vocabulary to express their intentions, but because they choose incorrectly" (p. 54). Although Bialystok locates the cause of "incorrect choices" in adult learners' lacking ability to control attentional resources, a more plausible explanation may be that learners' sociopragmatic knowledge is not yet sufficiently developed for them to make contextually appropriate choices of strategies and linguistic forms. How conventions of means and forms map onto context features is

a matter of knowledge representation, however. So far, whether Bialystok's proposal can account for pragmatic development has not been tested.

Do Children Enjoy an Advantage over Adults in Learning a Second Language?

The advantages of children over adults in some aspects of SLA are often attributed to the existence of a critical or sensitive period. There is no reason to assume that children would have any cognitive advantage in acquiring pragmatics, because no critical period has even been proposed for pragmatics, and indeed in our native languages we continue to expand our pragmatic competence throughout our lives. There are no comparative studies of the speed of pragmatic development, of how soon child and adult learners can do what kinds of things with words, or about ultimate attainment. The problem is not just a lack of empirical studies but the difficulty of comparing adults and children in an area of communicative competence that is closely tied to cognitive ability and social experience. With regard to ultimate attainment, it has been shown that highly proficient bilinguals differ in their linguistic action patterns from those of monolingual NSs (e.g., Yoon, 1991). Rather than such differences being attributed to lack of pragmatic competence, they have been understood as acts of divergence in the interest of identity maintenance, as features of an intercultural style that sets its speakers apart from both their native and target communities (Blum-Kulka, 1991).

Several types of pragmatic competence are possible for proficient bilingual speakers, differing in representation of and approximation to L2 norms:

1. Bilinguals may develop coordinate linguistic codes with a single pragmatic system, which may be perfectly appropriate in some stable bilingual contexts. For example, Kuiper and Lin (1989) describe the situation in Singapore where, although bilingual, most people (including both children and adults) are not bicultural, because their two languages encode the same Singapore Chinese culture. Kuiper and Lin suggest that the speaker of Singapore English uses English syntax and lexicon with Hokkien pragmatics (including many translated pragmatic formulae). In Tagalog, Cebuano Visayan, and perhaps all Philippine languages, one is required by considerations of politeness to take leave by saying one of a formulaic set (in Tagalog: *aalis na ako,* "I'm going now"; *uuwi na ako,* "I'm going home now"; *umuna na ako,* "I'll go ahead"). These formulae are all calqued into Philippine English, and in Hawai'i this is something that parents make a special effort to teach and take as something to be proud of if their Fil-American children do the expected (Michael Forman, personal communication).
2. Bilinguals may develop coordinate linguistic codes with a single pragmatic system based on the L1. This is commonly found in adult foreign language learning (Beardsmore, 1982) and is probably least likely in young learners immersed in the target language community.
3. Bilinguals may adopt the pragmatics of the second language completely. This seems to happen with many young bilinguals (e.g., children of immigrants) and, according to many informal reports, frequently leads to intergenerational conflict in the home. This model seems highly unlikely in adult learners.
4. An individual bilingual could operate in two languages with an idiosyncratic merged or

neutralized system that differs from the norms of monolinguals (e.g., Yoon, 1991). Whether child L2 learners develop such systems is unknown.

5. A system like (4) might become a new norm for immigrant communities, such as American Israelis (Blum-Kulka & Sheffer, 1993) or Japanese Americans in Hawai'i, or perhaps even for nonimmigrant expatriate communities, such as Japanese students at the University of Hawai'i or Americanized Arabs (Agar, 1991; Grosjean, 1982). Whether children of sojourners do the same is an issue that could be researched at such sites as international schools in Japan or Japanese schools in Hawai'i.

6. Bilinguals may develop partially or wholly coordinate pragmatic systems to go with the two languages. Presumably, maintaining completely separate systems would be difficult and approximate multiple personality disorder (Adler, 1977; Grosjean, 1982), but the present authors both follow partially distinct systems in our different languages (e.g., German, Danish, and English, and English and Arabic, respectively), and others have reported the same (Wierzbicka, 1985b).

Is There a Natural Route of Development, as Evidenced by Difficulty, Accuracy, or Acquisition Orders or Discrete Stages of Development?

There is no order of acquisition for ILP comparable to morphosyntax, in which a progression between distinct linguistic forms has been ascertained (e.g., progressive before past participles in English; indicative before subjunctive in Romance languages). ILP studies involving advanced learners suggest that nuanced strategies for refusing (Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1990; M. A. Robinson, 1992) and hinting (Bouton, 1988; Weizman, 1993) may be difficult to acquire in any language (refusals can be conveyed directly in early stages of ILP development, and hints may be tried, even if unsuccessfully). As both of these speech acts are also problematic for adult NSs, it is plausible that the subtleties of successful performance of speech acts with a potential for interpersonal conflict, high processing costs, or both will be acquired late in the L1 and L2, except in cases where the L1 and L2 are so similar that positive transfer works right away.

Studies by Schmidt (1983), Ellis (1992), and Sawyer (1992) suggest that, as in naturalistic second language development generally, pragmatic competence seems to evolve through initial reliance on a few unanalyzed routines that are later decomposed and available for productive use in more complex utterances. Although learners need to understand and produce novel utterances in order to interpret and express nonconventionalized speaker meanings, they also have to develop an increasing repertoire of prepatterned routines, conventionalized for specific pragmatic functions in the target community. How the development of creative pragmatic ability and pragmatic routine evolves over time is altogether unclear.

Does Type of Input Make a Difference?

Japanese ESL learners approximate NS norms better than EFL learners in their production of refusals (T. Takahashi & Beebe, 1987) and perceptions of politeness in requests (Kitao, 1990). Because pragmatic knowledge, by definition, is highly sensi-

tive to social and cultural features of context, one would expect input that is richer in qualitative and quantitative terms to result in better learning outcomes. A second language environment is more likely to provide learners with the diverse and frequent input they need for pragmatic development than a foreign language learning context, especially if the instruction is precommunicative or noncommunicative.

Does Instruction Make a Difference?

There is every reason to expect that pragmatic knowledge should be teachable. For L1 acquisition, no arguments have been put forth parallel to the debate over "learnability" in syntax, that is, no argument that parents do not teach pragmatics or provide corrective feedback, or no assertion that there is a pragmatics acquisition device that eliminates the need for instruction. The literature on language socialization (e.g., Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986) makes it very clear that parents and peers actively instruct (e.g., model routines, prescribe "rules," provide negative feedback) in child pragmatic learning.

There is also reason to suspect that instruction may be necessary for ILP, that learners who are not instructed at all will have difficulty in acquiring appropriate language use patterns, especially in foreign language or classroom settings where opportunities for the full range of human interactions are limited. Porter, a strong advocate of small group and pair work within a communicative approach, investigated whether learners could learn various features of pragmatic competence from each other. Analyzing expressions of opinion, agreement, and disagreement produced by learners in small group interaction, she concluded that this was not the case: "Communicative activities in the classroom will provide valuable production practice for learner, but they will not generate the type of sociolinguistic input that learners need" (Porter, 1986, p. 218).

Little research has been done on the effects of instruction in ILP, but the few existing studies are encouraging. A clear advantage was found for ESL students who were instructed in complimenting and responding to compliments (Billmyer, 1990) and in understanding different types of implicature (Bouton, 1994). Although some features of complimenting and implicature were more amenable to teaching than others (and some may be universal and need not be taught), focusing on aspects of pragmatic knowledge through consciousness-raising activities and communicative practice seems highly facilitative. In a classroom (pseudo-)experiment, Wildner-Bassett (1984) examined whether EFL learners acquired gambits (routines for conversational management and modification of illocutionary force) with differential success, depending on instructional approach. She found that learners' use of gambits improved significantly, qualitatively and quantitatively, regardless of teaching approach. Learners taught according to a vaguely communicative approach were even more successful than their colleagues who had been exposed to a version of suggestopedia (cf. also Wildner-Bassett, 1994, for studies on the teaching of routines in L2 German).

We can also identify some apparent instances of transfer of training, the misappli-

cation of knowledge derived through teaching. Many Japanese learners of English, for instance, use *should* when *must* would be appropriate in utterances such as *You should (must) be happy that you got a promotion so quickly,* explaining if challenged that EFL teachers in Japan typically explain that *should* is polite and *must* impolite. Likewise, pragmatically inappropriate use of modal verbs and register in German learners' interlanguage appeared to be related to inadequate description in the textbooks used by these classroom learners (Kasper, 1982). One study found that the mitigator *I mean* was conspicuously absent in German learners' conversational contributions, even though these learners used the formal and functional German equivalent *ich mein(e)* in their L1. According to these learners' retrospective comments, they consciously avoided L1 transfer in this case because their teachers had told them that *I mean* was not a correct English expression (Kasper, 1989). These examples suggest that defective presentation of pragmatic information, as revealed in comparisons of conversational closings (Bardovi-Harlig, Hartford, Mahan-Taylor, Morgan, & Reynolds, 1991) and conversational structure and management (Myers-Scotton & Bernstein, 1988) in textbooks and authentic discourse, may be a source of transfer of training.

A further potential cause of transfer of training is classroom discourse itself. Kasper (1982) suggested that German learners' tendency toward propositional explicitness, responding in complete sentences, and insufficient politeness marking was linked to the transactional and grammar-centered orientation of their EFL classrooms. Compared to conversation outside the classroom, EFL classroom interaction showed minimal politeness (Loerscher & Schulze, 1988); discourse organization and management had a classroom-specific structure that provided little opportunity for input and practice of the conversational strategies that learners need in nonclassroom contexts (Kasper, 1989; Loerscher, 1986). The three sources of transfer of training with respect to pragmatic learning—metapragmatic information, teaching materials, and classroom discourse—clearly deserve more attention in teacher training, materials development, and syllabus design.

Do Motivation and Attitudes Make a Difference in Level of Acquisition?

Motivation is widely considered to be a basic determinant of all learning and one of the primary sources (together with aptitude) of individual differences in SLA (Gardner, 1985; Krashen, 1980). Social–psychological and affective factors in general are widely believed to play an important role in language learning (Schumann, 1993). The available evidence is mixed, however, showing little if any relationship between motivation and the acquisition of phonology (Oyama, 1976; Purcell & Suter, 1980; Thompson, 1991) but generally robust correlations with global measures of oral language proficiency (Ehrman & Oxford, 1995) and language course grades (Gardner, 1980; Trembley & Gardner, 1995). Of the various types of motivation identified in the general psychological literature, some seem more relevant to ILP than others. It is possible that *intrinsic motivation* (enjoyment of learning for its own sake) might be more relevant for ILP learning than *extrinsic motivation* (learning motivated by

external reward), but then again intrinsic motivation might not be especially relevant because it is cognitive involvement and enjoyment rather than social involvement that is highlighted by the construct. Almost all studies of second (but not foreign) language learning motivation turn up some variant of *integrative motivation*, a combination of positive attitudes toward the target language community with some interest in interacting with target language speakers and a willingness to invest effort toward that goal (Gardner, 1985). Integrative motivation has been found to be strongly related to L2 achievement in numerous studies (but see Au, 1988, for counterexamples) and ought to be facilitative of pragmatic development. *Assimilative motivation* (Graham, cited in H. D. Brown, 1987) might well correlate even more strongly with the acquisition of ILP, as it stands to reason that the drive to become an indistinguishable member of a new speech community should lead learners to seek out interactions with different interlocutors, to obtain pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic input, to test hypotheses, and to practice their communicative skills whenever possible. Unfortunately, no studies explicitly address these questions with a view to establishing direct links between motivation and pragmatic development by providing careful operational definitions of the dependent and independent variables.

The profile established by Schmidt (1983) of his subject Wes suggests that Wes's high level of motivation was facilitative for his acquisition of pragmatic competence but apparently not facilitative for his acquisition of grammatical competence. Wes displayed integrative motivation bordering on assimilative motivation, a clear and strong desire to learn English through interaction and for the purpose of interacting with native speakers of English, and positive attitudes toward target language speakers and the target language culture. However, because no similar studies focusing on ILP have been done on learners with different motivational profiles, no conclusions may be drawn on the impact of motivation or attitudes on pragmatic development. Peirce (1995) argues that motivation needs to be reconceptualized within a less individualistic and more social model and suggests that a notion of "investment" rather than motivation captures the complex relationship of learners to language and their sometimes ambivalent desire to speak it. A pioneering ethnographic study on the social–affective aspects of pragmatic development is Siegal's (1994) research on the acquisition of communicative competence in L2 Japanese.

Does Personality Play a Role?

Schmidt also describes Wes as being very extroverted, gregarious, imaginative, insightful, curious, sophisticated, clever, sharp-witted, and witty, identifying personality characteristics that closely match Factor V (openness) in one theory of the major dimensions of personality (John, 1990). These are characteristics that ought to be facilitative of the development of ILP and that might partly explain Wes's relatively high level of pragmatic and discourse competence in contrast to his low level of acquisition of morphology and syntax, but, once again, there are no studies of learners similar in most ways but different in personality to compare him with.

Not much can be said with confidence about relationships between personality

factors and ILP. Most reviewers have concluded that no clear relationships between personality and language learning have been found (Ellis, 1985; Skehan, 1989). No consensus yet exists as to which personality constructs should be investigated or how they should be operationalized. Some recent studies have produced promising results, using both the Myers–Briggs Type Indicator (Ehrman, 1994; Moody, 1993; see Pittenger, 1993, for a dissenting view on the validity of the instrument) and the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Griffiths, 1991; D. Robinson, Gabriel, & Katchan, 1994). As Robinson et al. point out, however, there are theoretical reasons to suppose that personality theories make different predictions for different tasks (e.g., oral vs. written achievement in language and quite possibly the development of pragmatic as opposed to morphosyntactic L2 competence). As far as we are aware, no studies attempting to investigate possible relationships between personality characteristics and ILP have yet been done, although this seems an area now ripe for exploration.

Does Learners' Gender Play a Role?

Two studies report contrasting results. Rintell (1984) found no effect for gender on learners' perception of expressions of emotion by L2 speakers. On the other hand, Kerekes (1992) noted a distinct gender difference in NNSs' perception of sympathy and support; that is, female subjects responded in a more native-like manner than male subjects.

Does (Must) Perception or Comprehension Precede Production in Acquisition?

No studies have examined this issue. It seems likely that acquisition of some aspects of ILP (such as the production of appropriate formulae in the L2 that are not translation equivalents of L1 formulae) must depend on their presence in input and comprehension in interaction. Schmidt (1993) gives several examples of initial failures to comprehend such routines, later followed by comprehension and almost immediate subsequent production. It is conceivable, however, that learners might use already available linguistic knowledge (based on universals or L1 knowledge that is transferable) for pragmalinguistic purposes in the production of linguistic action without prior comprehension of such pragmalinguistic functions. Likewise, they may make decisions about sociopragmatic appropriateness on the basis of L1 (or prior L2) experience that is then transferred (L1) or generalized (L2) to new contexts. However, this is only what learners may do; whether and how much they actually use pragmatic strategies in production without having first heard, noticed, and comprehended them is unclear.

Does Chunk Learning (Formulaic Speech) Play a Role in Acquisition?

As Schmidt (1983), Ellis (1992), and Sawyer (1992) suggest, there appears to be an important role for prefabricated speech in pragmatic development. As formulae and routines often consist of lexicalized sentence stems (Pawley & Syder, 1983) with

open slots, learners can decompose them and extend their use productively, as in Wes's extension of permission requests from a few completely fixed expressions in specific contexts (e.g., *Can I get?* in restaurants) to more productive use (sometimes incorrect) in a very broad range of requests. But the importance of formulaic speech is not limited to its role in the early stages as a stepping stone toward the higher realms of creative language use. Routine formulae constitute a substantial part of adult NS pragmatic competence, and learners need to acquire a sizable repertoire of routines in order to cope efficiently with recurrent and expanding social situations and discourse requirements (Coulmas, 1981). Therefore, how pragmatic routines are acquired has to be addressed as a research issue in its own right (Wildner-Bassett, 1984, 1994).

What Mechanisms Drive Development from Stage to Stage?

Presumably, most of the same mechanisms as those identified for the acquisition of other cognitive skills will also propel pragmatic development, although not all learning mechanisms discussed in the field of SLA are likely to be implicated; specifically, the innate learning mechanisms associated with Universal Grammar theory should play no role because that model of language explicitly excludes considerations of pragmatics or communicative competence (Chomsky, 1980). A number of theoretical proposals are discussed by Schmidt (1992). None of them has been empirically tested for its potential to explain pragmatic development.

A DIRECTION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Two proposals have been made to account for pragmatic development from a processing perspective. Bialystok (1993) applied her two-dimensional model of language use and learning to pragmatics, suggesting that the task of adult NNS learners is primarily to achieve increasingly higher levels of executive control over their representations of pragmatic knowledge. Schmidt (1993) extended his noticing hypothesis to the intake of pragmatic information. He argued that for pragmatic information to be noticed and thereby made available for further processing, it has to be attended to or stored in short-term memory.

Whereas attention is thus required for converting available input into intake, and some level of awareness or understanding is also required (if a learner notices a new pragmatic realization in interaction but is unable to figure out whether the overheard form is extremely polite or extremely rude, its function has not been learned), it is less clear whether more abstract levels of awareness are necessary or merely facilitative or perhaps neither. Snow, Perlmann, Gleason, and Hooshyar (1990) examined parent–child interactions to see what kinds of information concerning politeness strategies are made available to children from their interaction with parents. They looked for three types of information that might be available to children: direct teaching of the rules of politeness, manipulation of the dimensions of politeness so that the relevant covariations were made more salient, and information about the

use of specific forms. Snow et al. found that the first type of information was rare but the latter two were common. This suggests that learning more abstract rules of form–function mapping (assuming they are psychologically real) may be implicit, although it is also possible that children and adults induce such generalizations explicitly, based on their exposure to instances.

Data-based studies are needed in order to examine Bialystok's and Schmidt's proposals. In addition to the proposed processing perspectives, focus should be given to the complexities of changes in learners' sociocultural perceptions over time and the impact of such altered perceptions on their strategies of linguistic action. It would be a mistake to view developmental issues in ILP in purely cognitive terms because the strategies for linguistic action are so closely tied to self-identity and social identity, as clearly shown by informants' comments cited in M. A. Robinson (1992) and richly documented in Siegal (1994). This suggests that it may be fruitful to place greater reliance on introspective and ethnographic methods in future studies, especially as these may focus on critical incidents (both psychological and social), and the need for stronger links between the study of ILP and social psychology, a field virtually ignored in SLA to date except in theories of attitudes and motivation.

REFERENCES

Adler, M. (1977). *Collective and individual bilingualism.* Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

Agar, M. (1991). The bicultural in bilingual. *Language in Society, 10,* 167–181.

Au, S. Y. (1988). A critical appraisal of Gardner's social–psychological theory of second-language learning. *Language Learning, 38,* 75–100.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (1993). Learning the rules of academic talk: A longitudinal study of pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15,* 279–304.

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,* 4–15.

Beardsmore, H. B. (1982). *Bilingualism: Basic principles.* Avon: Tieto.

Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. C. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55–73). New York: Newbury House.

Bergman, M. L., & Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and performance in native and nonnative apologizing. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 82–107). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representation and attentional control in pragmatic competence. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 43–59). New York: Oxford University Press.

Billmyer, K. (1990). "I really like your lifestyle": ESL learners learning how to compliment. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 6*(2), 31–48.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1989). Playing it safe: The role of conventionality in indirect requests. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics* (pp. 37–70). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1991). Interlanguage pragmatics: The case of requests. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research* (pp. 255–272). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Blum-Kulka, S., & House, J. (1989). Cross-cultural and situational variation in requestive behavior. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 123–154). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

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. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 8,* 47–61.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Sheffer, H. (1993). The metapragmatic discourse of American-Israeli families at dinner. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 196–223). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bouton, L. (1988). A cross-cultural study of ability to interpret implicatures in English. *World Englishes, 17,* 183–196.

Bouton, L. (1992). Culture, pragmatics and implicature. *AFinLa Yearbook, 1992,* 35–61.

Bouton, L. (1994, March). *The use of implicatures can be taught effectively in the ESL classroom.* Paper presented at the Eighth Annual International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign.

Brown, H. D. (1987). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1989). Politeness theory and Shakespeare's four major tragedies. *Language in Society, 18,* 159–212.

Chomsky, N. (1980). *Rules and representations.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Coulmas, F. (1981). Introduction: Conversational routine. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine* (pp. 1–17). The Hague: Mouton.

Ehrman, M. E. (1994). The type differentiation indicator and adult foreign language learning success. *Journal of Psychological Type, 30,* 10–29.

Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). Cognition plus: Correlates of language learning success. *Modern Language Journal, 79,* 67–89.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 14,* 1–23.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1977). Wait for me, roller skate! In S. Ervin-Tripp & C. Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), *Child discourse* (pp. 165–188). New York: Academic Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S., Strage, A., Lampert, M., & Bell, N. (1987). Understanding requests. *Linguistics, 25,* 107–143.

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguage request realization. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics* (pp. 221–247). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Gardner, R. C. (1980). On the validity of affective variables in second language acquisition: Conceptual, contextual, and statistical considerations. *Language Learning, 30,* 255–270.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation.* London: Edward Arnold.

Giles, H., Coupland, J., & Coupland, N. (Eds.). (1991). *Contexts of accommodation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graham, C. R. (1984, March). *Beyond integrative motivation: The development and influence of assimilative motivation.* Paper presented at the Eighteenth Annual TESOL Convention, Houston, TX.

Griffiths, R. (1991). Personality and second-language learning: Theory, research, and practice. In E. Sadtono (Ed.), *Language acquisition and the second/foreign language classroom* (pp. 103–135). Singapore: SEAMO Regional Language Centre.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

House, J. (1989). "Oh excuse me please . . . ": Apologizing in a foreign language. In B. Kettemann, P. Bierbaumer, A. Fill, & A. Karpf (Eds.), *Englisch als Zweitsprache* (pp. 303–327). Tübingen: Narr.

Hudson, T., Detmer, E., & Brown, J. D. (1995). *Developing prototypic measures of cross-cultural pragmatics.* (Tech. Rep. No. 7). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

John, O. P. (1990). The "big five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. A. Previn (Ed.), *Handbook of personality theory and research* (pp. 66–100). New York: Guilford Press.

Kasper, G. (1982). Teaching-induced aspects of interlanguage discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 4,* 99–113.

Kasper, G. (1989). Interactive procedures in interlanguage discourse. In W. Olesky (Ed.), *Contrastive pragmatics* (pp. 189–229). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research, 8,* 203–231.

Kasper, G. (1995). Wessen Pragmatik? Für eine Neubestimmung fremdsprachlicher Handlungskompetenz. *Zeitschrift für Fremdsprachenforschung, 6,* 1–25.

Kasper, G. (in press). Routine and indirection in interlanguage pragmatics. In L. F. Bouton & Y. Kachru

(Eds.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning* (Vol. 5). Urbana: University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, Division of English as an International Language.

Kasper, G. (in press). The role of pragmatics in language teacher education. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & B. Hartford (Eds.), *Beyond methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13,* 215–247.

Kerekes, J. (1992). *Development in nonnative speakers' use and perception of assertiveness and supportiveness in mixed-sex conversations* (Occasional Paper No. 21). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Department of English as a Second Language.

Kitao, K. (1990). A study of Japanese and American perceptions of politeness in requests. *Doshida Studies in English, 50,* 178–210.

Krashen, S. D. (1980). Aptitude and attitude in relation to second language acquisition and learning. In K. C. Diller (Ed.), *Individual differences and universals in language learning aptitude* (pp. 155–175). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Kuiper, K., & Lin, D. T. G. (1989). Cultural congruence and conflict in the acquisition of formulae in a second language. In O. Garcia & R. Otheguy (Eds.), *English across cultures: Cultures across English* (pp. 281–304). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lörscher, W. (1986). Conversational structures in the foreign language classroom. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Learning, teaching and communication in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 11–22). Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Lörscher, W., & Schulze, R. (1988). On polite speaking and foreign language classroom discourse. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 26,* 183–199.

Maeshiba, N., Yoshinaga, N., Kasper, G., & Ross, S. (1996). Transfer and proficiency in interlanguage apologizing. In S. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 155–187). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Miles, P. (1994). Compliments and gender. In E. Kellerman & R. Bley-Vroman (Eds.), *Special issue on gender and language* (Occasional Paper No. 26, pp. 85–137). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Department of English as a Second Language.

Moody, R. (1993). Motivation, learning strategies, and personality. *Journal of the Freshman Year Experience, 5,* 37–75.

Morosawa, A. (1990). Intimacy and urgency in request forms of Japanese: A psycholinguistic study. *Sophia Linguistica, 28,* 129–143.

Myers-Scotton, C., & Bernstein, J. (1988). Natural conversation as a model for textbook dialogue. *Applied Linguistics, 9,* 372–384.

Nattinger, J. R. & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Olshtain, E. (1983). Sociocultural competence and language transfer: The case of apology. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 232–249). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics* (pp. 155–173). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Olshtain, E., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1985). Degree of approximation: Nonnative reactions to native speech act behavior. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 303–325). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 18–35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Oyama, S. (1976). A sensitive period for the acquisition of a non-native phonological system. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 5,* 261–285.

Pawley, A., & Syder, F. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J. C. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 191–225). London: Longman.

Peirce, B. N. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29,* 9–31.

Pittenger, D. J. (1993). The utility of the Myers–Briggs Type Indicator. *Review of Educational Research, 63,* 467–488.

Porter, P. A. (1986). How learners talk to each other: Input and interaction in task-centered discussions. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 200–222). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Preston, D. (1989). *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Purcell, E. T., & Suter, R. W. (1980). Predictors of pronunciation accuracy: A reexamination. *Language Learning, 30,* 271–287.

Rintell, E. (1984). But how did you feel about that? The learner's perception of emotion in speech. *Applied Linguistics, 5,* 255–264.

Robinson, D., Gabriel, N., & Katchan, O. (1994). Personality and second language learning. *Personality and Individual Differences, 16,* 143–157.

Robinson, M. A. (1992). Introspective methodology in interlanguage pragmatics research. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as native and target language* (Tech. Rep. No. 3, pp. 27–82). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Rose, K. R. (1994). On the validity of discourse completion tests in non-Western contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 15,* 1–14.

Sawyer, M. (1992). The development of pragmatics in Japanese as a second language: The sentence-final particle *ne.* In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as a native and foreign language* (Tech. Rep. No. 3, pp. 83–125). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Scarcella, R. (1979). On speaking politely in a second language. In C. A. Yorio, K. Perkins, & J. Schachter (Eds.), *On TESOL '79* (pp. 275–287). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986). *Language socialization across cultures.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R. (1983). Interaction, acculturation and the acquisition of communicative competence. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 137–174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schmidt, R. (1992). Psychological mechanisms underlying second language fluency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 14,* 357–385.

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

Schumann, J. H. (1993). Some problems with falsification: An illustration from SLA research. *Applied Linguistics, 14,* 295–306.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society, 5,* 1–23.

Siegal, M. (1994). *Looking East: Identity construction and white women learning Japanese.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second-language learning.* London: Edward Arnold.

Snow, C. E., Perlmann, R. Y., Gleason, J. B., & Hooshyar, N. (1990). Developmental perspectives on politeness: Sources of children's knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14,* 289–305.

Svanes, B. (1989). En undersøkelse av realisasjonsmønsteret for spraakhandlingen "aa be noen om aa gjøre noe." *Maal og Minne, 1–2,* 89–107.

Takahashi, S. (1992). Transferability of indirect request strategies. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in ESL, 11,* 69–124.

Takahashi, S. (1995). *Pragmatic transferability of L1 indirect request strategies perceived by Japanese learners of English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Takahashi, S., & DuFon, P. (1989). *Cross-linguistic influence in indirectness: The case of English directives performed by native Japanese speakers.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Honolulu. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 370 439)

Takahashi, S. & Roitblat, H. (1994). Comprehension of nonliteral utterances by nonnative speakers. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 15,* 475–506.

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. M. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal, 8,* 131–155.

Thompson, I. (1991). Foreign accents revisited: The English pronunciation of Russian immigrants. *Language Learning, 41,* 177–204.

Trembley, P. F., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *Modern Language Journal, 79,* 505–518.

Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in natives/non-natives. *Journal of Pragmatics, 11,* 147–167.

Weizman, E. (1989). Requestive hints. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics* (pp. 71–96). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Weizman, E. (1993). Interlanguage requestive hints. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 123–137). New York: Oxford University Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (1985a). Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics, 9,* 145–161.

Wierzbicka, A. (1985b). The double life of a bilingual. In R. Sussex & J. Zubrzycki (Eds.), *Polish people and culture in Australia* (pp. 187–223). Canberra: Australian National University.

Wildner-Bassett, M. (1984). *Improving pragmatic aspects of learners' interlanguage.* Tübingen: Narr.

Wildner-Bassett, M. (1994). Intercultural pragmatics and proficiency: "Polite" noises for cultural appropriateness. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 32,* 3–17.

Yoon, K. K. (1991). Bilingual pragmatic transfer to speech acts: Bi-directional responses to a compliment. In L. F. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 75–100). Urbana: University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, Division of English as an International Language.

Zhang, Y. (1995). Strategies in Chinese requesting. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as a native and foreign language* (Tech. Rep. No. 5, pp. 23–67). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.