

**A Comparative Study of the Use of Request Strategies by Learners and Native
Speakers of Japanese**

by

Kyoko Kaneko
B.A., Ibaraki University, 1993

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Linguistics

© Kyoko Kaneko, 2012
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

A Comparative Study of the Use of Request Strategies by Learners and Native Speakers
of Japanese

by

Kyoko Kaneko
B.A., Ibaraki University, 1993

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Hossein Nassaji, (Department of Linguistics)
Supervisor

Dr. Hiroko Noro, (Department of Pacific and Asian Studies)
Outside Member

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Hossein Nassaji, (Department of Linguistics)
Supervisor

Dr. Hiroko Noro, (Department of Pacific and Asian Studies)
Outside Member

The present study examined the request strategies of advanced learners of Japanese, by comparing those of native speakers of Japanese. The investigation focused on the following aspects: discourse structure, sentence types, strategy types, and reasoning behind the speakers' choice of strategy. The participants for this study were five learners and six native speakers of Japanese. Data were collected through role plays and a retrospective verbal report. The distribution of the types of responses was compared. Results showed that the request realization of learners of Japanese and that of native speakers of Japanese were similar at least in the use of the supporting statements in the discourse structure and use of indirect strategies; in contrast, they differed in the use of sentence types to realize indirect requests and types of intended strategies. Findings suggest that the learners' deviations from native speakers were caused by their inadequate grammatical skills.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
Acknowledgments.....	vii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Motivation for the Study.....	1
2 Previous Literature.....	6
2.1 Communicative Competence of Second Language Learners	6
2.2 Speech Act	8
2.3 Indirect Speech Act.....	13
2.4 Politeness and Politeness Strategies.....	17
2.4.1 Models of politeness.	17
2.4.2 Cultural differences in politeness strategies.	20
2.5 A Speech Act of Request	22
2.6 Japanese Request	26
2.7 Studies of Request Realization	26
2.7.1 Overview.....	26
2.7.2 Request realization of native speakers.....	27
2.7.3 Request realization of second language speakers.	30
2.8 Studies of Request Realization in Japanese	35
2.9 Summary of Previous Literature.....	39
2.10 Statement of the Problem.....	40
2.11 Significance of the Problem.....	41
3 Methodology.....	42
3.1 Participants.....	43
3.1.1 Groups.....	43
3.1.2 Group size.	43
3.1.3 Learner group.....	45
3.1.4 Native speaker group.	47
3.2 Instruments.....	49
3.2.1 Role play.	49
3.2.2 Designing role-play scenarios.....	54
3.2.3 Retrospective interview.	59
3.3 Procedures.....	65
3.4 Pilot Study.....	66
3.5 Data Analysis	70
3.5.1 Transcription.	70
3.5.2 Analysis of role-play data.	72
3.5.3 Analysis of verbal report data.	90
3.5.4 Statistical analyses	96
4 Results.....	98

4.1	Structure of Request Discourse.....	98
4.2	Sentence Type of Request Head Acts.....	99
4.3	Request Strategy Type.....	101
4.4	Statements of Intention in Verbal Report.....	103
5	Discussion.....	105
5.1	Types of Discourse Structure.....	105
5.2	Types of Sentence.....	108
5.3	Types of Strategies.....	114
5.4	Statement of Intention.....	119
5.5	Summary of Findings and General Discussion.....	124
6	Conclusion.....	129
7	References.....	135
8	Appendices.....	142
8.1	Appendix A.....	142
8.2	Appendix B.....	143
8.3	Appendix C.....	144
8.4	Appendix D.....	149
8.5	Appendix E.....	151
8.6	Appendix F.....	153
8.7	Appendix G.....	154

List of Tables

Table 1	45
Table 2	48
Table 3	71
Table 4	73
Table 5	76
Table 6	77
Table 7	84
Table 8	99
Table 9	100
Table 10	101
Table 11	102
Table 12	104

Acknowledgments

This research for, and development of this thesis could not have been completed without the support and contributions of faculty members, colleagues, friends, students and family. I would like in particular to thank my supervisor Dr. Hossein Nassaji for his guidance, expertise, and patience throughout the process. I would also like to thank Dr. Hiroko Noro for her insightful and invaluable suggestions. I also wish extend my sincere appreciation to Dr. Catherine Caws for her role as an external examiner. Special gratitude goes out to my colleagues and friends Shari Corbin, Jun Tian and Mika Oshige for their constructive feedback, guidance, and support throughout the completion of my studies. I would like to also express my gratitude Luna and Mike Philips, and Michiko and Joji Iisaka, Mayuri Yamaguchi, Minako Hasagawa, and MarcMartínez for their never-ending encouragement and kindness.

This research could not have been complete without the cooperation and involvement of the many students who volunteered to participate in this study. A special note of appreciation and gratitude goes out to each of the participants for their assistance and contributions to this project and to this field of research.

A special appreciation goes out to my late grandparents, Kimi Tadokoro, and Asami and Isamu Kaneko whose continual encouragement helped me to believe in and pursue my dream. Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank my parents, Sachiko and Nobuyuki, and my sister Yasuko for their years of support. Their unwavering belief and love provided the inspiration to turn a dream into a reality. *Hontoo ni arigatoo.*

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation for the Study

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the use of request strategies by advanced learners of Japanese who are enrolled or have completed an advanced-level Japanese course at a Canadian university in oral communication. *Request* is a speaker's attempt to get a hearer to do action (Searle, 1969). The learners' use of request strategies was described, in comparison with that of native speakers of Japanese, in terms of the following categories: (a) patterns of discourse structures, (b) sentence types and (c) strategy types of requests, and (d) cognitive process in the realization of requests. The similarities and differences in these categories between native speakers of Japanese and advanced learners of Japanese were analyzed to obtain information that helps further understand the acquisition of pragmatic and sociolinguistic competence by learners of Japanese. Learners' deviant performance from native speakers' norms were examined to find possible causes as they may correspond to specific problem areas where many learners of Japanese may experience difficulties in learning Japanese. Knowing more about the difficulties faced by learners and the possible causes of these difficulties, the teachers can prepare appropriate activities and feedback that meet the needs of the learners. The learners can also benefit from the information obtained from this study to avoid possible communication break downs, especially in making requests in Japanese.

The present study was motivated by previous studies on the realization of requests by learners of different languages, such as English (Taguchi, 2006; Trosborg, 1994). Hebrew (Blum-Kulka, 1982; Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1987; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain,

1986), Indonesian (Hassall, 2001), and Spanish (le Pair, 1996). Particularly, the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) project by Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989a) was the motivation for the present study as the researchers attempted to apply their methodology to study a variety of languages and compare the realization of requests cross-linguistically.

These studies showed that learners realize requests in similar ways as native speakers do in some aspects, as well as in different ways in other aspects. Similarities were found in the frequency of the use of direct and indirect requests. Learners made these requests as frequently as native speakers did (Blum-Kulka, 1982; Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1987; le Pair, 1996; Taguchi, 2006; Trosborg, 1994). Direct requests are made in the form where the meaning of a request is clearly expressed, whereas indirect requests are made in the forms where the meaning of request is hidden (Searle, 1975). According to this definition, for example, in the situation where speakers want hearers to lend them a pen, speakers of English perform a direct request by saying *Lend me a pen*; or an indirect request by saying *Can you lend me a pen?*

Previous studies showed that the use of requests by learners differed from those by native speakers in many aspects of request realization, such as the degree of indirectness in requests (le Pair, 1996), range of indirect requests (Blum-Kulka, 1982; Taguchi, 2006) and length of requests (Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1987; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986; Hassall, 2001). For example, in his study of the use of Spanish requests by Dutch-speaking learners and native speakers of Spanish, le Pair (1996) reported that more Dutch-speaking learners chose interrogative requests of higher indirectness than native speakers of Spanish. Another example in their study of the use of requests by

learners of Hebrew, Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986) reported that the utterances of requests used by English-speaking learners of Hebrew were longer than those used by native speakers of Hebrew.

These findings raised further questions about learners of Japanese. For example, she was intrigued by questions, such as how would learners of Japanese perform Japanese requests in request situations, and how do learners of Japanese differ from native speakers of Japanese in performing requests?

The present study reviewed several published studies that examined the use of requests by learners of Japanese (Kashiwazaki, 1993; Kumai, 1992; Izaki, 2000; Tsuchida, 2003). Some findings from these studies were similar to those from the studies of other languages. It was reported that learners and native speakers both realized requests in a similar way, such as by using indirect requests (Kashiwazaki, 1993; Takahashi, 1987) and giving statements to support requests before making them (Tsuchida, 2003). However, learners and native speakers realized requests differently, for example, in the way of expressing indirectness and politeness (Izaki, 2000; Kashiwazaki, 1993; Kumai, 1992; Tsuchida, 2003). Other findings may have been specific only to the use of requests in Japanese. It was found that native speakers and learners used different sentence endings and developed their discourse slightly differently (Kashiwazaki, 1993); and learners used requests in interrogative forms more frequently than native speakers who used declarative forms more often (Kumai, 1992).

Such limited but noteworthy information was obtained from different types of participants, through different methods. Participants who were learning Japanese were native speakers of French (Izaki, 2000), Korean (Tsuchida, 2003), Malay, Chinese,

Indonesian, Korean, or Pidgin (Kumai, 1992), and an unknown language (Kashiwazaki, 1993). Data were collected by naturally-occurring interactions in a university office (Kashiwazaki, 1993) and through role plays in a limited number of situations (Izaki, 2000; Kumai, 1992; Tsuchida, 2003). Compared to the findings obtained from studies of other languages, those obtained from the previous studies of Japanese requests appear to be inadequate to lead to a complete picture of the use of requests by learners of Japanese. It is possible to contribute to the existing body of knowledge about the use of requests by learners of Japanese by conducting studies with different types of participants through a different type of methodology. Of particular interest is the use of requests by learners of Japanese in Canada who have a limited exposure to natural Japanese speech.

The present study intends to describe similarities and differences in the use of request strategies between native speakers and learners of Japanese. Based on the results of previous studies of Japanese requests (Kashiwazaki, 1993; Kumai, 1992), the present study assumes that similarities and differences can be found in the following categories: the choice of discourse structures, sentence forms, and strategies. In addition, the present study will attempt to examine how learners and native speakers of Japanese differ or match in their reasoning behind their choices of discourse structures, strategies, and sentence forms. To obtain such information, the present study used verbal reports. Previous studies (Cohen & Olshtain, 1993; Félix-Brasdefer, 2004) suggested that verbal reports provide information about what learners and native speakers of a language think prior to and at the time of role plays.

Data were collected from two groups of participants: English-speaking learners and native speakers of Japanese. They were collected using role plays in 16 situations and

retrospective interviews. Data were segmented into functional units, and coded according to categories for statistical analysis. The statistical analyses were conducted to calculate the frequencies of the categorised utterances.

This thesis is organized as follows. The second chapter discusses related literature and provides background information and outlines research questions for the present study. Chapter three illustrates the methodology of the study, including participants, design and procedure of data collection, and data analysis. Chapter four presents the results of the study. Chapter five discusses the findings of the study. The last chapter summarizes the findings and presents conclusions and implications for Japanese language learning and teaching and future research on the use of speech acts by speakers of Japanese. Limitations of the study are also discussed.

2 Previous Literature

2.1 Communicative Competence of Second Language Learners

The ability for appropriate language use is one of the most important aspects in language communication. Hymes (1972) argued that to become a competent speaker of a language, children must acquire *communicative competence*, the knowledge of the grammar and forms of a language and the rules of using the language appropriately in context. According to Hymes, competence in language use is neither innate nor attained automatically through the acquisition of grammatical structures. Children must learn to communicate their meaning in the correct form, at the appropriate time, to the appropriate person, in the right situation, and in the correct manner. Such learning takes place through social experiences in various socio-cultural contexts.

Hymes' view of communicative competence was elaborated on by Canale and Swain (1980) in their theory of second language teaching and testing. They further emphasized the significance of determining language competence by actual language use and its appropriateness in a given context. In their study and Canale's later study (1983), communicative competence was redefined in terms of four categories of competence: *grammatical*, *discourse*, *sociolinguistic*, and *strategic*. Each of these categories was outlined in the studies of Canale and Swain's (1980) and Canale's (1983) as follows:

- Grammatical competence refers to the knowledge of (a) words and sentences and (b) the rules of using them grammatically correctly to express meaning.
- Discourse competence refers to the ability to create a meaningful piece of speech or writing by linking one sentence to another.

- Sociolinguistic competence refers to the knowledge of how to use and understand spoken or written utterances appropriately in a given social context.
- Strategic competence is the ability to use language more skilfully and effectively to express meaning and achieve an intended communicative goal.

Canale and Swain's definition of communicative competence, composed of these four aspects, implies the importance of reflecting the functions of language in second language teaching and research. It is suggested that in second language teaching, learners should be introduced to how forms and rules of language work in real communicative situations; and that in second language acquisition research, researchers should observe how learners use their knowledge of the second language in authentic communication.

In their observations of learners' language use, researchers have found that learners not only use their knowledge correctly but also inappropriately and they fail to communicate their message accurately in given situations. In her discussion of cross-cultural pragmatic failure, Thomas (1983) stressed the importance of correctly determining the type of communication breakdowns in second language interactions. They are classified into two types, *pragmalinguistic failure* and *sociopragmatic failure*. The former type of breakdowns occurs when learners incorrectly use or interpret the intended meaning of an utterance in the second language by applying their knowledge of the rules of their first or another language. An example of this type of error is learners' misunderstanding of an English suggestion, such as *Why don't you come?* Because of its form, learners may misinterpret this utterance as a question inquiring reasons for not coming. The latter type of breakdowns occurs when learners express or understand the politeness or formality of an utterance in the second language according to the learners'

beliefs or cultural norms of the learners' community. An example is the excessive use of polite expressions in English utterances by learners who are from a community, such as Japan, where teachers are addressed politely. Thomas argued that errors resulted from sociopragmatic failure are more difficult for learners and teachers to handle because correcting those errors implies changing learners' social values. The misuse of polite expressions, however, may not be as tolerable as that of grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation (Lakoff, 1975). Thus, errors in language use, especially sociopragmatic errors, must be avoided as often as possible.

Learner's language use has been examined frequently by observing their performance of *speech acts*. Blum-Kulka et al. (1989a) examined the requests and apologies used by native speakers and learners of several languages and attempted to describe the differences and similarities in the realization of these acts across languages. After their study, more theoretical and empirical studies were conducted with speakers of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, on a variety of speech acts. Details are discussed in the following sections.

2.2 Speech Act

A speech act is an action that is performed by a speaker who makes an utterance. Every communicative utterance is a communicative action that a speaker performs with an intention (Searle, 1969). If speakers say something, not only do they convey the literal meaning of their utterance, but they also perform their intended action, such as advising, greeting, warning, thanking, and requesting. For example, when speakers of English say *Good morning, how are you?* they perform a speech act of greeting. In saying *I would*

like to ask for help with my homework, they perform a speech act of requesting to obtain help with their homework.

The theory of speech acts was first introduced by Austin (1962) and later developed by Searle (1969). Austin called a speech act an *illocutionary act*. He explained that an illocutionary act is an action performed by a speaker uttering a sentence called a “performative sentence” (p. 6). A performative sentence is one that performs an action by being stated. It differs from a sentence which simply describes something, or a statement which can be said true or false. The following is an example of a performative sentence cited by Austin: “I name this ship the *Queen Elizabeth*” (p. 5). This sentence is used not to report an action of naming, but to do an action of naming the ship. That is, the sentence performs an illocutionary act of naming, and as a consequence, the action of naming takes place. Austin distinguished two more actions from an illocutionary act in a performative sentence. One is an action of saying something to perform an illocutionary act, called a *locutionary act*, and the other is an outcome of an illocutionary act, called a *perlocutionary act*. In the previous example, the action of saying *I name this ship the Queen Elizabeth* is a locutionary act, the action of giving a name to the ship is an illocutionary act, and the action of calling the ship the Queen Elizabeth as the effect of the illocutionary act is a perlocutionary act.

Searle (1969) further elaborated on the speech act theory by formulating conditions for successful performance of illocutionary acts and rules for the use of expressions containing illocutionary acts to be performed. He hypothesized that the same rules are shared by speakers of different languages and cultures when they perform speech acts in different surface forms.

He first discussed conditions of promising and then extended his discussion to describe conditions of other illocutionary acts. The following statements are nine conditions of promising. The alphabetical symbols are used as follows: S for a speaker, T for a sentence uttered by S, H for a hearer, p for a proposition, and A for a future act.

1. Normal input and output conditions obtain.
2. S expresses the proposition that p in the utterance of T.
3. In expressing that p, S predicates a future act A of S.
4. H would prefer S's doing A to his not doing A, and S believes H would prefer his doing A to his not doing A.
5. It is not obvious to both S and H that S will do A in the normal course of events.
6. S intends to do A.
7. S intends that the utterance of T will place him under an obligation to do A.
8. S intends (i-1) to produce in H the knowledge (K) that the utterance of T is to count as placing S under an obligation to do A. S intends to produce K by means of the recognition of i-1, and he intends i-1 to be recognized in virtue of (by means of) H's knowledge of the meaning of T.
9. The semantical rules of the dialect spoken by S and H are such that T is correctly and sincerely uttered if and only if conditions 1-8 obtain.

(pp. 57-61)

Condition 1 states the qualification that speakers and hearers must have to perform an act of promising. Both speakers and hearers must be competent in a language, and they have to communicate to communicate, not pretend to communicate. Condition 2 specifies that a proposition must be expressed in an utterance of promising. A proposition of an utterance of promising refers to an action that is promised by making the utterance. For example, in an utterance *I promise to call you*, a proposition *I will call you* is expressed. According to Searle, this Condition 2 differentiates an illocutionary act of promising from the other acts. Condition 3 states that a proposition expressed by speakers in their utterance must refer to a future action, not a past action, by the speakers. Thus, a speakers' utterance *I promise to call you* never expresses a proposition that implies their past action, such as *I called you yesterday*. Condition 4 determines that both speakers and hearers understand that a speakers' future act is done for the sake of the hearers, and that the hearers wish the act to be done by the speakers. To further illustrate this, Searle compared an act of promising with an act of threatening. Promising differs from threatening in that the former benefits the hearers, whereas the latter does not. Condition 5 states that speakers' future action is not implied or taken for granted in a context where an illocutionary act is performed. In an act of promising, speakers cannot promise to do an action that they have already promised to do, they are doing, or they are expected to do at any cost. For example, speakers cannot promise to call hearers at eight o'clock at night while they are talking with these hearers on the phone at the time promised. Condition 6 determines whether speakers are honest in making a promise. If the speakers plan to do a future action, their action of promising is considered "sincere"; however, if they do not, it is considered "insincere" (p. 60). Condition 7 further specifies a speakers'

intention. The speakers make a promise, believing that it is necessary for them to do a promised action in the future. According to Searle, like Condition 2, this condition distinguishes an illocutionary act of promising from the other acts. Condition 8 describes what performing an illocutionary act of promising means to both the speakers and hearers. The speakers intend to do an action for the hearers by making an utterance; and the hearers understand the meaning of the speakers' utterance and recognize the intention implied in their utterance. Condition 9 states that there is no doubt that speakers have made an utterance in the common language between the speakers and hearers to promise to do an action.

Each condition, except Conditions 1, 8, and 9, was named as follows:

propositional content conditions for Conditions 2 and 3, *preparatory* conditions for Conditions 4 and 5, and *sincerity* condition for Condition 6, and *essential* condition for Condition 7. According to Searle, the unnamed conditions 1, 8, and 9 impose the same requirements in all types of illocutionary acts, whereas the named ones specify different requirements in different types of illocutionary acts. Thus, the descriptions stated in the four conditions--propositional content, preparatory, sincerity, and essential—characterize an illocutionary act of promising and distinguish it from the other illocutionary acts.

Searle extended his examination and described conditions for other types of illocutionary acts, including *request*, *assert*, *question*, *thank*, *advise*, *warn*, *greet*, and *congratulate*. Requests, of interest to the present study, will be characterized by the descriptions of the four named conditions in Section 2.4.

2.3 Indirect Speech Act

Speech acts are often performed indirectly. Searle (1975) described an *indirect speech act* as speakers' attempt to communicate their intended meaning indirectly in the form of another speech act. For example, when speakers intend to request hearers to help them in English, speakers may communicate the intention directly by saying *Help me*. The same intention can be expressed indirectly, in the form of a statement, such as *I would like you to help me*, or in the form of a question, such as *Can you help me?* According to Searle, in the last utterance performed are two speech acts: a question to ask if the hearers have ability to help the speakers and a request for help.

Searle believed that the use of indirect requests is mainly motivated by politeness. When the use of direct requests is inappropriate according to the general rules of conversation, speakers express their intention by uttering an indirect request, such as one in the form of an ability question opened by *Can you?* According to Searle, this type of request was preferred for two reasons. First, the use of ability questions implies that speakers do not assume that hearers are able to do the action. Second, hearers have an option to say no to respond to this type of request.

Searle also discussed the mechanism of indirect speech acts: how indirect speech acts are used and understood correctly. When speakers perform an indirect speech act, they rely on their hearers' linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge and their ability to understand the speakers' primary intention in context. This way, the hearers accurately understand the speakers' intended meaning rather than not the literal meaning of an utterance. Searle argued that this account holds true even when two intended meanings are implied in an utterance. In the case of indirect speech acts that are realized in a

conventional form, such as *can-you* questions, the speakers' intended meanings of the acts are obvious to hearers despite the indirectness. Thus, an English utterance *Can you help me?* is chosen by the speakers and perceived correctly by the hearers, not only as a question, but as a request.

Searle also claimed that speakers of different languages and cultures perform indirect speech acts in different surface forms, according to the same underlying rules; and their use of indirect speech acts is motivated by politeness. For example, an English utterance *Can you help me?* and the Japanese equivalent *tetsudatte kur-emasen ka* are both used and interpreted as polite requests by speakers of each language, according to the same speech act rules, despite the difference between Japanese and English in the language form. Searle also argued that his theory of indirect speech acts can explain a case where literal translations of indirect requests in one language are not understood as polite requests in another language, such as the case of a Czech translation of an English indirect request opening with *Can you?* Searle explained that the difference in the realization of indirectness between languages is simply because of the differences in the conventions of the languages.

Levinson (1983) pointed out that Searle's view of speech act faces a basic but serious problem. Particularly, Searle's notion of an indirect speech act, which is the demonstration of a speech act through another, is based on the assumption that a speech act matches with a specific sentence form. Levinson elaborated on his point by showing a contradiction between this assumption of Searle's and real language usage as follows: At least in English, requests are rarely performed in imperatives, and an interrogative sentence is not always a question. Levinson suggested that the theory of speech acts

needs further examination; and that the use and function of those should be studied empirically.

Wierzbicka (1985, 2003) also criticized the speech act theory and many related studies of speech acts for being biased towards the English-speaking culture. She argued that the use of indirect speech acts is not universal as Searle claims. To illustrate this point, she showed how differently an indirect form of a Polish request would be interpreted by native speakers of Polish, compared to that of an English request. In English, requests are commonly introduced by a type of phrases, such as *will you*, *could you*, *do you want to*, *why don't you*, and *would you mind*. A question *Will you close the window?* is an indirect form of a request *Close the window*. According to Wierzbicka (1985), however, the Polish equivalents of such type of indirect requests are understood as no more than questions and do not have the same implication in Polish as they do in English. The speaker's intention implied in some of the literal translations of English indirect requests may be far from a request in Polish. Wierzbicka elaborated on this point by showing the following example: A Polish question "Nie zamkniesz okna?", literally corresponding to an English indirect request "Won't you close the window?", is interpreted by speakers of Polish as a question to ask for explanation for why hearers do not close the window (p. 33).

Wierzbicka also argued against Searle's explanations of the motivation for the use of indirect speech acts by speakers of different languages. She claimed that politeness is not necessarily motivation for indirect speech acts in every culture. In the example provided by Wierzbicka (1985), speakers of Polish use requests in imperative forms in situations where speakers of English may use requests in interrogative forms. For

example, in Polish, children may ask their mother to hand them a tissue by making a request in an imperative form. According to Wierzbicka, requests in imperative forms are not considered impolite in Polish.

Wierzbicka also opposed Searle's claim that the differences in the realization of speech acts between different languages can be explained simply by the differences in the surface forms. She claimed that speech acts are performed according to the rules that are governing language use in the given language community; and that each cultural and linguistic community has its own way to show politeness, and thus, it does not always coincide with indirect language forms. This point was illustrated by her following analysis of indirect requests in English and Polish. Speakers of English in some English-speaking communities make requests in interrogative forms because such types of requests allow hearers to comply or not to comply with, and that is considered polite. In contrast, speakers of Polish make requests in imperative forms because such types of requests allow hearers to respond in more ways than they would do to interrogative questions. In response to the speakers' requests, the hearers are able to comply with or without any verbal responses, express their compliance, or show their rejection. In addition, Polish speakers avoid making requests in interrogative forms because these requests sound so indirect and polite for Polish speakers that they may feel distant from their hearers. Showing care for others in this way is a form of expressing politeness in Polish communities. This difference in the realization of polite requests between English and Polish is the reflection of different cultural values between the two. Wierzbicka suggested that when different ways of language use are examined and described, the cultural norms of the given language community should be considered.

The following section reviews the models of the politeness theory discussed in previous studies and shows how cultural differences in politeness phenomena have been explained in the literature.

2.4 Politeness and Politeness Strategies

2.4.1 Models of politeness.

The realization of politeness differs across languages and cultures. One way of expressing politeness in one culture may not always be viewed as polite or appropriate in another culture, as has been seen in Wierzbicka's Polish example of an imperative request, in Section 2.3. According to Pizziconi (2006), studies of politeness have been conducted based on two types of models of politeness. The first model, proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), was developed on the assumption that motivation for the use of politeness is universal across languages and cultures and that the same rules of politeness can explain all expressions and actions of politeness in different languages. This model has been elaborated on and discussed probably most frequently by researchers. The second model was developed based on the idea that the means of, as well as the motivation for, expressing politeness are specific to each culture so that the universal rules cannot account for the differences in polite expressions between different languages. This model has been referred to in the study of English politeness by Watts (2003) and in studies of the politeness of other languages, such as Japanese, by Hill, Ide, Ikuta, Kawasaki, and Ogino (1986) and Matsumoto (1988).

Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness was derived from the discussion, by Goffman (1967), about the concept and management of *face* in social interactions. Brown and Levinson claimed that people express politeness to maintain their *face* "public self

image” (p.61) and that of others when they perform communicative acts called “face-threatening acts” (p.60) or, in short, FTAs. FTAs are defined as acts that inherently pose the risk of damaging face, such as orders, offers, criticism, and expressions of negative emotions. Brown and Levinson’s theory suggested that every speaker’s face bears two sides of self-image, a *positive face* and a *negative face*. A positive face is an image that interlocutors desire from each other. This face can be maintained when speakers undertake their desired action that is also desired by hearers. An example is when the speakers complement the hearers on what the hearers wish to be complemented on. A negative face, on the other hand, is an image showing that the interlocutors’ actions are not restrained. This kind of face can be maintained when speakers execute an action that does not inconvenience anyone. An example of this is when the speakers use polite expressions in their requests. Every speaker tries to prevent both kinds of face from being damaged, by avoiding FTAs or undertaking FTAs with or without using politeness strategies to lessen the threat. By providing examples from three languages: English, Tamil and Tzeltal, Brown and Levinson claimed that this model for executing and avoiding FTAs underlies the rules for using politeness strategies in every culture.

Brown and Levinson’s model of politeness has provoked discussions about whether this model is valid in different cultural communities and whether different models of politeness need to be derived from the perspective of each linguistic and cultural group. Watts (2003) described politeness as “mutually shared forms of consideration for others” (p.28) and claimed that politeness is motivated by different reasons and realized differently across cultures and languages. He criticized Brown and Levinson’s work for reaching a universal definition of politeness without any cultural

context. Watts emphasized the importance of studying the use of linguistic politeness in relation to a specific situational and cultural context where it occurs.

Attempts have been made by researchers to define Japanese politeness and describe the nature of linguistic politeness in Japanese. Hill et al. (1986) defined politeness as “one of the constraints on human interaction, whose purpose is to consider other’s feelings, establish levels of mutual comfort, and promote rapport” (p.349) and claimed that under this definition, the use of politeness is motivated by two factors: *discernment* and *volition*. Discernment is an aspect of politeness that speakers are required to express by social rules, whereas volition is one that speakers are free to express as they want. Hill et al. believed that the weight of these factors differs across cultures. In their questionnaire study on the difference in the use of requests between Japanese and Americans, results showed that the Japanese speakers highly agreed on the use of certain request forms. Based on the results, Hill et al. suggested that discernment outweighs volition in the Japanese politeness system. Matsumoto (1988) disagreed with the explanation for the motivation for the use of politeness by Brown and Levinson (1987). She argued that Japanese speakers use politeness, not to maintain the face of each participant in their interaction, but to indicate their acknowledgment of the difference in status between the addressees and themselves. For example, to express ‘(someone) eats’, Japanese speakers use *meshiagarimasu* if they determine the addressees as those in respected positions, and *tabemasu* if they don’t. Matsumoto also explained that the speakers use auxiliary verbs, *-kureru* ‘giving’ and *-morau* ‘receiving’ to show that the addressees deserve their respects and gratitude.

2.4.2 Cultural differences in politeness strategies.

Brown and Levinson (1987) suggested four sets of politeness strategies for executing FTAs. They are respectively, in decreasing order of directness in meaning, “bold on record,” “positive politeness,” and “negative politeness,” and “off record” (p.68-9). The first three are sub-strategies of an “on record” (p.68) strategy, which is placed in contrast to an off-record strategy. In undertaking FTAs by means of an on-record strategy, speakers communicate their intention more clearly and directly than they would do by means of an off-record strategy. A bold-on-record strategy is used when the efficiency of communication takes precedence over the protection of the face of the speakers’ and the hearers’. A request in an emergency situation *Help!* and a quick offer of food at a dinner table *Have some more* are included in this category. A positive politeness strategy is used when speakers wish to realize their desired action while satisfying the hearers’ desire and maintaining the positive face of the speakers’ and hearers’. This strategy, for example, makes it possible to turn a command into a request by creating a sense of “common ground” (p.103) with using an in-group address term, such as honey, dear, and mom. Thus, with the term *mom*, which is used to gently address a mother, a request *Come here, mom* sounds more polite than a command *Come here*. A negative politeness strategy is used when speakers wish to maintain the hearers’ negative face, and attempt to avoid an imposition on the hearers. By using this strategy, requests are made in interrogative forms, such as *Can you come here?* Unlike these on-record strategies, such off-record strategies are ambiguous and indirect. For example, if speakers say *I have something to show you here, but I am not sure if you want to see it*, the meaning that they want the hearers to

understand is not directly stated. Thus, the hearers can interpret, at their discretion, what the speakers meant by making that utterance.

Brown and Levinson proposed an account for cultural difference in the use of these politeness strategies. They claimed that speakers of different cultural communities use politeness according to the universal rules of politeness in principle, but realize it differently because of their culturally specific assessment of the weight of an FTA (W). The value of W represents the threat level of an FTA, calculated by summing each value of the following three measures of social factors: social distance between speakers and hearers (D), relative power of hearers over speakers (P), and ranking of imposition in the culture (R). These three social factors are culturally specific, so the values of W differ across cultures. The higher the value of W, the more ambiguously and indirectly speakers attempt to communicate their intention to hearers. According to Brown and Levinson, cultural communities of western U.S.A., which have a low value of W, prefer positive politeness strategies. However, Japanese communities, which have a high value of W, are more in favour of negative politeness strategies.

Brown and Levinson admitted that the assessment of only P, D, and R values cannot account for all the cultural differences in the use of politeness strategies. To validate this model in different cultural contexts, they explained that each category of these values is “compounded of culturally specific factors” (p.16). Thus, for example, a P value in the interaction between two people, in one cultural context, is assumed different in another cultural context even in the interaction between the same people. Similarly, D and R values are also affected by cultural factors in a given cultural context.

More social factors have been introduced as elements to characterize politeness strategies in different cultural contexts, such as in Japanese speech. For example, Shibatani (2006) showed that the use of honorifics, a way of expressing politeness, is influenced by social and psychological distance between speakers and hearers; demeanour, the speaker's manner of the presentation of himself; the formality of the speech setting; and the relativity of the social distance of the speakers, the nominal referent, and the hearers, which is called group membership.

2.5 A Speech Act of Request

The lexical meaning of the verb *request* is described in a variety of ways in dictionaries using synonyms. It implies an action of politely stating an expectation of someone doing something, such as politely or formally asking someone to do something ("Request," 2011b), begging ("Request," n.d.), expressing a desire for, especially politely, or politely demanding ("Request," 2011a).

The action of requesting has also been described by Austin (1962), Searle (1969; 1976) and Leech (1983). In their studies, illocutionary acts were categorized according to their classification systems, and an act of requesting was distinguished from the other acts.

Austin classified illocutionary verbs into five groups – *verdictives*, *exercitives*, *commissives*, *behabitives*, and *expositives*. The first group *verdictives* includes verbs that describe the state, value, and quality of something. The verbs of this class are, for example, *assess*, *diagnose*, *estimate*, and *measure*. The second group *exercitives* consists of verbs that express a speaker's decision that someone will do or not do something. Austin described this group as "a very wide class" (p. 154). It includes *advise*, *beg*, *name*, *pray*, and so forth. The third group *commissives* consists of verbs that express a speaker's

commitment to do something. The verbs of this class are *agree*, *bet*, *intend*, *promise*, and so forth. The fourth group behabitives includes verbs that describe a speaker's response or attitude towards someone's actions. The verbs of this class are *apologize*, *congratulate*, *criticize*, *protest*, and so forth. Austin described this class as "very miscellaneous" (p. 151). The last group expositives includes verbs that are used to express speaker's thoughts and opinions in arguments and conversations. The verbs of this class are *affirm*, *mention*, *inform*, *swear*, *recognize*, and so forth. According to Austin, many of the verbs of this class are borderline verbs that can be categorized into the other groups. For example, verbs such as *class*, *urge*, *agree*, and *demur* may be classified into the following groups: verdictives, exercitives, commissives, and behabitives, respectively. The verb *request* is not found in any groups of the verbs listed by Austin. It can presumably be categorized into the exercitives group that includes the verb *beg*.

Searle (1969) proposed a set of conditions that must be satisfied for a successful performance of a speech act (see section 2.2). Among these conditions, four of them, which include propositional content, preparatory, sincerity, and essential, were claimed to distinguish between different speech acts. A successful illocutionary act of request satisfies the following four conditions:

- Propositional content condition that requires the hearer to do a future action.
- Preparatory condition that requires that (a) the hearer is able to do the action, and the speaker believes that the hearer is able to do the action, (b) it is not obvious to both the speaker and the hearer that the hearer will do the action in the normal course of events of his own accord; and (c) the speaker has no authority over the hearer.
- Sincerity condition that requires that the speaker wants the hearer to do the action.

- Essential condition that requires that the speaker attempts to get the hearer to do the action.

An illocutionary act of request that may satisfy these conditions would be an act that, for example, speakers request hearers, who are friends of speakers, to lend them a pen. As the propositional content condition requires, an action of lending a pen is a future action; and the speakers have not been lent a pen by the hearers. As the preparatory condition states, the action of lending a pen to the speakers are feasible for the hearers, and the speakers know the hearers are capable of doing the action. In addition, the speakers and hearers have no power over each other so that the speakers would ask the hearers if the hearers could lend them a pen. As the sincerity condition requires, the speakers are honest about their request: They are not pretending that they want the hearers to lend them a pen. Finally, as the essential condition states, when the speakers says *Can you lend me a pen?* this utterance is considered as the speakers' attempt of requesting.

Searle (1976) placed an illocutionary act of requesting with other illocutionary acts, such as *asking (questioning)*, *ordering*, *commanding*, and *advising*, in a single category called *directives*. This category includes illocutionary acts that satisfy the propositional content, sincerity, and essential conditions of requests. According to Searle, illocutionary verbs in Austin's categories of exercitives and behabitives are also classified into this category.

Leech (1983) categorized speech acts according to their relationship with the use of politeness. He believed that speakers express their politeness in their utterance for a different purpose in realizing different types of speech acts. Four classification types

were suggested: *competitive*, *convivial*, *collaborative*, and *conflictive*. The first class competitive includes speech acts whose realization is impolite, such as requesting, demanding, and begging. For example, in realization of requesting, a speaker's utterance of request is considered impolite; therefore, the speaker uses their politeness to lessen their impoliteness. If speakers want hearers to lend them a pen, they may ask politely *Could you lend me a pen?* instead of *Lend me a pen*. The second class convivial includes speech acts whose realization is innately polite, such as offering, inviting, and thanking. For example, engaging in action of thanking is polite. Speakers are expected to realize the speech act of thanking whenever it is possible. The third and fourth classes, which are collaborative and conflictive, consist of speech acts that the use of politeness is unnecessary. Collaborative class includes speech acts used in writing, such as asserting, reporting, and announcing, whereas the conflictive class includes speech acts whose realization causes conflicts, such as threatening, accusing, and cursing.

The observation of these classification systems of speech acts by Austin, Searle and Leech suggests that an illocutionary act of requesting is speaker's action to get hearers to do something; and the act shares conditions for a successful speech act and purposes for the use of politeness with other illocutionary acts. This implies that an illocutionary act of requesting may not be distinguished clearly from other similar acts, such as ordering and commanding. Sadock (2004) stated that the classification of speech acts has been discussed from a variety of perspectives in many studies, but no agreement has yet been reached on a specific system.

2.6 Japanese Request

A Japanese term that corresponds to *request* in English is *irai*. Kabaya, Kawaguchi, and Sakamoto (1998) illustrated the pragmatic properties of *irai* in relation to the use of honorific expressions. In their study, *irai* was explained as a type of *kodotenkaihyogen*, an expression or speech unit that prompts action. It was distinguished from the other types of *kodotenkaihyogen* by the following three roles that are involved in the action prompted by the expression: action-takers, decision-makers and beneficiaries. For example, in case of *irai*, on one hand, both roles of action-takers and decision-makers are played by hearers, and those of beneficiaries are played by speakers. Thus, when speakers express *irai*, hearers decide whether or not to comply with the speakers' request; and when the request is complied, the speakers are to benefit from the hearers' compliance. In case of a different *kodotenkaihyogen*, for example, *jogen* 'advice,' on the other hand, all three roles are played by hearers as they are beneficiaries to benefit from their own compliance with the speakers' advice.

2.7 Studies of Request Realization

2.7.1 Overview.

The variation in the use of requests has been examined within and across a variety of languages, between different social and situational contexts, and between different types of speakers. The primary goal of these studies is to study the similarities and differences in the realization of requests between languages and identify systematic, universal or language-specific patterns and rules. The Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) project compared the use of requests between English, Hebrew, German, Danish, Canadian French, and Argentinean Spanish and between

native speakers and learners of English, German, and Hebrew (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka, 1989; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989a). In this project, responses containing requests were elicited by questionnaires, and each response was separated into constituent parts and analyzed for types of request strategies, direct or indirect. Then, these strategies and constituent parts were compared between languages, cultures, and situations.

Additional studies were conducted on languages other than those investigated in the CCSARP project, as well as the same languages. The data were collected from speakers of Dutch and those of French (Van Mulken, 1996), Indonesian speakers (Hassall, 1999), Turkish native and Turkish-German bilingual speakers (Marti, 2006) and learners of a second language (L2): English (Rose, 2000; Suh, 1999; Taguchi, 2006; Trosborg, 1994), Indonesian (Hassall, 2001), Japanese (Mizuno, 1996), Korean (Byon, 2004), and Spanish (Félix-Brasdefer, 2007; le Pair, 1996; Pearson, 2006). A limited number of these studies investigated the L2 learners' development of request strategies (Rose, 2000; Trosborg, 1994). The following subsections review the use of requests by native speakers and learners of different languages.

2.7.2 Request realization of native speakers.

One of the key issues in the studies of this subject area is universality in the use of types of request strategies across languages. The results of the previous studies suggested that indirect requests are universal. For example, indirect requests were used more frequently than direct requests by native speakers of English, French, Hebrew, and Spanish (Blum-Kulka, 1989), Indonesian (Hassall, 1999), and French and Dutch (Van Mulken, 1996). The study by Blum-Kulka showed that the native speakers of Australian English, French, Hebrew, and Argentinean Spanish used structurally indirect requests

more frequently than direct requests. Most favoured were the types of indirect requests that ask for ability, such as those that start with the English equivalent of *can you* or *could you*. Similar results have also been reported by Hassal and Van Mulken. By interpreting the result of her study, Blum-Kulka suggested that ability questions may be standard forms of indirect requests in all languages because both the literal and intended meanings of these questions are clear to the hearers; and that indirect requests can therefore be considered as universal.

However, findings from other studies do not support this claim. Wierzbicka (2003) refuted that indirect requests are universal. Her study suggested that while questions are commonly used to make indirect requests in English, the same cannot be said of indirect requests in Polish. In his 2006 study of Turkish requests, Marti reported that speakers of Turkish used direct requests relatively frequently when compared with speakers of other languages. In one scenario in which a speaker asks a hearer to clean a mess in a kitchen, the Turkish speakers used direct requests more frequently than indirect requests. The opposite was true of the French, English, and German speakers, in the study by Blum-Kulka and House (1989). Results of these studies suggest that indirect requests cannot be considered to be universal strategies.

Another key issue in the previous studies was cross-linguistic variation in the realization of requests and contributing factors that determine the variation. Previous studies identified cross-linguistic differences in several aspects of the realization of requests, such as the choice of perspectives (Blum-Kulka, 1989) and the use of internal modifiers (Blum-Kulka, 1989; Van Mulken, 1996). The choice of perspective determines whose action is emphasized, whereas internal modifiers, such as English adverbs *please*

or *possibly*, are elements unessential to realize a request. According to Blum-Kulka et al. (1989b), the manipulation of these aspects affects the degree of politeness in requests. As for the choice of perspectives, when the hearer's action is emphasized, the degree of imposition is higher than when the speaker's action is emphasized. For example, in a request made from a hearer's perspective, such as *Can you lend me a pen?* the action of the hearer (*you*), *lend* is emphasized. In contrast, in a request made from a speaker's perspective, such as *Can I borrow a pen?* the action of the speaker (*I*), *borrow* is emphasized. The latter request is thus less imposing than the former. Internal modifiers are also used to manipulate the degree of imposition in requests. For example, the degree of imposition is lowered in an English request, as follows: *Can I possibly borrow a pen?* Blum-Kulka (1989) reported that the choice of perspectives and the use of internal modifiers differ cross-culturally. For example, indirect requests were made from the hearer's perspectives more frequently but made with modifiers less frequently by speakers of Argentinean Spanish than by speakers of other languages. However, they were made in a completely opposite way by speakers of English: They were made from the speaker's perspectives more frequently, and modifiers were more commonly used. Hebrew speakers, however, neither chose the hearer's perspectives nor used modifiers frequently in their requests. Differences in the way of using internal modifiers were also reported in the study of Dutch and French speakers (Van Mulken, 1996). She found that both Dutch speakers and French speakers used interrogative forms of request, such as ability questions, most frequently; however, the requests by Dutch speakers had twice as many internal modifiers (such as *graag* 'please' or *even* 'a short while') as those by French speakers. They were also less wordy than those by French speakers which were

followed or preceded by clauses to provide reasons for requests. Her study concluded that Dutch speakers tend to show politeness lexically by using politeness expressions, whereas French speakers prefer to show politeness globally by adding pragmatic support to requests. Based on their findings, both Blum-Kulka and Van Mulken suggested that languages differ in the ways of showing politeness. Wierzbicka (2003) argued that differences in the realization of speech acts are not a reflection of the different ways of showing politeness, but the different cultural value attached to the language.

2.7.3 Request realization of second language speakers.

The studies of speech acts by native speakers of different languages, such as those reviewed in the previous section, led researchers to conduct studies on the same topics, with learners of second languages (Kasper, 1996). The use of requests by learners of second languages has been examined, in comparison to that of requests with native speakers, in a variety of languages: English (Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1987; Rose, 2000; Takahashi & DuFon, 1989; Taguchi, 2006; Trosborg, 1994), Hebrew (Blum-Kulka, 1982; Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1987), Korean (Byon, 2004), Spanish (le Pair, 1996), and Turkish (Marti, 2006). The primary goal of these studies was to study the similarities and differences in the realization of requests between learners and native speakers and provide with a range of explanations.

Similarities were found in the use of direct and indirect requests. Studies reported that learners made direct or indirect requests as frequently as native speakers did (Blum-Kulka, 1982; Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1987; Byon, 2004; le Pair, 1996; Marti, 2006; Rose, 2000; Takahashi & DuFon, 1989; Taguchi, 2006; Trosborg, 1994). For example, in her study of the use of requests by learners of Hebrew, Blum-Kulka (1982) reported that

learners and native speakers of Hebrew were similar in aspects of request realization, such as the range of indirect requests, sensitivity to situational contexts, and perception and performance of indirect requests in some situations. Based on the results, Blum-Kulka claimed that learners are as sensitive to context as native speakers, using various strategies that are common to many languages.

Differences were found in many aspects of request realization, such as the range of indirect requests (Blum-Kulka, 1982; Taguchi, 2006), choice of perspectives (Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1987), choice of the subtypes of strategies (le Pair, 1996), choice of strategies and expressions in a specific situation (Blum-Kulka, 1983; Taguchi, 2006), use of modifiers (Færch & Kasper, 1989; Trosborg, 1994), and length of request (Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1987; Hassall, 2001; Weizman, 1993). For example, in his study of the use of Spanish requests by Dutch-speaking learners and native speakers of Spanish, le Pair (1996) reported that more Dutch-speaking learners chose interrogative requests of higher indirectness than native speakers of Spanish. Among the interrogative requests, questions with the verb *poder* 'can', which ask for ability, were chosen most frequently by the learners; however, the same type of questions and those with the verb *querer* 'want', which ask willingness, were chosen, for the most part, as frequently by the native speakers. In his study of requests by English speaking learners of Indonesian, Hassall (2001) also reported that learners used longer *supportive moves* more often than speakers of Indonesian. Supportive moves are phrases and sentences that precede or follow requests and provide reasons for the requests. For example, in English, a sentence *I need to write a note* can be a supportive move preceding a request *Can I borrow your pen?* In

Hassall's study, supportive moves, including repetitive and excessive information, were found longer and more redundant in requests of learners than in those of native speakers.

These deviations from native speaker's norms can be viewed as learners' difficulty, causing learners to fail to realize a request appropriately and effectively. In previous studies, a variety of accounts have been presented as possible factors responsible for the differences. They are factors related to learners' native languages, learner-specific strategies, methods of second language instruction, and learners' second language proficiency.

Blum-Kulka (1982) suggested the learners' native language was responsible for their deviations. In her study, most native speakers of Hebrew used direct request strategies as a police officer's request, such as the Hebrew equivalent of *Move the car*, while many learners, who were from North America, avoided using the same type of requests and made indirect requests instead, such as the Hebrew equivalent of *The car should be moved*, or even more indirect forms of requests. To discuss explanations for such differences in the use of request strategies by the learners and native speakers of Hebrew, the study noted cultural differences between the two communities from where the study participants originated. Police officers were assumed to be direct and impolite in Israel, where the native speakers of Hebrew were from, whereas they were assumed to be indirect and polite in North America, where English-speaking learners were from. Blum-Kulka suggested that learners' reference to such knowledge of their first language culture had an influence on their realization of indirect requests in Hebrew.

In addition to cross-cultural differences, learners' use of specific strategies has been considered as one of the factors contributing to learner's deviations. In le Pair's

study (1996) which compared native speakers of Spanish to Dutch-speaking learners of Spanish, the latter avoided using willingness questions with the verb *querer* 'want'; and instead, they used ability questions with the verb *poder* 'can', to realize requests. According to le Pair, these ability questions were considered more indirect than the willingness questions. He argued that learners' stronger preference for indirect requests at a higher level of indirectness may have resulted from their use of learner-specific strategies in two possible ways: (a) to compensate for their lack of knowledge of appropriate politeness expressions or (b) to avoid using any expressions of imposition to be safe. It was believed that many of the learners chose ability questions over willingness questions because the former were more accessible than the latter in their Spanish knowledge base, or because the former were less imposing than the latter.

The effect of the methods of second language instruction through which learners were taught was suspected responsible for their deviant performance. Hassall (2001) reported supportive moves used by learners of Indonesian were more redundant than those used by native speakers of Indonesian because they included words and phrases that could be omitted to be understood. For example, to borrow a pen, after saying *I've forgotten my pen*, a learner would say in Indonesian *Can I borrow your pen?* whereas a native speaker probably would say *Can I borrow yours?* One of the explanations for this finding in the study was that such redundancy was influenced by language examples in textbooks and interaction patterns in learners' classrooms. In textbooks, interactions given as speech examples are explicit rather than natural; and in classroom exercises, learners are expected to speak in a complete sentence.

Learners' lack of proficiency in their second language has been suggested to account for the discrepancy in request realization between learners and native speakers. Some developmental studies examined the request by learners of different proficiency levels and reported that requests of advanced learners were more similar to those of native speakers than those of lower levels in terms of the ranges of request types and the use of specific forms and modification (Ellis, 1992; Félix-Brasdefer, 2007; Rose, 2000; Schmidt, 1983; Taguchi, 2006; Trosborg, 1994). Félix-Brasdefer's 2007 study examined the use of requests by learners of Spanish who had different language proficiency levels. He reported that beginner level Spanish students used more direct requests than those at the intermediate and advanced levels. Students at the higher levels used more indirect requests. In addition, he found that learners whose language competence was low used polite expressions to mitigate their direct requests. It was suggested that learners who have a low language proficiency level have sociopragmatic competence in using polite expressions; however, they are unable to use them correctly because of their low level of grammatical proficiency. In their longitudinal studies, Schmidt and Ellis reported that learners with higher the grammatical proficiency were able to make more native-like requests. These findings suggested that learner's non-native-like responses may decrease as their language proficiency improves. However, some pragmatic failures, such as the overuse of imperative forms, have also been found in the use of requests by advanced learners (Taguchi, 2006; Trosborg, 1994); and this implies that learners may not fully develop their sociolinguistic competence over time with increasing grammatical competence.

A number of findings have been made in previous studies of requests regarding the use of requests by learners of second languages. Learners' requests were examined in various aspects of the realization of requests, in comparison with those of native speakers, and both similarities and differences were found. Differences were provided with explanations from different perspectives, which helped understand the characteristics of learners' requests and their difficulty in the use of requests. In addition, findings from developmental studies suggested as proficiency in the target language improves, learners may approximate to native speakers in the use of requests; however, learners at advanced levels may still fail in some aspects of the realization of requests. Further investigation with speakers of different languages, particularly those at advanced levels, would provide additional information to understand the nature of the use of requests by learners of second languages.

2.8 Studies of Request Realization in Japanese

The present study reviewed several published studies that examined the use of requests by speakers of Japanese. These studies include the investigations of the use of requests by speakers of Japanese, in comparison to that by speakers of English (Fukushima, 1996; Takahashi, 1987) and the studies of the realization of requests by learners of Japanese who were native speakers of French (Izaki, 2000), Korean (Tsuchida, 2003), and different languages (Kashiwazaki, 1993; Kumai, 1992).

Takahashi examined the difference in the use of indirect requests by native speakers of American English and those of Japanese. She reported that indirect requests most frequently used by Japanese participants were more indirect than those used by American participants. For example, in the situation where a speaker requested a

neighbour to refrain from playing the violin at night, Japanese participants made a request most frequently by using sentences that imply the speaker's desired action, such as "*biorin no oto ga chotto ... yoru nemura nakute kommatte irun desu keredomo* [italics added]," 'the sound of the violin is a little ... I am having trouble sleeping well at night' (p. 144). On the contrary, American participants more frequently used sentences that clearly expressed the speaker's desired action, such as "I wonder if she could practice, maybe, before eleven o'clock at night" (p. 142). Takahashi argued that the types of indirect requests used by Japanese participants were more indirect than those used by American participants because the Japanese participants as speakers allowed their hearers to interpret their intention and did not force them to respond to the requests if they didn't want to.

Fukushima compared the realization of requests by speakers of British English and Japanese. One of her findings was the same as that found in the other previous studies: Indirect requests were used most frequently. However, Fukushima also found that direct requests were used by her Japanese-speaking participants almost as frequently as direct requests, whereas they were not used at all by her English-speaking. Fukushima attributed this difference in the use of direct requests between Japanese and British participants to the different cultural values of the communities which these participants belong to. She argued that both groups of participants viewed the status of the roles equal in the role play where a student borrows salt from a neighbour living in the same students' dormitory; and in such a case, direct requests, on one hand, were more appropriate in Japanese communities to keep the relationship with the hearers close.

Indirect requests, on the other hand, were more desirable to stay distant with the hearers in British communities.

Studies of the use of requests by learners of Japanese reported that their realization of requests was comparable to that of Japanese native speakers in the most frequently used types of requests (Kashiwazaki, 1993) and types of interaction preceding the realization of requests (Tsuchida, 2003). Kashiwazaki examined the natural interactions including Japanese requests between native speakers of Japanese who were university employees or students, and those occurred between these native speakers and learners of Japanese, in a university campus. She reported that both learners and native speakers of Japanese most frequently used indirect requests that implicitly refer to desired actions, such as “*kagi o motte-nai-n desu ga* [italics added],” ‘I don’t have a key, but,’ in the request of lending a key (p. 58). Tsuchida compared the realization of requests between Korean-speaking advanced learners of Japanese and native speakers of Japanese. The requests were elicited from eight role plays. Tsuchida found that both groups of speakers were similar in that they often asked for information that may support their realization of requests, such as, in the case of a request for a ride, information that describes whether a hearer has a car, before making requests.

Learners of Japanese were found different in their use of politeness expressions called *iisashi* (Izaki, 2000; Kashiwazaki, 1993; Kumai, 1992; Tsuchida, 2003). *Iisashi* are expressions that are used at the end of a sentence to soften it, such as *ga* and *keredomo* as in *pen o kari-tai-n desu ga*, ‘I would like to borrow a pen.’ In addition to its sentence-softening function, when these expressions are used in requests, they may also elicit hearer’s responses; and such responses may act as the hearers’ offers that save the

speakers from making requests (Izaki, 2000). Kumai examined the use of *iisashi* in the requests, which were elicited by role plays in three situations of requesting to lend a book, used by learners of Japanese. It was reported that the sentence-final expressions *ga* and *keredomo* were found in the learners' requests less frequently than in the native speakers' requests. Other studies (Izaki, 2000; Kashiwazaki, 1993; Tsuchida, 2003) also reported learners' infrequent use of *iisashi* and discussed this behaviour. Tsuchida interviewed her Korean participants to ask them about their use of *iisashi*. In her interview, one of the Korean participants explained that it was more appropriate to make the end of a sentence clear in the realization of requests. Tsuchida thus concluded that the avoidance of *iisashi* by Korean-speaking learners resulted from their use of communication strategies in Korean culture. Kumai and Izaki pointed out the learners' discourse sounded more abrupt without *iisashi*; and thus, such discourse may cause trouble in communication in Japanese.

Findings from the previous studies of Japanese requests imply that like speakers of other languages, speakers of Japanese realize requests frequently, by using indirect requests (Takahashi, 1987). However, their realization of requests differs in the way in which they use direct requests (Fukushima, 1996). It is also suggested that the way in which learners and native speakers of Japanese realize requests is similar. For example, both groups use indirect requests (Kashiwazaki, 1993), give statements to support requests before making requests (Tsuchida, 2003). However, they differ, for example, in the way in which they express indirectness and politeness (Izaki, 2000; Kashiwazaki, 1993; Kumai, 1992; Tsuchida, 2003).

These results provide vital information to understand the realization of requests in Japanese. However, it appears to be inadequate to lead to a complete picture of the use of requests by learners of Japanese. There are fewer findings from the previous empirical studies of the use of Japanese requests than there are from the studies of the use of requests in other languages, such as English, German and Hebrew (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989a). Previous studies were conducted with data collected by a limited range of methods, such as naturally-occurring interactions in a university office (Kashiwazaki, 1993) and role plays in eight situations (Tsuchida, 2003). In addition, participants were from a small pool of different types of learners of Japanese, such as speakers of French (Izaki, 2000), Korean (Tsuchida, 2003), Malay, Chinese, Indonesian, and Pidgin (Kumai, 1992). Findings from these studies are not sufficient enough to determine the similarities and differences in the use of request strategies between learners and native speakers of Japanese. To further characterize them, more empirical studies are needed that focus on the collection of data containing requests, in a variety of request situations by learners, particularly those at advanced levels, who have different cultural backgrounds.

2.9 Summary of Previous Literature

In summary, the previous studies of request strategies have presented both similarities and differences in the realization of requests by learners and native speakers of different languages. In the language studied, structurally-indirect requests have been reported to be used most frequently by both native and non-native speakers. However, cross-linguistic variations have been presented in various aspects, such as the choice of perspectives and use of modifiers. In addition to these aspects, the length of request utterances was found different in the requests between native speakers and second

language learners. Similarly, a small number of studies have reported similarities and differences in making requests between native speakers and learners of Japanese.

Learners' deviations from native speakers' norms have been found in the use of direct requests and politeness expressions. Such deviations may cause a learner an interruption in communication. To better understand request realization by learners of Japanese, further studies need to be conducted to examine the utterances surrounding a request, in addition to the aspects that have been investigated.

2.10 Statement of the Problem

The main purpose of this study is to examine the use of request strategies by advanced learners of Japanese who are enrolled or have completed an advanced-level Japanese course at a Canadian university in oral communication. The learners' use of request strategies was described, in comparison with that of native speakers of Japanese, in terms of the following categories: (a) the patterns of discourse structures, (b) sentence types and (c) strategy types of requests, and (d) cognitive process in the realization of requests. The similarities and differences in these categories between native speakers of Japanese and advanced learners of Japanese were analyzed to obtain information that furthers the understanding of the acquisition of pragmatic and sociolinguistic competence by learners of Japanese. Learners' deviant performance from native speakers' norms were examined to find possible causes as they may correspond to specific problem areas where many learners of Japanese may experience difficulties in learning Japanese.

This study will take the following approaches: (a) categorizing each speech act of request performed by learners and native speakers of Japanese according to the types of discourse structures, sentences, and strategies; (b) describing the patterns in the

realization of requests by the learners and native speakers, according to the choice of discourse structures, sentences, and strategies; (c) examining the similarities and differences in the patterns; and (d) describing variations in the reasoning behind their choice of discourse structures, strategies, and sentences. This study will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What discourse structures do learners and native speakers of Japanese use to realize a request?
2. What types of sentences do learners and native speakers of Japanese use to realize a request?
3. What strategies do learners and native speakers of Japanese use to realize a request?
4. What is the reasoning behind Japanese speakers' choice of discourse structures and strategies in realizing a request?

2.11 Significance of the Problem

First, the research findings may provide additional information to characterize request strategies by second language learners of L2 learners of Japanese. The results of the study may show problem areas in the acquisition of pragmatic and sociolinguistic competence by learners of Japanese. Such information will be valuable for teaching and learning Japanese.

In addition, the study can be a base for further research in the use of requests or other speech acts. The instrument that was developed in this study can be used in a replicated study or studies of other speech acts in Japanese, such as apology, compliment and refusals.

3 Methodology

This chapter discusses the methodology of the study. First, it describes the demographic and linguistic characteristics of the study participants, learners and native speakers of Japanese. The learners' levels of Japanese language proficiency, the method of assessing the levels, and the possible influence of the native speakers' English (as a second language) on their production of Japanese are also explained. Next, the chapter discusses the instruments of data collection. Data were collected from the participants individually by two methods: role play and a retrospective interview. Role play is one of the elicitation techniques to collect spoken discourse, conducted in the form of an interview. It is often used to collect data containing specific language forms that may be difficult to obtain from natural or spontaneous interactions (Como, 2006). Two or more participants are informed of their roles and situations and asked to act out. The present study used written scenarios on cards to explain the situations of the role plays to the participants. A retrospective interview is a type of elicitation technique to collect information about a participant's cognitive process at the time of a relevant task, conducted after the task. This technique provides useful information about a participant's mind, when it is integrated with other techniques of data collection (Tirkkonen-Condit, 2006). The present study conducted retrospective interviews, immediately after the role play, to elicit information about a speaker's cognitive process at the time of role-playing. The reasons for the use of the role play and retrospective interview, and the design of the instruments are also explained.

Third, the procedure of data collection is explained. The present study conducted data collection in the following order: (1) background questionnaires, (2) role plays, and

(3) retrospective interviews. Learners of Japanese had a short interview as a Japanese oral proficiency test before role plays.

Fourth, the pilot study is discussed.

Fifth, the method of data analysis is described.

Finally, this chapter illustrates the statistical analyses that were conducted to calculate the frequencies of the categorised utterances.

3.1 Participants

3.1.1 Groups.

The participants for this study were students from two groups, a group of learners of Japanese and a group of native speakers of Japanese. The present study defined learners as those who are competent speakers of their native language and have learned or are learning another language (i.e., Japanese) as a foreign language. Native speakers, for the purpose of this study, are defined as those individuals who are competent speakers of their native language and who were raised and educated in the community of their native language. All participants were residents of Victoria, Canada. The native speakers of Japanese had continued contact with their culture and own language and had not had extensive exposure to English. The reason for such limitation is that a great amount of exposure to a second language may have influence on various aspects of the speaker's native language (Pavlenko, 2000).

3.1.2 Group size.

In total, eleven students participated in this study. They were divided into two groups, the first of which was composed of five learners of Japanese. There were two

male and three female participants. The second group, which was comprised of six native speakers of Japanese, included three male and three female volunteers.

Originally, the study intended to recruit a larger sample of forty participants. The planned sample was to include twenty participants from each of the following populations: (a) students of the University of Victoria who had completed a Japanese language course of upper-intermediate level or above and (b) native speakers of Japanese who had lived in Canada less than six months. The recruitment of participants was advertised by posters in the University of Victoria campus between January and early February 2009.

Two reasons may account for this smaller size of participants. First, at the time of recruitment, the target populations from which participants were recruited were smaller than anticipated. The researcher expected to be contacted by students at the University of Victoria who were enrolled in advanced Japanese courses and those who were enrolled in an English language program. However, at the time of the study, the enrolment of students in these courses seemed to be lower than expected. Second, the time required of participants to complete the research activities may have been too long. At most, two hours were required for learners of Japanese, and ninety minutes for native speakers of Japanese. The participation in the study for such a length of time might have been inconvenient for students although the recruitment took place during a relatively quiet time of the semester at the university.

The background questionnaires shown in Appendix A and B were administrated to obtain demographic information of the participant population. The following sections

describe the profiles of the participants of each group including their social, linguistic, and educational backgrounds.

3.1.3 Learner group.

Learners were undergraduate students of the University of Victoria, ranging in age from 19 to 23, who had taken or been enrolled in an advanced-level Japanese course in the university. Four of them were native speakers of English. One of the students spoke Mandarin Chinese as her native language, and was presumably fluent in English at the time of the data collection. She immigrated to Canada when she was thirteen, and completed her six-year secondary education in Canada. The students had received different lengths of formal instruction of Japanese language ranging between 13 months and 36 months. Details are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Learners' Profile

	Age	Sex	Native language	Length of Japanese instruction
Cary	21	F	Chinese	3 years 1 month
Alissa	21	F	English	2 years 6 months
Nina	21	F	English	3 years 10 months
Justin	19	M	English	1 year 1 month
Luke	23	M	English	3 years

The language proficiency level of these learners was determined by the researcher in two ways: learners' background questionnaires and oral proficiency tests given before role plays. First, according to the background questionnaires, the learners were assumed

to have at least lower-advanced speaking skills in Japanese at the time of recruitment. They all had taken Japanese 311, an upper-intermediate Japanese course at the University of Victoria. The completion of this course was one of the requirements for participation in the study. According to the academic course calendar of the University of Victoria, Japanese 311 offered “further balanced development of language skills,” and the lectures were conducted in Japanese (University of Victoria, 2008). After this course, four learners continued to study Japanese in more advanced Japanese language courses at University of Victoria. Three learners reported their self-estimated level of Japanese language proficiency was advanced, and two reported it was intermediate.

In order to verify their oral proficiency, the researcher conducted interview tests with the learners individually. The interview format was adapted from the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview. According to the researcher’s subjective evaluation, each learner’s oral performance in the interview ranged from *advanced-low* to *advanced-high* in the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines (Breiner-Sanders, Lowe, Miles, & Swender, 2000).

Learners at this level of Japanese language proficiency were selected as participants in this study for two reasons. First, the selection was due to the nature of the research activities required of the participants. In this study, the participants were asked to read and understand role-play scenarios written in Japanese and perform role plays in Japanese. To complete these tasks within a limited time frame, advanced levels of Japanese proficiency, particularly in reading and speaking, were necessary. Second, learners at advanced levels were chosen because their communication skills were assumed more comparable to those of native speakers than learners at lower levels. In her study of the use of requests by Japanese-speaking learners of English, Taguchi (2006)

reported that learner's language proficiency influences their choice of request strategies as well as the appropriateness of their overall performance of making requests. In her study, the request forms in role plays used by learners at two different proficiency levels were compared with those used by native speakers. In addition, these learners' role-play performances were evaluated by native speakers, in terms of appropriateness of politeness expressions, grammar, and discourse. The study found that lower-level learners did not use certain expressions which were used by both native speakers and advanced-level learners; and lower-level learners were rated much lower than advanced-level learners. These findings suggest that learners at low levels of language proficiency may not be able to communicate appropriately in role plays due to their lack of pragmatic, grammatical, and discourse skills. In order to collect a sufficient number of various request strategies in a short period of time, the present study selected advanced-level learners as participants.

3.1.4 Native speaker group.

Native speakers were six Japanese students, ranging in age from 21 to 40 years, who were studying in Victoria. One of them was a student studying English as a second language at a private school. The other five were students at University of Victoria: two were studying English as a second language; two were studying various subjects as exchange students from Japan; and one was majoring in Pacific and Asian studies. They all speak and understand standard Japanese, and some of them also speak dialects of Japanese. Five of them have lived in Canada for no longer than 7 months, and one has lived in the country for three years and ten months. Detail is shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Japanese Native Speakers' Profiles

	Age	Sex	Length of residence in Canada
Miyoko	21	F	4 months
Rika	21	F	3 months
Kana	27	F	7 months
Jun	22	M	3 years 10 months
Hiro	28	M	1 month
Tomo	40	M	6 months

Some influence of English as a second language may have been present in the use of Japanese by these native speakers. By reviewing previous studies, Pavlenko (2000) showed that various areas of speakers' first language may be affected by their second language which was learnt as adults. She suggested that the influence of second language on first language appears in the following linguistic phenomena: "borrowing, convergence, shift, restructuring, and loss" (p.175); and factors contributing to these phenomena are numerous. Some of the native speaker participants in this study could have been subjected to these phenomena because of their advanced proficiency of English and an extensive exposure to the language, which were among the factors discussed by Pavlenko.

However, a possible influence of English on these bilingual participants' Japanese was assumed to be minor so that it did not strongly affect their use of request strategies or overall performance in role plays. Among the studies reviewed by Pavlenko, influence of

second language was reported mostly on the use of first languages by immigrants whose length of stay in the target language environment was longer than three years. In contrast, all the native speaker participants, except one, in this study had lived in Canada less than a year as temporary residents. In addition, based on the researcher's observation, no significant influence of English was present in these participants' spoken Japanese. Thus, the data elicited from these native speaker participants are considered comparable to those elicited from monolingual native speakers of Japanese.

3.2 Instruments

3.2.1 Role play.

Reasons for the use of role play. In the present study, role plays were conducted between the researcher and each of the participants. The participants were given a cue card on which a request situation had been written. They then read the scenario and spoke to the researcher as if they were in the situation. Each participant performed sixteen role plays.

Role play is one of the methods of data collection that has been adopted by the empirical studies of speech acts (Taguchi, 2006; Trosborg, 1994). In her assessment of the assessment of the appropriateness of requests used by Japanese learners of English, Taguchi asked the participants to conduct four role plays. She then elicited spoken requests. Similarly, in her study of Danish learners of English, Trosborg used role plays to investigate the speech acts of requests, complaints, and apologies. Other methods that have been used to collect requests and discourse containing requests include the observation of natural discourse (Aoyama, 2002) and a type of a written questionnaire

called discourse completion test (DCT), which is a type of written questionnaire (Blum-Kulka, 1982; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Byon, 2004; Marti, 2006).

There are several reasons why role play was chosen as a data collection method in this study over other methods. First, role play is a practical method to collect spoken requests. Ideally, spoken data should be elicited from several participants in natural request settings in order to examine the realization patterns of natural spoken requests. However, collecting data through such a method is not realistic for the present study. First, it would take a great amount of time to collect sufficient data from which conclusions could be drawn. For example, Aoyama (2002) reported that she spent two months collecting 123 requests from interactions between customers and workers, and those between workers, at a coffee shop in Tokyo, Japan, while she was working there as an employee. As discussed by Cohen (2005), the investment of time to collect naturally-occurring speech acts is necessary given a low frequency of dialogues containing speech acts in natural discourse (Cohen, 2005).

The second reason is that it would be difficult to control contextual variables that affect language use in a natural setting, and maintain the same condition for every participant during the data collection stage. In Aoyama's study, the worker's gender, age, and status were provided, but no information about the customers, except their gender, was obtained. It was impossible to confirm that each context and interaction were comparable because of the lack of information about each of the informants.

The quality of data obtained through role plays is comparable to that obtained by a DCT. A DCT is a data collection method that has been successfully used in other studies (Kasper & Dahl, 1991) to elicit responses containing request forms. A DCT is a

written questionnaire on which the participants fill in the lines between written dialogues. Because this method asks participants to respond to a description of a situation in writing, it is considered comparable to a written role play (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 2005). It was first used by Blum-Kulka (1982) in her study of the use of requests by learners of Hebrew, and has been used in the studies of speech acts (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Byon, 2004; Marti, 2006). This method makes it possible to easily control contextual variables and collect a large quantity of data (Kasper & Dahl, 1991).

A small number of studies have compared written questionnaires and role play in terms of their influence on the quality and quantity of data. The results of these studies suggest that the data collected by written questionnaires do not truly reflect that collected by role plays. For example, Rintell and Mitchel (1989) collected responses containing requests and apologies from learners and native speakers of English through DCTs and role plays. They examined the differences between the written responses in the DCTs and the spoken replies in the role plays. They reported that there were no significant differences in the quality between the two sets of data. The learners, however, made longer responses in their role play than in the DCT. In addition, in the situations where the use of direct requests was appropriate, both learners and native speakers made direct requests more frequently in the DCT than they did during the role play. Rintell and Mitchel concluded that the role play may elicit longer and less direct responses than the DCT because there is more personal interaction between the speakers and thus there is a greater requirement for the use of polite language. A similar study was conducted by Sasaki (1998). Through the use of questionnaires and role plays that did not involve any interaction, termed *closed* role plays, she collected responses containing requests and

refusals from 12 Japanese learners of English. Unlike the study by Rintell and Mitchel, her study collected both written and spoken responses from the same participants. She examined the differences between the two sets of responses. Sasaki reported that similar types of expressions were used to communicate essential meanings in both sets of responses; but longer and different types of expressions were made in the role plays. She concluded that role plays are more appropriate to examine a speaker's complete realization of speech act than written questionnaires.

Based on the studies above, it can be determined that role play is the most appropriate method to collect spoken data for this study. Its simplicity means that it can be readily adapted to this research. In addition, data collected through this method contain oral responses that are probably more comparable to authentic speech in natural discourse than responses in questionnaires.

The next section discusses the method of data collection in the present study, and provides a detailed description of a closed role play.

Closed role play. Role play can be classified as *closed* or *open*, according to the amount of interaction between the participants (Kasper & Dahl, 1991). Closed role plays do not involve any interaction. A participant, who is the main speaker in the role plays, reads information about a situation on a card and speaks as if he is communicating with another speaker. In contrast, open role plays allow limited interaction. The participants are usually provided with information about the roles of each participant, the purpose of the interaction, and the context to start the interaction. They then develop a close interaction at their discretion. A more measurable definition of each type of role play, which was given by Kasper (2008), is as follows: A closed role play involves a "single"

discourse turn, whereas an open role play involves “many” and “complex” interactions because participants need to resolve a problem to reach the goal of the communication (p. 323).

Closed role plays, which are performed by two people facing each other, were chosen over open role plays in the present study. Given the limited time allowance for the study, it was determined that the transcription and the coding of the data would consume more than the allotted time frame. According to Kasper and Dahl (1991), transcribing a one-hour recording of spoken data takes approximately ten hours. Furthermore, it is difficult to identify every component of conversational discourse to a type of utterance and categorize it accurately.

In the present study, however, some role plays which involve a participant having more than one turn, can be seen as an open role play as was defined by Kasper (2008). In their role plays, most of the participants sought out responses from the researcher, who was their interlocutor. They asked questions or called out the name of her role. Example 1 shows an entire discourse of a role-play performed by one of the participants Cary (C), a learner of Japanese, and the researcher (R). In this role play, they played out Scenario 5, in which the participant asks her friend to translate a letter in English:

1. C: *taro kun.*
Taro

R: *a nani?*
Uh, what?

C: *chotto ii?*
Is it OK?

R: *un.*
Yes.

C: *ima jikan aru?*

Do you have time now?

R: *aru yo.*

I have.

C: *nagano ni itta-toki no hosuto-famirii no otoosan kara tegami moratta-n desu kedo chotto tegaki ga watashi yomu-no ga nigatena nde eigo ni yakushite-morae-nai kashira?*

I received a letter from my host father whom I met when I did home stay in Nagano, but I am not good at reading his handwriting, so can you translate it into English?

R: *a ii yo.*

OK.

C: *ja onegai-shi masu.*

Then. Please do.

(Cary, Scenario 5)

Although it contains more than a turn, the interaction of this role play is not as complex as that of an open role play; thus, this interaction can be considered as that of a closed role play. Throughout the role play session, the researcher's interruption was limited to short phrases in Japanese, such as *un* 'yes', *ii yo* 'OK', and *nani?* 'What?' Having been responded by the researcher in this way, the participant Cary did not seem to encounter any complex situation where she needed to negotiate, or any trouble to make a request. To create as natural a setting as possible, the researcher interacted with all the other participants in the same way as the interaction shown in Example 1 throughout the role-play sessions.

3.2.2 Designing role-play scenarios.

Roles. The present study chose three roles: *taro* 'Taro', a university student; *yamada-sensee* 'Teacher (Ms.) Yamada', a university teacher; and *anata* 'you', a university student. First two roles were played by the researcher. She played either role

depending on a role-play scenario. The last one was played by the participants. That is, they acted as themselves and played a role of a student in all the scenarios. Because performing an unfamiliar role makes the role-play task very difficult (Clark, 1989), the participants were assigned to only a single role that was considered familiar according to their background information, throughout the role plays. In addition, the participants acted as a requester who made a request, and the researcher acted as a person who was a recipient of the request and who would take action for the sake of the requester, in all the role plays.

Social relationship of the roles. Two different types of social relationships were presented in the role plays. One is a relationship between two students who are friends, and the other is one between a student and a teacher who teaches one of the student's classes. Such differences in the social relationship influence the level of formality of the language use by Japanese speakers. According to Iwasaki (2000), there are roughly three levels of formality in Japanese communication: informal, neutral, and formal. Each of these levels is referred to by a variety of expressions. One of them is a verb. Iwasaki illustrated how different levels of formality are presented in interrogative sentences with modified verbs of *iku* 'to go.' Example 2 shows the sentences provided in Iwasaki (2000, p.293). The presentation of the sentences is adjusted slightly for the present study. The verbs are indicated in bold.

2. *yoshiko mo **iku**?*
Are you going, too, Yoshiko?
- yamada-san mo **iki-masu** ka?*
Are you going, too, Ms. Yamada?
- sensee mo **irasshai-masu** ka?*
Are you going, too, Professor?

The plain form of the verb *iku* in the first sentence can be used in interactions between close people, such as friends or family members. It can also be used in utterances given by speakers of higher status to hearers of lower status, such as those given by seniors to juniors in high school or college. The verb ending *-masu* attached in the second and third sentences are used in more formal interactions. The second sentence can be used between strangers, or friends or classmates who are not very close. This level of formality is typically introduced in Japanese language textbooks prior to the other levels (Niyekawa, 1991). The third sentence, in which the speaker uses *irassharu* which is an honorific verb of *iku*, sounds more polite than the second one. Such a polite sentence may be used when speakers speak to people who are superior to them, such as a teacher or a boss.

In the present study, each of these levels of formality was expected to be present in the role plays. In student-student role plays, on one hand, the participants would use informal or neutral levels. However, the former level was expected to appear more frequently than the latter because it was implied in the role-play instruction that the participants, who play a student's role, were close to their friends who are also students. In student-teacher role plays, on the other hand, the participants, in the role of a student, would use more formal and polite language than they would do in student-student role plays. The speakers of Japanese often use polite language to their teachers, who are superior to them (Mizutani & Mizutani, 1988).

Setting of interaction. Throughout the scenarios, all the interactions were assumed to be taking place at a place in a university: the interactions with a friend were in front of a classroom, and those with a teacher were in her office.

Request situations. The situations presented in the role play in this study are those of requests where a speaker gets a hearer to do action. To obtain ideas for the situations, the present study examined the role-play situations used in the previous studies (Félix-Brasdefer, 2007; Fukushima, 1996; Mizuno, 1996; Taguchi, 2006; Trosborg, 1994). It was found impossible to copy any of the scenarios in these studies and use them in the present study for two reasons. First, the situations described in the scenarios of these studies seemed unrealistic and thus difficult for the participants of the present study to imagine. For example, Taguchi used a scenario where a participant asked her sister to get a TV remote. This scenario can be used for native speakers of Japanese to act out in Japanese. However, it cannot be used for learners of Japanese because they would rarely speak to their sister in their second language in real life. Besides, the home setting of this scenario does not suit the setting of the present study. Second, some roles in the scenario of the previous studies appeared to be unfamiliar for the participants of the present study. For example, in the study by Félix-Brasdefer and that by Fukushima, there was a scenario where a participant asked her roommate or a person living next to her dormitory room to do action. In the researcher's view, these scenarios were not assumed to be appropriate for the present study because having a roommate or sharing a living space with others was not very common in Japan at the time of the data collection. For these reasons, the present study made its original scenarios as familiar, natural, and realistic to the participants as possible to encourage them to make requests as they would do in a natural, Japanese-speaking environment.

Based on the pragmatic description of requests by Searle (1969) and that of *irai* by Kabaya et al. (1998), the study decided on the following conditions in order to create settings where request utterances can be elicited:

1. The speaker's desired action is the one the speaker believes that the hearer can do.
2. The speaker wants the hearer to do the action.
3. The speaker must ask the hearer to do the action.
4. The hearer decides whether or not to do the action.
5. The speaker benefits from the hearer's compliance with his request.
6. The speaker is not in a position of authority over the hearer.

Conditions 1 to 4 and 6 follow Searle's felicity conditions, and Conditions 3 to 5 follow the description of *irai* provided in the study by Kabaya et al.

Based on these conditions, the researcher first chose nine actions where speakers ask hearers to (a) lend a book, (b) reschedule an appointment, (c) write a recommendation letter, (d) translate a letter, (e) return a book, (f) correct writing, (g) answer a questionnaire, (h) talk as a guest speaker, and (i) become a judge. The present study assumed that the participants may experience or may have experienced these actions in a university context. Then, the researcher designed 16 scenarios, each of which describes a situation where speakers ask hearers to do one of these nine actions. Eight scenarios were the request scenes between two friends, and the rest were between a student and a teacher. The scenarios used in the learner's role plays and those used in the native speaker's were identical except for four scenarios: 5, 9, 10, and 13. In each of these scenarios, the basic storylines remained the same, but some details were adjusted to approximate to the roles of the participants and the real life situations of theirs. The learner's scenario 5, where

speakers ask hearers to translate a Japanese letter which was written by a Japanese host father into English, is written as follows. The text to be modified is shown in bold.

*anata wa kyonen no natsu ni hoomusutee o shita **nagano** no hosutofamilii no otoosan kara tegami o moraimashita. demo sore wa tegaki de yominikuku nan to kaitearu ka yoku wakarimasen. taro san ni **eigo ni yakushitehoshii** to omotteimasu. taro san ni nan to iimasuka.*

You have received a letter from your host father in **Nagano** whom you stayed with last summer. It's handwritten and hard to read and understand what he is saying. You want Taro to **translate the letter in English**.

The same scenario could not be used for the participants who were native speakers of Japanese, because an English translation would not be necessary for them to understand a Japanese letter written by a host father in Nagano if the same situation happened in real life. This scenario of the learners' was modified as follows. The modified text is shown in bold.

*anata wa kyonen no natsu ni hoomusutee o shita **kanada** no hosutofamilii no otoosan kara tegami o moraimashita. demo sore wa tegaki de yominikuku nan to kaitearu ka yoku wakarimasen. taro san ni **nihongo ni yakushitehoshii** to omotteimasu. taro san ni nan to iimasuka.*

You have received a letter from your host father in **Canada** whom you stayed with last summer. It's handwritten and hard to read and understand what he is saying. You want Taro to **translate the letter in Japanese**.

Slight modifications were made so that speakers could ask hearers to provide a Japanese translation for an English letter sent from a host father in Canada. Similar adjustments were made in scenarios 9, 10, and 13 of the native speaker's. All the role-play scenarios are shown in Appendixes C and D.

3.2.3 Retrospective interview.

The use of a verbal report. Verbal report refers to either a data collection technique to obtain information about an informant's cognitive process at the time of a

relevant task, or data obtained by the technique. It is conducted in the form of an interview during or in the middle of the performance of a task, or after the completion of a task. Data elicited during task performance are called *concurrent* reports and those elicited after task performance are called *retrospective* reports (Ericsson & Simon, 1984). In the study of second language acquisition, verbal reports have often been used to obtain more information about learners' language use and learning of L2 (Gass & Mackey, 2000). Cohen (1998) argued that verbal report data can be used primarily to add more empirical support in the studies of learners' strategy use, when used together with data collected by other instruments.

Previously, a verbal report has served a variety of uses in the studies of speech acts. For example, Cohen and Olshtain (1993) used verbal reports to study the cognitive process of Hebrew-speaking learners of English in their realization of apologies, complaints, and requests in role plays. They found that the learners (a) planned what expressions to use in their utterances one-third of the time; (b) used English, Hebrew or another language in which they were more fluent during the time of planning; (c) used various strategies to decide on a specific speech act form; and (d) did not pay attention to grammar or pronunciation. Félix-Brasdefer (2004) also conducted retrospective interviews in his study of the use of Spanish refusals by English-speaking learners and native speakers of Spanish, and examined these Spanish speakers' perceptions of the social status of the people whom they gave refusals in the role-play situations. He reported that the length of residence in the target language community influence the learner's perception of social status in formal situations. Félix-Brasdefer's verbal report data revealed that learners who had one year or longer in the target language community

perceived social status in a manner similar to native speakers. On the other hand, learners who had spent less than five months in the target language community were not aware that they should give more indirect refusals to people of higher social status. His research also revealed that the learners with a shorter length of residence in the target language culture used the pragmatic knowledge of their native language culture to react in both formal and informal refusal situations.

Findings from these previous studies suggest that verbal reports provide information about what learners and native speakers of a language are thinking prior to and at the time of performing speech acts in role plays; and that such information will help further understand the realization of speech acts including request strategies. The present study assumes that verbal reports can be used to help further interpret the role-play data, by addressing the fourth question of the study, *What is the reasoning behind Japanese speakers' choice of discourse structures and strategies in realizing a request?*

The use of retrospective interview. To elicit information to answer this question, the present study conducted retrospective interviews. According to Ericsson and Simon, both concurrent report and retrospective report have advantages and disadvantages. The present study, however, believes that the latter method is more appropriate for the present study than the former because of the smaller complexity in adopting the method; and that the disadvantages of the method can be reduced by improving its elicitation techniques.

A concurrent report is believed to be a better method to elicit more uncontaminated information that speakers are directly attending to at the time of task performance. However, problems have been reported in association with the timing of the method, such as the probable influences on their subsequent task performance (Cohen,

1998) and the difficulty of providing reports during task performance (Robinson, 1992). In contrast, a retrospective report has an advantage over a concurrent report, in terms of its influence on task performance. Unlike a concurrent report, a retrospective report allows speakers to access their cognitive process of performing a task, without interruption or possible effects on the subsequent tasks, because it is conducted after the completion of a task. This timing of collecting a report is an advantage for a retrospective report; however, it is also a disadvantage. Because of the time lag between a specific task and a report, speakers may not be able to provide information referring to the task that is being asked about.

Upon evaluating the advantages and disadvantages of concurrent and retrospective reports, it was decided that the latter would be less problematic to adopt for the present study given the limited time frame. If the concurrent report were to be used to obtain authentic verbal data, each participant would have to be trained to behave and think as if they were in an everyday situation normally while they were performing their tasks. Such training would involve a greater time commitment the participants. A retrospective report must also be preceded by a training session. However, because of the simplicity of its tasks, the time frame for completing this type of report is far shorter than that for a concurrent report. Another disadvantage of a concurrent report is that it is possible to lose information because of the time lag between a role play and a report. This situation is negated when a retrospective report is used. To enhance the accuracy of the speakers' memory, as well as the amount of information in the report, Gass and Mackey (2000) suggested conducting an interview immediately after all the tasks are completed, and using stimuli, such as audio recordings, video recordings, and written documents.

The present study played back the audio-recording of their role plays as stimuli in the interview. It also presented the scenarios of role-play situations again to the participants.

Designing a retrospective interview. Retrospective interviews used to elicit verbal reports can be categorized into the following three styles: structured, unstructured, and semi-structured (Matsumoto, 1993). A structured retrospective interview is conducted with a set of prepared questions that can be answered straightforwardly in short phrases. Matsumoto described it as “the most systematic and most objective” style of interview (p. 35); and therefore, the influence of the researcher on the interview can be easily minimized. Matsumoto did not address any negative aspects in using this style of interview. However, it can be assumed that this interview format can only be conducted in a limited number of studies in which identical questions and stimuli are used to elicit verbal reports from each participant. Structured interviews are thus unsuitable for the present study, for the stimuli and participants’ responses differ. In contrast, an unstructured retrospective interview is conducted in a less controlled manner. The researcher as an interviewer has opportunities to ask participants to elaborate on their responses and develop a discussion on the topic of their interest. However, one of the drawbacks of having such opportunities is a risk of a researcher’s bias in the data. A semi-structured retrospective, however, is a style of interview between the two others. It is less biased, and the data collected by the interview are, thus, more reliable.

The present study chose a semi-structured interview over the other styles because it suits the purpose of the study. To analyze the similarities and differences in cognitive process in the realization of requests between the two groups of participants quantitatively, interviews need to be conducted in a controlled manner, with consistent

questions. However, they also need to be administered flexibly to capture as much information about the cognitive process of different participants as possible in a limited time frame. In the interviews, the researcher asked spontaneous questions to expand the participant's responses, in addition to a set of prearranged questions. Questions asked in the interviews are discussed in more detail in the following section.

Retrospective interview questions. Questions were asked to elicit information about the speakers' cognitive processes of decision-making during the realization of requests in role plays. More specifically, the study intended to use the participants' verbal reports to explore what information the speakers attended while realizing requests and choosing a particular form of request. The present study asked the participants the following two questions that were prearranged by the researcher.

1. What were you thinking at the time of this role play? Please tell me what you intended to do in the role play from the beginning to the end.
2. What were you thinking when you said what you said?

The first question was asked to have the participants recall a relevant role play and to verbalize any of their intentions and thoughts at any time of the role play. The second sentence in the first question was added to elicit information regarding to the speakers' processes of making utterances in the entire sequence. The second question was intended to elicit the participants' thoughts at the time of making a request sentence.

The planned questions were constructed to extract not so specific but rather general information about the speakers' cognitive process. According to Ericsson and Simon, if questions were asked to elicit specific information, the participants may be forced to answer them and provide information, even if they did not remember or pay

attention to the matter being asked about. In fact, the participants in the pilot study recalled neither a specific thinking process nor reasoning for the choice of particular sentences and expressions when they were asked questions, such as *What were you thinking when you said “karite mo ii desu ka?”* Thus, by asking rather broad questions, the present study intended to obtain general understanding of the participant’s mind.

In addition to these planned questions, a few other questions were asked spontaneously to clarify the participants’ responses, such as *What do you mean by “trying to speak politely”?* or *What were you thinking when you posed?* The participant’s answers to these questions were used primarily to help understand their responses to the planned questions.

3.3 Procedures

The researcher met each participant in a university classroom. Data were collected in the following orders: a background questionnaire, role play, and a retrospective verbal interview. A short interview was also conducted only with the learners of Japanese to determine their Japanese oral proficiency prior to the role play. The role play and retrospective interview were both audio-recorded. The entire session lasted approximately for two hours at most. The researcher was present through the session. She acted as an interlocutor in the role play and initiated the verbal report as an interviewer.

Each role-play session began with an orientation session. The participants read the written instructions including the role-play procedures and information about their roles and those of the researcher who interacted with them. The instructions and information were written in Japanese, but an English translation was also provided for the learners

(Appendix E). After reading the instructions, the participants practiced a few role plays in order to become familiarized with role-playing and its procedure.

After the orientation session, sixteen role plays took place between each participant and the researcher. The participants read a written scenario on a cue card, and when ready, they were asked to respond to it as they would do in an authentic conversation. The researcher had limited interaction with the participants during the role plays to avoid influencing the participants' responses. To avoid possible order effects, the cue cards were presented randomly in each session. The participants' utterances were audio-recorded.

A retrospective interview was conducted immediately after the role-play session. It began with a training session. The researcher presented printed instructions and explained the interview procedure to the participant. The printed instructions were written in Japanese and English. After a brief training session, the researcher interviewed the participant for 40 to 60 minutes. First, she presented a scenario and played back the audio recording of each role play. Then, she asked the planned interview questions, followed by some spontaneous questions. The recordings of twelve role plays were used as stimuli to elicit responses. In the interviews, all the native speakers and three learners spoke Japanese, whereas two learners used English in their reports. The interview was audio-recorded.

3.4 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to examine if the data collection instruments and procedure of the present study would work as planned. More precisely, it was conducted to ensure if the participants would

1. understand the instructions of the role play and those of the retrospective interview clearly;
2. understand the description of each role-play situation unambiguously and realize a request as intended by the present study;
3. perform role plays smoothly without much linguistic trouble; that is, it was assured that the participants, especially learners of Japanese, could read and understand words and expressions in the role-play scenarios correctly, and that they could produce their responses almost as promptly as native speakers of Japanese;
4. understand the retrospective interview questions and provide information as intended by the present study; and
5. complete all the tasks within the period of time for which they agree to participate in the data collection.

The pilot study was conducted with five participants: three native speakers of Japanese and two learners of Japanese. Major revisions were made to the wording in the role-play scenarios and the retrospective interview questions.

Some language in the role-play scenarios was revised to avoid a possible influence on the participants' responses. It was suspected that the participants of the pilot study might have borrowed the phrase from the scenario and used it in their role plays. For example, four of the participants in the pilot study used a benefactive auxiliary verb -*morau* 'receive' to realize their requests, as shown in Example 3. The auxiliary verb is in its inflected form -*morai* (indicated in bold).

3. *taroo-kun ni ano sakubun o naoshite-**morai**-tai-n desu kedo ii desu ka?*
I want to get you Taro to correct the composition, but would it be all right?

The verb *-morau*, and the preceding verb *naoshite* ‘to correct’, which is in the *te*-form of a verb *naosu*, are made into a verbal phrase *naoshite-morau* ‘to get it corrected.’ This verbal phrase (shown in bold) was also used in the original form of scenario 10, as follows:

*raishuu nihongo no jugyoo de kadai no sakubun o dasana-kucha ike-masen.
konshuu no shuumatsu sakubun o **naoshite-mora**-eruyoo taroo-san ni
onegai-suru-koto ni shi-mashita.*

You are going to submit your Japanese essay in a week that is part of the course requirement in your Japanese class. You get Taro to correct your essay this weekend.

The use of this auxiliary verb in the role plays could however be seen as a natural outcome or coincidence. The benefactive auxiliary verb *-morau* is often used in request sentences in Japanese. In fact, as discussed later in this study, the request forms containing this verb appeared frequently in the main study.

To avoid any possible effect, however, the benefactive auxiliary verb *-morau* was removed from this scenario as well as all the other original scenarios. It was replaced by the auxiliary adjective that expresses a speaker’s desire *hoshii* ‘want’ in the revised scenario 10, as follows. The revised text is shown in bold.

*raishuu nihongo no jugyoo de kadai no sakubun o dasana-kucha-ike-masen.
konshuu no shuumatsu taroo-san ni sakubun o **naoshite-hoshii** to omotte-i-
masu.*

You are going to submit your Japanese essay in a week that is part of the course requirement in your Japanese class. You want Taro to correct your essay this weekend.

The retrospective interview questions were also revised. Originally, there were four questions. The following two questions were removed after the pilot study.

1. Were you thinking of any alternative ways to make a request in terms of speech structures, sentence patterns, vocabulary, expressions, and speech styles? Is there anything you wanted to say that didn't say?
2. What did you pay the most attention to in the role play? Which part of your speech did you pay the most attention to? Why?

These were not asked in the main study for two reasons. First, in the pilot study, the participants often did not have much to say to respond to these questions. They answered *No*, *I don't know*, or *I don't remember* most of the time. Second, these questions tended to elicit the participants' thoughts at the time of the interview, instead of those at the time of making a request sentence. When the researcher further questioned participants after their response to clarify if it was in their mind during the role play, they often answered *No*. Example 4 shows the dialogue between the researcher and one of the participants, from the retrospective interview in the pilot study. The researcher (R) asked the participant (P) the first question regarding the role play for scenario 16.

4. R: Are there other forms or other ways that you were thinking of?

P: Well I mean I could say even less formally than that I guess like.

R: Were you thinking of a form less formal?

P: I wasn't really because I don't think he is a unless he is like a really like a you know a best friend kind of thing I wouldn't really think about

R: So you weren't thinking of any other form?

P: Not really.

In response to the researcher's question, the participant first described an alternative and more informal way of communicating the same message in the same

situation, not the other choices of sentence forms in the participant's mind during the role play. At the end of the response, the participant clearly stated that no other request forms were called to mind during the role play.

Similar responses were elicited by these questions from other participants in the pilot study. Information contained in these responses may help the study further understand the use of Japanese request strategies by Japanese speakers. However, because the examination of such information is beyond the purpose of the present study, these two questions were eliminated from the main study.

3.5 Data Analysis

3.5.1 Transcription.

For transcribing data, the study adopted the transcription conventions used in Achiba (2003). Details of phonetic and prosodic features of speech, such as pronunciation, intonation, and stress were not encoded in the transcription because they were assumed to be of little importance to the interest of the present study. Table 3 shows a list of the conventions used to transcribe the data of the present study:

Table 3

Transcription Conventions

Convention	Description
?	A question forms
. (A single period)	A short pause, approximately two seconds
... (Three periods)	A pause longer than two seconds
(text)	Clarifying information provided by the researcher
[...]	A word or segment omitted by the researcher
[R:]	An interruption by the researcher
[text]	A translation added by the researcher
text (in bold)	Text referred to in the discussion of this study

Japanese data are presented in the Roman alphabet according to the rules used in Iwasaki (2002), which were developed based on modified Hepburn romanization, as follows:

- When a syllabic *n* is followed by a vowel, they are separated by an apostrophe. For example, *shinin* means a dead person, whereas *shin'in* means psychogenesis.
- Double consonants are presented as follows: *nisshi*, *otto*, or *rappa*. A doubled *chi* is represented as *tch*, such as *matcha*, not *maccha*.
- Long vowels and diphthongs are presented by doubling two vowels, such as *aa*, *iu*, and *oi*. However, doubled vowels *ei* and *ou* are shown as *ee* and *oo*. For example, *gakusei* is presented as *gakusee*, and *tookyoo* as *tookyoo*.
- No capitalization is used in the romanization of Japanese.

- Clauses, sentences, and words are separated by spaces. A space is also given between a word and a particle.
- A hyphen is used to separate a suffix from a word. However, a verb root and verbal suffixes are not separated by hyphens unless it is necessary for the discussion. A hyphen is also used to separate constituents of a compound noun, a verbal noun from the verb *suru*, and a verb in *te* form from an auxiliary verb. A hyphen is also added between a verb or adjective and *n*, a short form of *no*, a word that makes a sentence sound explanatory.
- A gloss is provided for each word and phrase when it is necessary for the discussion.

3.5.2 Analysis of role-play data.

Segmentation of role-play data. The present study segmented each of the transcribed role-play responses into functional units, with reference to the segmentation procedure used by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989b). Their method of segmentation and coding was also used by other studies of requests that collected their data by role plays (Fukushima, 1996; Hassall, 2001; Trosborg, 1994). In their study of requests of English, French, Danish, German, Hebrew, and Russian, Blum-Kulka et al. segmented written requests into three functional units: an essential part to realize a request called *head act* and two nonessential parts to support the realization of requests, which are called *alerter* and *supportive move*. A head act is the main part of a request; an alerter is an opening unit to draw the hearer's attention; and a supportive move is a unit that precedes or follows the head act to intensify or mitigate the force of a request. Blum-Kulka et al. segmented an English request "Judith, I missed class yesterday, do you think I could borrow your notes? I promise to return them by tomorrow" (p. 17) as shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Example of Segmentation in Blum-Kulka et al. (1989b)

Unit	Category
Judith	Alerter
I missed class yesterday	Supportive moves
I promise to return them by tomorrow	
do you think I could borrow your notes?	Head act

According to Blum-Kulka et al., in this English request, an opening address term *Judith* is used to get the hearer's attention. Then, the following utterance *I missed class yesterday* gives a reason for making a request. The next utterance *I could borrow your notes* is the main part of this request, and the phrase *do you think* softens it. The last utterance *I promise to return them by tomorrow* is another supportive move in this request and makes it easier for a hearer to comply with the request.

While segmenting the role-play responses that were collected in the pilot study into these categories, the present study found different types of utterances that could not be classified into any of the categories. They were greetings, expressions of apology, gratitude, and farewell and short responses to the hearer's utterances. Greetings, such as *ohayoogozaimasu* 'Good morning' and *genki desu ka?* 'How are you today?', were included in only six role-play responses elicited from two participants in the learners' group. Expressions of apology, gratitude, farewell, such as *gomennasai* 'I am sorry', *arigatoo* 'thank you', and *shitsurei-shi-masu* 'I'm leaving', respectively, and short responses to the hearer's utterances, such as *hontoo desu ka?* 'is that right?', were found

frequently in the role-play responses of both learners and native speakers. These types of expressions could not be classified into any of the categories presented by Blum-Kulka et al., probably because the categories were originally made to classify written requests. The present study, in which data were collected by open-ended role plays, needed to create more categories to classify spoken requests.

The present study examined the functions of these utterances and decided to create two new categories to classify spoken requests in its data. These are referred to as *Opening* and *Supporting unit*. *Opening* includes greetings and other utterances to be classified as alerters by Blum-Kulka et al. Because greetings were found at the beginning of a discourse immediately after alerters, they could be considered as part of alerters that attract the hearer's attention. Another new category, *supporting unit*, accommodates expressions of apology, gratitude, and farewell; speakers' short responses following the hearer's utterances; and utterances to be categorized as supportive moves by Blum-Kulka et al. Apology may appear as an expression of politeness in Japanese requests when speakers make a request in highly imposing situations (Kabaya, Kawaguchi, and Sakamoto, 1998). In Kumai's study (1992), expressions of apology and gratitude were used to close their act of request by both learners and native speakers of Japanese. The present study assumed that these expressions, as well as those of farewell and short responses to the hearer's utterances, were necessary to complete a request discourse in Japanese. Thus, they were classified as supporting units for the realization of requests in the study.

In summary, the present study divided each request sequence into three components: opening, head act, and supporting unit. Example 5 shows a response by a

native speaker of Japanese, Tomo, in his role play for Situation 1, where he requests his hearer to lend him a guidebook.

5. *a taroo sa. ano jitsu wa sa konshuu no shuumatsu kyooto ni ikoo to omotte-iru-n da kedo. ano yasui hoteru shitte-ru? a hontoo? taroo sa konomae taroo n chi ni itta-toki ni ano kyooto no gaido-bukku mita-n da kedo sa. are chotto kashite-hoshii-n da kedo ii? a arigatoo*
(Tomo, Situation 1)

This excerpt was coded as presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Example of Coding Segments Accompanied by Gloss and Category

Category	Unit	Gloss
Opening	<i>a</i>	‘hey’
	<i>taroo sa</i>	‘Taro’
Supporting unit	<i>jitsu wa sa konshuu no</i>	‘well, this weekend I am
	<i>shuumatsu kyotoo ni ikoo</i>	thinking of going to Kyoto,
	<i>to omotte-iru-n da kedo</i>	but’
	<i>ano yasui hoteru shitte-ru?</i>	‘do you know of any cheap
		hotel?’
	<i>a hontoo?</i>	‘really?’
	<i>taroo sa konomae taroo n chi</i>	‘Taro, when I visited your
	<i>ni itta-toki ni ano kyotoo</i>	place last time, I saw a
	<i>no gaido-bukku mita-n da</i>	guidebook of Kyoto, but’
	<i>kedo sa</i>	
	<i>arigatoo</i>	‘thank you’
	<i>ii?</i>	‘is it all right with you?’
Head act	<i>are chotto kashite-hoshii-n da</i>	‘I want you to lend me that’
	<i>kedo</i>	

In some sequences, two or more utterances appeared alike in lexical and semantic forms so that they were hard to determine what type of segments they were. The following two utterances appeared within the same sequence.

6. *yamada sensee ga motte-irassharu nihon no kigyoo to iu hon o kashite-itadak-enai ka to omotte-iru-n desu keredo ii desu ka?*

I am thinking if you could lend me the book called *nihon no kigyoo* that you have, but would it be all right?

(Kana, Situation 2)

7. *jaa repooto owaru made o-kari-shite-ite mo daijoobu desu ka?*

then, is it all right if I borrow (it) until I complete the report?

(Kana, Situation 2)

Both sentences can be seen as head acts, suggesting that the speaker is asking for the hearer's act of lending her a book. In such a case, the present study chose the first sentence as a head act and the second as a supporting unit.

The description of each segment of the responses in the role play is summarized in Table 6.

Table 6

Description of Segments of Responses in Role Play

Segments	Description
Opening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alerter (an opening unit to draw the hearer's attention) • Greeting
Head act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main part of request
Supporting unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive moves (a unit that precedes or follows the head act to intensify or mitigate the force of request) • Expressions of apology, gratitude, farewell • Short responses to the hearer's utterances • The head-act like unit following the head act

These segments are arranged in a particular way in each request response, and a few ways of arrangement have been indentified as types of request discourse structures in the present study. In addition, head acts were examined separately from other segments and categorized in terms of the sentence type and strategy type. Details are discussed in the following sections.

Analysis one: Types of request discourse structures. The types of request discourse structures were determined by the order of the functional segments shown in Table 6. In previous studies, a few possible types of request discourse structures were shown (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989b; Fukushima, 1996; Izaki, 2000; Kumai, 1992). In their series of cross-cultural studies on requests and apologies, Blum-Kulka et al., suggested four possible structure types: (a) Head act only, (b) Head act + Supportive moves, (c) Supportive moves + Head act, and (d) Multiple head acts. In addition to these types, Fukushima used two more types to examine requests used by native speakers of Japanese and British English: (e) Supportive moves + Head act + Supportive moves and (f) Supportive moves only. She classified written requests into these six types and reported as follows: types (a) and (c) were used most frequently by native speakers of Japanese; types (e) and (f) were rarely used; and types (b) and (d) were not used at all.

Previous studies also showed that sequences containing head acts and supportive moves like those of types (b), (c), and (e) were often preceded by opening segments. Fukushima reported that native speakers of Japanese preferred to start their request discourse with greetings in the pre-request section. In her study of the use of spoken requests by native speakers and learners of Japanese in Japan, Kumai reported that the realization of Japanese requests began with a pre-request, which included greetings, self-

introduction, and utterances to check on a possibility for the hearer's compliance. In her study of the discourse of Japanese and French requests, Izaki reported that Japanese native speakers made announcements that they would make requests before they did, whereas French-speaking learners of Japanese did not make such announcement but provided reasons or support for making requests.

These findings from previous studies imply that Japanese speakers go through roughly three or four sequential phases to realize requests in Japanese. First, they make a kind of opening statement by greeting and declaring their intention of requesting. Second, they provide information to support the realization of requests, such as justification or reasons for making requests. Third, they realize a request by expressing what action they get the hearer to do. Finally, they add more supporting information and attempt to close a discourse by expressing farewell and gratitude. That is, a request is considered to be realized by speakers of Japanese in the following sequence: (1) opening, (2) supporting unit, (3) head act, and (4) supporting unit.

Many requests were realized in this discourse structure in the pilot study of the present study. Some of them did not have supporting statements after the head act. Based on the result of the pilot study, as well as those of previous studies, the present study created two categories to classify the types of request discourse structures. *Type one* is comprised of opening, supporting unit, head act, and supporting unit, and *type two* is comprised of opening, supporting unit, head act.

Analysis two: Sentence types of request head act. Request head acts were first classified according to the coding method used by Fukushima (1996). In her study, Fukushima divided the head acts of spoken requests collected from two groups of

speakers, English and Japanese, into three according to the sentence forms of the head acts, *imperative*, *interrogative* and *declarative*. Then, the frequencies of the use of these forms were compared between the two groups of speakers. The comparison identified two notable features about the sentence forms of requests used by speakers of British English and Japanese. First, both native speakers of Japanese and those of British English used interrogative forms most frequently. Fukushima speculated that these forms were preferred most because they were considered more indirect than the other forms, by giving the hearer an option to say no. Fukushima also noted that imperative forms of head acts were used relatively frequently by Japanese native speakers. The present study thus assumes that request head acts used by the Japanese-speaking participants of the present study can be classified into imperative, interrogative and declarative.

The following discussion explains each sentence type of request head acts with examples.

Imperative. In the present study, sentences that end with a verb in the imperative form (IMP) are categorized as imperative sentences. Imperative forms of Japanese verbs vary according to their conjugation types, but they almost always end with one of the following sounds, *-i*, *-e*, and *-ro*, as shown in Examples 8, 9, and 10. PTCL stands for particle.

8. *kotchi e koi*
 here PTCL come: IMP
 Come here
9. *hon o kase*
 book PTCL lend: IMP
 Lend me a book
10. *miro*
 look: IMP
 Look

These sentences are assumed to be used very little or never in the realization of requests, as they are considered as strong commands.

-nasai, an imperative form of the verb *-nasaru* ‘do’ also makes a sentence imperative by being added to the stem of a verb in *masu* form. With this verb *-nasai*, the sentences in Examples 8, 9, and 10 are formed into slightly polite commands as follows:

11. *kotchi e ki-nasai*
 here PTCL come.do: IMP
 Come here
12. *hon o kashi-nasai*
 book PTCL lend.do: IMP
 Lend me a book
13. *mi-nasai*
 look.do: IMP
 Look

These commands are more polite than Examples 8, 9, and 10; yet, they are rarely considered as requests. These types of imperative sentences are used when people have someone of a lower status take action, such as when a mother tells her son to come close to her.

An imperative sentence that is possibly used as a request is one with *-kudasai*, an imperative form of a benefactive verb *-kudasaru* ‘give (me)’. This type of sentence is made with a verb in *te* form followed by *-kudasai* and used as a polite command or direction. The imperative sentence in Example 12 is changed into a polite command as in Example 14.

14. *hon o kashite-kudasai*
 book PTCL lend.give: IMP
 Please lend me a book

It can be shortened and used in a rather casual situation as shown in Examples 15 and 16.

15. *hon (o) kashite*
book PTCL lend
Lend me a book
16. *hon (o) kashite-kure*
book PTCL lend.give: IMP
Lend me a book

Interrogative. In Japanese, requests in interrogative forms are constructed by adding a particle *ka* (Example 17) or a combined particle *kana* (Example 18) to the end of the sentence. They are also made without any of these particles (Example 19). In speech, requests in these forms end with a rising intonation.

17. *hon o kashite-kure-masen ka?*
book PTCL lend.give: POLITE NEGATIVE PTCL
Can you lend me a book?
18. *hon o kashite-kure-nai kana?*
book PTCL lend.give: PLAIN NEGATIVE PTCL
Can you lend me a book, perhaps?
19. *hon o kashite-kureru?*
book PTCL lend.give: PLAIN
Can you lend me a book?

Declarative. Requests in declarative forms are often composed of a predicate *hoshii* ‘want’ attached to a verb. The predicate is followed by a sentence ending phrase (SEPH) *n-da* (Example 20 and 21). Some predicates end with a “clause combining form” (Iwasaki, 2002, pp.264-265), such as the particle *kedo* (Example 21) and a verb in *te*-form *omotte* ‘to think’ (Example 22), to soften the assertive force.

20. *hon o kashite-hoshii-n-da*
book PTCL lend.want.SEPH
I want you to lend me a book
21. *hon o kashite-hoshii-n-da kedo*
book PTCL lend.want.SEPH PTCL
I want you to lend me a book

22. *hon o kashite-hoshii na to omotte*
 book PTCL lend.want PTCL I think that
 I thought you could lend me a book

Analysis three: Strategy types of request head act. The present study also classified request head acts into groups according to their strategy types. To classify them, the present study first examined whether to use one of the existing coding methods developed by previous studies or to create an original coding scheme. In the CCSARP studies (Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989b), head acts were classified in terms of the directness and explicitness of an intended action presented in their predicates. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain categorized head acts into three types by degree of directness: *direct*, *conventionally indirect* and *non-conventionally indirect*. These levels of directness and indirectness were originally introduced by Searle (1975). A *direct* request is realized in a syntactic form where a requested action is clearly expressed, such as an imperative form in English. In contrast, an *indirect* request is realized in a conventional form where more than two intended meanings can be interpreted, such as questions with modals, *could you* or *will you*. Further classification of indirect requests determined two types of indirect requests: *conventionally indirect* requests, which are type of requests that are always interpreted as requests regardless of their literal meanings, and *non-conventionally indirect* requests, which are types of requests that are more indirect than conventionally indirect requests, implicitly referring to the intended action in a given context. Non-conventionally indirect requests are called *hints* in some studies (Trosborg, 1994; Weizman, 1993). They can be realized in any types of sentences, expressing no or an unclear intention of a speaker's desired action. Blum-Kulka et al. further categorized requests into nine different strategies according to

the level of indirectness. According to this scheme, request strategies were grouped into five direct types, two conventionally indirect types, and two nonconventionally indirect types as shown in Table 7:

Table 7

Nine Strategy Types Used in Blum-Kulka et al. (1989b)

Level of directness	Strategy type	Example
Direct	• Mood derivable	Lend me a book
	• Performatives	I am asking to lend me a book
	• Hedged performatives	I would like to ask you to lend me a book
	• Obligation statements	You'll have to lend me a book
	• Want statements	I wish you'd lend me a book
Conventionally indirect	• Suggestory formulae	How about lending me a book?
	• Query preparatory	Could you lend me a book?
Nonconventionally indirect	• Strong hints	I'm looking for a book to read
	• Mild hints	I like reading

Blum-Kulka et al. originally developed this coding scheme to classify written requests and compare the patterns of request strategies across many different languages.

Requests elicited from native speakers of English, French, Danish, German, and Hebrew, and learners of English, German, and Hebrew were categorized according to this scheme. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), who made the base of this nine-category scheme, stated that this coding system could be used to classify requests of any languages. Slightly modified forms of this scheme were used in the studies that examined requests of other languages, such as Korean (Byon, 2004), Spanish (Félix-Brasdefer, 2007), Indonesian (Hassall, 1999), and Japanese (Fukushima, 1996).

The present study attempted to use this coding scheme to classify its data of Japanese requests. It was straightforward to classify them into three groups: direct, conventionally indirect, and hint or non-conventionally indirect requests. However, the present study found a challenge in using the same scheme to further classify Japanese requests into nine sub-strategies according to the indirectness of utterances. Japanese utterances can be classified into these categories, but they are not necessarily used as requests in natural settings of requesting. For example, an utterance *hon o kashite-kureru-yoo onegai-shite-imasu* ‘I am asking you to lend me a book’ can be coded as performative. However, it sounds very unnatural as a spoken request in Japanese. Wierzbicka (2003) argued that different languages have their own ways of realizing speech acts; and thus the indirectness of an utterance cannot be measured simply by its grammatical form in all languages as can be done in English.

The present study then decided to create an original coding scheme by modifying the classification scheme used by Takahashi (1987), which conducted a comparative study of request strategies used by Japanese speakers and those used by English speakers. In her study, Takahashi grouped the head acts, according to directness, into three groups:

direct, explicitly indirect, and implicitly indirect. Next, the explicitly and implicitly indirect requests were further classified, according to the level of the hearer's freedom in responding to the speaker's request.

Takahashi explained that a request is considered direct if it does not give a hearer a choice to comply or not to comply with it, and indirect if it does. For example, a request made in an imperative sentence, such as *lend me a book* is direct. On the contrary, the same request formed in a question, such as *can you lend me a book*, is indirect. Two levels of indirect requests, *explicit* and *implicit*, are determined according to the degree of explicitness in the meaning of a requested action. An indirect request is described as implicit if an expected action of the hearer's is implicitly mentioned, but explicit if it is explicitly expressed. For example, a request *I need to borrow a book* is implicitly indirect, less explicitly describing a speaker's wish that someone will lend the speaker a book, whereas a request *I want you to lend me a book* is explicitly indirect, explicitly expressing the speaker's wish. The present study used this three-level classification scheme of Takahashi's, and then further classified explicitly indirect requests into four subcategories. Among the subcategories, three were taken from Takahashi's study and one was developed by the present study and added to accommodate the requests elicited for the study. The following discussion presents all the categories with descriptions, examples, and translations of the examples.

Direct. A Japanese request is viewed as direct when a requested action is clearly expressed in an imperative sentence with a verb in *te*-form with a verbal ending *-kudasai*, as shown previously in Example 14. In addition, imperative sentences without the verbal

ending (Example 15) or a shortened verbal ending (Example 16) can be used in a rather casual situation.

In Takahashi's study, a request in a declarative sentence with a verb in *te*-form with a benefactive auxiliary verb *-morau* 'receive' was also included. The auxiliary verb may appear in a polite form (POL) *-morai-masu*, as shown in Example 23.

23. *kotchi e kite-morai-masu*
 here PTCL come.receive:POL
 I will have you come here.

The verbal ending *-morai-masu* can be replaced by an honorific form *-itadaki-masu* or a plain form *-morau*. In Takahashi's study, any of these direct requests were however used by native speakers of Japanese.

Explicitly indirect. An indirect request is *explicit* when it is interpreted clearly as a request of a desired action by the hearer. In the present study, explicit indirect requests were further classified into four subcategories, according to the speaker's intention expressed in the form and the syntactic structure of the form. Embedded structures were not considered to determine types of structure. The following discussion explains each subcategory of explicitly indirect requests with examples provided with English translations.

Stating a speaker's desire (SPD). This utterance expresses a speaker's wish that the hearer will perform an action requested by the speaker. The most frequently used English equivalents are *I want you to do* or *I would like you to do*. In Japanese, the utterances in these patterns contain a clause comprised of a verb of the requested action in *te*-form, attached by an auxiliary adjective *-hoshii* 'want' (Example 24), or followed by a benefactive auxiliary verb *-morau* and an auxiliary adjective *-tai* 'want to do' (Example

25). The clause in Example 25 can be embedded, followed by *-to omou* ‘I think that,’ as seen in Example 26. The utterance often ends with *-n desu* or *-n da* to add more explanatory force, followed by the particle *-kedo*, a spoken form of *keredomo*, to soften the tone of the utterance.

24. *kashite-hoshii-n desu kedo*
 lend.want.SEPH: POL PTCL
 I want you to lend (it), but
25. *kashiite-morai-tai-n da kedo*
 lend.receive.want to do:SEPH PTCL
 I would like you to lend (it)
26. *kashiite-morai-tai to omou-n da kedo*
 lend.receive.want to do I think that.SEPH PTCL
 I am thinking I would like you to lend (it)

Asking a hearer's desire (HRD). This utterance is a question asking if a hearer wishes to perform an action requested by the speaker. The most frequently used English equivalents are *will you* or *would you please*. The utterance contains a clause comprised of a compound verb, *-te-kureru* or *-te-morau*, or its negative form (NEG), *-te-kure-nai* (Example 27) or *-te-morae-nai* (Example 28). This type of compound verb is made with a verb in *te*-form, implying the requested action, and a benefactive auxiliary verb *-kureru* or *-morau*. These auxiliary verbs are often used in honorific forms (HON), *-kudasaru* and *-itadaku* respectively, and made into a compound verb *-te-kudasaru* and *-te-itadaku* (Example 29), as the plain forms are done. Japanese questions are marked by particles *kana* or *ka* as shown in Examples 27 and 29. Without these particles, a sentence can be used as a question with a rising intonation (Example 28).

27. *kashite-kure-nai kana?*
 lend.give:NEG PTCL
 will you please lend (it)?

28. *kashite-morae-nai?*

lend.receive:NEG
will you lend (it)?

29. *kashite-itadake-nai deshoo ka?*

lend.receive:HON:NEG probably PTCL
would you please lend (it)?

Stating a speaker's expectation of a hearer's action in hypothetical situations

(EHA). This utterance expresses how the speaker would feel if an action requested by the speaker is performed by the hearer. The most frequently used English equivalents are *I would be if* or *it would be if*. A Japanese statement in this pattern contains a clause comprised of a verb of a requested action attached by the particle *tara*. In requests, the clause is often followed by adjectives, such as *ii* 'good' or *ureshii* 'happy.' It can also be embedded with *-to omou*, as shown in Example 30. PRG stands for progressive aspect.

30. *kashite-itadake tara ii na to omotte-iru-n desu kedo*
lend.receive:HON PTCL good PTCL I think that:PRG:SEPH:POL PTCL
I am thinking it would be great if you could lend (it)

Asking a hearer's permission for a desired action to be realized (PMT). This is an original category developed by the present study. This type of utterance is a question asking if the hearer allows a desired action to be performed. If permission is granted, the requested action will be performed by the hearer. The most frequently used English equivalents are those that begin with *Is it all right if I?* A Japanese utterance in this type contains a clause comprised of a verb, implying the requested action in *te*-form. It is then attached by the particle *mo* and followed by adjectives, such as *ii* (Example 31), *daijoobuna* 'all right', and *yoroshii*, a polite form of *ii*.

31. *kashite-itadaite mo ii desu ka?*
 lend.receive:HON PTCL good:POL PTCL
 would it be all right if you lend (it)?

Implicitly indirect. An implicitly indirect request is an indirect request that does not refer to a desired action explicitly or an utterance that is interpreted as other than a request. It includes, for example, a question to ask for a hearer's permission to borrow a book (Example 32) or a statement to describe the speaker's wish to borrow a book (Example 33).

32. *hon o karite mo ii desu ka?*
 book PTCL borrow PTCL good:POL PTCL
 May I borrow a book?

33. *hon o kari-tai-n desu*
 book PTCL borrow.want to do:SEPH:POL
 I want to borrow a book

In these utterances, the speaker's primary intentions might be recognized easily as requests so that they could be classified as explicitly indirect requests. However, the verb *kariru* 'to borrow' refers to the action by the speaker. It can be associated with the action by the hearer only indirectly, so they are thus classified into this category.

3.5.3 Analysis of verbal report data.

Segmentation of verbal report data. The verbal report data are comprised of 11 reports elicited from all the participants in the retrospective interviews. Each of these reports contains participant's isolated responses to the interview questions about each role play.

From the responses, the present study extracted the statements which described participants' intentions or thoughts during the role plays, and analyzed them for patterns of the participants' cognitive processes.

The participants' statements of their intentions were extracted from the participants' responses by two approaches. First, the present study examined the content of each statement carefully and removed the statements that did not describe their thoughts during the role plays, such as their assessments about the role-play performance and descriptions and beliefs of their general strategies for making requests. Such statements provided information irrelevant to the purpose of the present study and thus were not examined in the present study.

Another way to extract the participants' statements of their intentions from their interview response is identifying them through key words. According to Ericsson and Simon (1984), the statements of intention and goals can be isolated from the other types of statements, according to the types of verbs, such as *will*, *shall*, *must*, and *have to* in English. In addition to these verbs, the present study examined the responses for synonyms of the verb *intend* to identify as many statements of intention as possible. They are *plan*, *think*, *try* and *want* (*Thesaurus.com* Web site, n.d.). Statements of intention including these verbs, elicited by the present study, are shown in Examples 34 and 35.

34. I **was thinking** what was easy way to say "help me with my homework.
(Justin, Situation 3)

35. But I didn't **want to be** too direct.
(Alissa, Situation 15)

Example 34 shows that the speaker's use of expression *I was thinking* indicates that he was describing his thought at the time of his role play, not at the time of the interview, and his attempt to form a sentence in a simple way. Similarly, in Example 35, the speaker expressed her wish to avoid being direct at the time of her role play, by using the expression *I didn't want*.

The Japanese expressions that are used in statements to describe speaker's intention are the noun *tsumori* 'intention or purpose,' verbal phrases, *-yoo to omou* or *-yoo to kangaeru* 'to think of doing,' and a clause ending *-yooni suru* 'make sure that.' The statements including these expressions are shown in Examples 36 and 37, which are excerpts from the data:

36. *wazato, kaete, baito tte iwanai yoo ni shi-mashita*
 Intentionally, I changed (the expression) and **made sure that I do not say** it.
 (Kana, Situation 2)
37. *Nande shitte-iru no, de, kekkyoku gaido-bukku tte iu fuu ni motte-ikoo ka to omotte-ita*
 Why I know (about his guidebook), and then (this is how I have got to know about his) guidebook. This is how **I was thinking** of doing
 (Tomo, Situation 1)

In Example 36, the speaker used *iwanai yooni shi-mashita* 'made sure that I do not say' to describe her intention to avoid saying *baito* 'part-time job', at the time of her role play. Likewise, in Example 37, the speaker's use of *omotte-ita* 'I was thinking' shows that he was expressing his cognitive process of performing one of his role plays and also explaining how he was planning to develop a discourse in his request.

Coding categories of speakers' intentions. Each statement of intention was examined for its meaning and coded according to categories. In the previous studies, no categories and patterns have been identified in order to classify the verbal reports regarding the request strategies. Based on the results of the previous studies of requests, the present study assumed that the speakers of different languages intentionally attempt to mitigate their requests or avoid delivering their meanings directly in making requests; and thus, in the verbal reports, it may be possible to elicit information about their thoughts related to their politeness strategies and those related to other strategies.

The present study divided the analysis of the verbal report data into two stages. In the first stage, three categories were used to code the statements of intention: intended politeness strategies, other intended strategies, and both. If any categories and patterns emerged from the coded statements, the present study planned to conduct the second analysis: examine the patterns and code the statements into the derived categories.

The definition of linguistic politeness varies between the studies of politeness (Pizziconi, 2006). In addition, politeness strategies take different forms and are used differently from one culture to another according to rules (Holmes, 2006). A way of expressing politeness in one culture may not always be viewed as polite or appropriate in another culture, as has been seen in Wierzbicka's Polish example of an imperative request, in Section 2.2. The next subsections illustrate the previous discussions on the meaning of linguistic politeness and outline the properties of politeness strategies and those of other strategies for the present study, by showing examples of coding.

Politeness strategy. To identify the intention of using politeness strategies in the participants' verbal reports, the present study needs to define politeness strategies in Japanese. However, in Japanese context, to date, no studies have reached an unambiguous definition of politeness and sets of rules to describe the use of politeness strategies. As has been reviewed in Section 2.4, the notion of politeness can be explained according to a universal theory of politeness, such as one formulated by Brown and Levinson (1987). However, such a theory may not account for all culturally specific actions of politeness.

The researcher included eight politeness strategies that are relevant to the realization of requests in the present study. Those eight strategies are based on the lists of

politeness strategies in Japanese contexts, which were proposed by Minami (1974) and Mizutani and Mizutani (1988). In his analysis of honorifics, Minami listed a variety of linguistic and non-linguistic politeness strategies that are used by speakers of Japanese. In addition, he showed that linguistic politeness is marked not only by lexical and syntactic means, such as by the use of *keigo* ‘honorific language’ or other verbal expressions, but also by means of other linguistic aspects, such as rhetorical, phonological, and orthographical means. A complete list of the strategies and details about the strategies can be obtained in Minami (1974, p.221-234). The following five politeness strategies from his list are considered to be relevant to the present study:

- use of *keigo*
- use of other lexical and phrasal expressions to mark politeness
- appropriate length of sentences
- use of complete sentences
- use of contents and topics appropriate to discourse

In their study of Japanese politeness, Mizutani and Mizutani illustrated a number of politeness strategies. The following three strategies are assumed to be relevant to the present study:

- speaking indirectly by avoiding describing things exactly or by developing a discourse indirectly
- expressing apology and gratitude; and
- making explanations brief

One of these politeness strategies was identified in a response by a participant of the present study, as shown in Example 38. In this excerpt, the speaker described his

politeness strategy to avoid sounding urgent and express his intention indirectly, which was suggested by Mizutani and Mizutani.

38. *sakki mo tsukatta ga dekireba hayaku motte-kite hoshii ga sore o aite ni tsutae-takunai futan o kanji-sase-takunai kara jizen ni motte-ki-yasui-yooni ashita made de ii kedo motte-kite-kureru to iu ii-kata o shi-mashita.*

As I said before, I didn't want to express that I want her to bring it as soon as possible and I don't want to impose. I said "can you bring it back? But tomorrow is OK" so that she will feel comfortable bring in the book.
(Hiro, Situation 7)

This response shows that the speaker believed that requesting to bring his book tomorrow was too sudden and impolite; thus, the speaker was trying to use expressions that sound less imposing. Responses of the retrospective interview like this will be coded as the speaker's intention of using a *politeness strategy*.

Other strategies. A segment was coded as *other strategies* if it contained a statement suggesting the speakers' intention other than the use of politeness, as shown in Example 39, an expert taken from the data. The speaker described his attempt to use the words in the scenario and explain the reasons for his request.

39. *chantto sukuriputo ni kaite-aru tango o ioo to shita-n desu yo yamada sensee ni hanashite-hoshii koto o ioo to shita-n desu kedo kore (kokusai-kooryuu saakuru no kaigoo) mo ire-nai to wakaranai to omotte.*

I was trying to use the words in the script and trying to tell Ms. Yamada what I want her to talk about, but I thought I need to include this (a meeting of the international friendship club); otherwise she would not understand.
(Luke, Situation 13)

This response does not contain the information about his politeness strategy. The speaker simply described his intention of providing necessary information to his hearer.

Some of the speakers' responses contained more than one statement of intention. The two excerpts shown in Examples 40 and 41 are taken from a single response in the data. In the first part of the response (Example 40), the speaker described her attempt to

avoid explaining that she had to cancel her appointment with the teacher because of her part-time job. She does not believe that having to work is an appropriate reason to give her teacher; therefore, the category intended polite strategies fits this excerpt.

40. *shaberu toki ni kangaete-ita no wa sensee ni chotto baito de ikenai tte iu no wa ie-nai na to omotte. [R: dooshite desu ka?] nanka tomodachi dattara baito tte sonnani ieru-n desu kedo [...] nanka baito ga yuusen mitaini sensee ni kikoetara nanka chotto imeeji waruina to omotte*

what I was thinking is that I could not say that I cannot go because I have to go to work. [R: Why?] somehow, if she were my friend, I could say I have to work (so I cannot go), but if I give the teacher the impression that I prioritize my part-time job, it will make me look a little bad.

(Kana, Situation 4)

In the second part of the response (Example 41), however, the speaker described her attempt to use the phrase she was thinking of using before the role play. Thus, the category other intended strategies fits this excerpt, too.

41. *sensee dooshitemo nukerare-nai yooji ga haitchatte ittara sooshitara sensee ga kitto “a jaa kyoo wa muri ne” tte iu to omotte de kawari ni hanasu mae ni kawari ni ashita no ofisu awaa no jikan te iu no o kangaete-ita node sore o sonomama iimashita*

I thought if I say, “sensee I’ve got a pressing engagement,” the teacher will surely say “then it’s not possible for you to meet me.” then, before I spoke, I was thinking of saying tomorrow’s office hour instead, so I said it.

(Kana, Situation 4)

If both types of statements are included in a response as shown in Examples 40 and 41, such a response was coded as *politeness and other strategies*.

Therefore, three coding categories were used: *politeness strategies* (Polite), *other strategies* (Other), and *politeness and others strategies* (Both).

3.5.4 Statistical analyses

Statistical analyses were conducted to describe the realization of requests by two groups of Japanese speakers, learners and native, and examine the difference between the two groups. Frequencies were computed for the occurrence of the types of discourse

structures, types of request sentences, types of request strategies, and types of statements of intention in verbal reports. The analyses were carried out for each group of participants. The Chi square tests were conducted by using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) to obtain *p*-values. They helped to determine whether the frequencies of the categories were different between the groups.

4 Results

A total of 176 request utterances were elicited from the participants. They were analyzed for the types of request discourse structures, types of head act sentences, and types of request strategies.

In addition, a total of 11 interview responses were collected. The statements that contain speaker's intention were extracted for analysis and divided into categories.

Results of analyses are shown in tables.

4.1 Structure of Request Discourse

Data were examined for similarities and differences in the use of request discourse structures between the group of the learners of Japanese and that of the native speakers of Japanese. Request discourse structures were first classified as Type 1 or Type 2. Type 1 request discourse structure is comprised of opening, supporting unit, head act, and supporting unit. Type 2 request discourse structure is comprised of opening, supporting unit, and head act. The frequencies of each type of request discourse structure for both groups are shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Frequencies of Request Discourse Structure Types

Group	Structure Type		Total
	Type 1	Type 2	
Learner	76	4	80
Native speaker	93	3	96

Note. Type 1 structure is comprised of opening (OP), supporting unit (SU), head act (HA), and SU; and Type 2 structure is comprised of OP, SU, and HA.

Eighty request discourses were elicited from the learners of Japanese. Most of them were classified as Type 1 request discourse structure ($n = 76$), and only a few were classified as Type 2 request discourse structure ($n = 4$).

Ninety-six request discourses were elicited from the native speakers of Japanese. Results were similar to those of the learners. The majority of the native speakers' request discourses were categorized as Type 1 request discourse structure ($n = 93$), and a very few were categorized as Type 2 request discourse structure ($n = 3$).

No significant difference was found between the group of learners of Japanese and that of native speakers of Japanese in the frequency of using the types of discourse structure, $\chi^2(1, N = 176) = .402, p = .526$.

4.2 Sentence Type of Request Head Acts

A request head acts, which is the main part that realizes a request, was extracted from each request utterance. A total of 176 request head acts were obtained. The request head acts were classified according to the following sentence types: imperative, interrogative, and declarative. The frequencies of request head act sentence types for the

group of the learners of Japanese and that of the native speakers of Japanese are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

Frequencies of Request Head Act Sentence Types

Group		Head Act Sentence Type			Total
		Declarative	Imperative	Interrogative	
Learner	<i>n</i>	22	1	57	80
	%	27.5	1.25	71.25	100
Native Speaker	<i>n</i>	62	0	34	96
	%	64.58	0	35.42	100

The sentence types of the most head acts used in this study were declarative or interrogative. Of 80 request head acts used by learners of Japanese, 57 were classified as interrogative (71.25%), and 22 were classified as declarative (27.5%). Only one request head act was classified as imperative. Results were slightly different for the native speakers' group. Of 96 request head acts, 62 were categorized as declarative (64.58%), and 34 were categorized as interrogative (35.42%). No head act was categorized as imperative.

A significant difference was found between the groups in the frequency of using the types of request sentences, $\chi^2(2, N = 176) = 24.610, p = .000$. Interrogative sentences ($n = 58, 72.5\%$) were most frequently used by learners, whereas declarative sentences ($n = 62, 64.58\%$) were most frequently used by native speakers.

4.3 Request Strategy Type

Request head acts were also classified in terms of the type of request strategies. They were classified largely into three strategy types, according to the degree of directness: direct, explicitly direct, and implicitly indirect. The frequencies of these request strategy types for the group of learners of Japanese and that of native speakers of Japanese are as shown in Table 10.

Table 10

Frequencies of Request Strategy Types

Group		Strategy Type			Total
		Direct	Explicitly Indirect	Implicitly Indirect	
Learner	<i>n</i>	1	67	12	80
	%	1.25	83.75	15	100
Native Speaker	<i>n</i>	1	84	11	96
	%	1.04	87.5	11.46	100

Of 80 request head acts used by learners of Japanese, 67 were classified as explicitly indirect requests (83.75%), 12 were classified as implicitly indirect requests (15%), and only one was classified as a direct request (1.25%).

Of 96 request head acts elicited by native speakers of Japanese, 84 were categorized as explicitly indirect requests (87.5%), 11 were classified as implicitly indirect requests (11.46%), and one was categorized as direct requests (1.04%).

No significant difference was found between the group of learners of Japanese and that of native speakers of Japanese in the frequency of using the types of request strategies, in terms of directness, $\chi^2 (2, N = 176) = .507, p = .776$.

Explicitly indirect request head acts were further categorized into four types, according to the degree of explicitness in the meaning of a requested action: SPD (Stating a speaker's desire), HRD (Asking a hearer's desire), EHA (Stating a speaker's expectation of a hearer's action in hypothetical situations), and PMT (Asking a hearer's permission for a desired action to be realized). The frequencies of these request strategy types for the group of learners of Japanese and that of native speakers of Japanese are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Frequencies of Explicitly Indirect Request Strategy Types

Group		Explicitly Indirect Strategy Type				Total
		SPD	HRD	EHA	PMT	
Learner	<i>n</i>	19	39	1	8	67
	%	28.35	58.20	1.49	11.94	100
Native Speaker	<i>n</i>	50	14	7	13	84
	%	59.52	16.67	8.33	15.48	100

Note. Abbreviations in the table are as follows: SPD (Stating a speaker's desire), HRD (Asking a hearer's desire), EHA (Stating a speaker's expectation of a hearer's action in hypothetical situations), and PMT (Asking a hearer's permission for a desired action to be realized).

Among the explicitly indirect requests used by learners, the HRD was used the most ($n = 39, 58.2\%$). The rest were categorized as SPD ($n = 19, 28.35\%$), PMT ($n = 8,$

11.94%), and EHA ($n = 1$, 1.49%). Among the explicitly indirect requests used by native speakers, the SPD was used the most ($n = 50$, 59.52%). The rest were classified as HRD ($n = 14$, 16.67%), PMT ($n = 13$, 15.48%), and EHA ($n = 7$, 8.33%).

A significant difference was found between the learner group and the native speaker group in the frequency of using the types of explicitly indirect request strategy, $\chi^2(3, N = 151) = 29.875, p = .000$. Overall, the HRD strategy was most frequently used by learners ($n = 39$, 58.2%), whereas the SPD strategy was most frequently used by native speakers ($n = 50$, 59.52%). A variation was also found in the range of strategy types. The learners rarely used the strategy EHA; in contrast, the native speakers used it more often.

4.4 Statements of Intention in Verbal Report

There were 54 segments of verbal reports elicited from the learners of Japanese, and there were 72 elicited from the native speakers of Japanese. From these segments, statements of intention were extracted. Forty of those segments elicited from the learners contained statements of intention, as were 53 of those elicited from the native speakers. These statements of intention were classified into three groups: statements of intention to use *politeness strategies* (Politeness), those to use *other strategies* (Other), and those to use *politeness and other strategies* (Both). Frequencies of each type of statements are shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Frequencies of Strategy Types in Statement of Intention

Group		Types of Strategy			Total
		Politeness	Other	Both	
Learner	<i>n</i>	19	19	2	40
	%	47.5	47.5	5	100
Native Speaker	<i>n</i>	8	26	19	53
	%	15.1	49.1	35.8	100

Note. Politeness stands as *politeness strategies*; Other stands as *other strategies*; and Both stands as *politeness and other strategies*.

For learners, the most frequently used types of strategies in the statements of intentions were *politeness and other strategies* ($n = 19, 47.5\%$). For native speakers, they were *other strategies* ($n = 26, 49.1\%$), which were more frequently than *politeness strategies* ($n = 8, 15.1\%$). The statements of intentions including *politeness and other strategies* were provided by learners ($n = 2, 5\%$) much less frequently than by native speakers ($n = 19, 35.8\%$).

5 Discussion

This chapter discusses the findings of the present study. The results of the study have been analyzed to answer the initial four research questions that were presented in Chapter 2. The implications of these results will then be discussed.

5.1 Types of Discourse Structure

The following discussion is to answer the first question of the present study: *What discourse structures do learners and native speakers of Japanese use to realize a request?*

Both the learners and native speakers in the present study realized requests by using only one type of discourse structure that was composed of multiple supporting units. Such requests begin with an opening, followed by supporting units, a head act, and more supporting units. Only a few of their requests were realized in the type of discourse structure that was composed of supporting units before a head act but none were realized after a head act. No significant difference was observed between the group of learners of Japanese and that of native speakers of Japanese in the frequency of using the types of discourse structure.

The use of supporting units, particularly before a head act, by the speakers of Japanese in their requests in the present study is consistent with the finding in Tsuchida (2003). This result implies that in various request situations, both learners and native speakers of Japanese use statements to support a request before making a request. However, unlike Tsuchida's study, the present study identified frequent use of supporting units before as well as after a head act in both the learners and native speakers.

The difference in the results between the previous study and present study might be due to the nature of the role-play scenarios used to elicit requests. Kabaya et al. (1998) argued that the discourse structure of request is determined according to the degrees of the influence of two elements in polite speech: “*aite reberu* [the level of the hearer] and *yooken reberu* [the level of the matter]” (pp. 136-142). The level of the hearer refers to the degree of the relationship between the speaker and hearer in terms of the closeness and social status, whereas the level of the matter corresponds to the degree of the hearer’s responsibility in complying with the request. According to Kabaya et al., when both the level of the hearer and the level of the matter are low, the discourse structure is simply comprised of an opening and request sentence. In contrast, when the levels of both variables are high, the discourse structure is prolonged with more sequences, such as explanations and apologies, before a request sentence. Kabaya et al. explained that developing the discourse of requests this way is one of the ways to express politeness without using explicit polite expressions. The following excerpt is a sequence where Cary, a learner of Japanese, asks her friend to correct her composition.

42. *taro-kun*

Taro

konshuu no shuumatsu nani ka yotee aru?

Do you have any plans this weekend?

watashi ano jituwa nihongo no jyugyoo de kadai no sakubun o dasa-nakute wa ikenai-n da

Well, I have to submit my composition that is an assignment in my Japanese class.

de ano shuumatsu ni sakubun o naoshite-morai-tai-n desu kedo morai-tai-n da kedo

This weekend, I wonder if you can correct it

ano ii kana?
Well, is that all right?

jaa onegai-suru yo
Please.
(Cary, Situation 10)

In Example 42, after opening a conversation in line 1, she asked if the hearer was available on the weekend in line 2 and explained her situation that she was given an assignment in her Japanese class in line 3. Finally, the speaker asked the hearer for help with the assignment in line 4. Compared to the discourse of the request to a friend, as shown in Example 42, that of the request to a teacher is slightly longer. The following excerpt from the present study is a sequence where the same speaker asks her teacher to become a judge at the speech contest that she is organizing.

43. *sumimasen*
Excuse me

sensee wa raishuu no doyoobi nanika yotee arimasu ka?
Ms. Yamada, next Saturday, do you have any plans?

ano desu ne watashi daigaku de nihongo-speech-contesuto ga atte
Well, I, Japanese speech contest will be held at the university.

de watashi wa sore no unee-iin desu
I am one of the organizers.

de ano tanonde-ita shinsain no hitori ga korare-naku-natchatta-n de
One of the judges can not come.

moshi yoroshik-ereba
If it is all right with you

yamada sensee shinsain ni natte hoshii to omotte-iru-n desu ga
I am thinking, I want you Ms. Yamada to become a judge.
(Cary, Situation 15)

Compared to the excerpt in Example 42, Cary had more explanations and other statements to support her request between lines 2 and 6 before uttering a request sentence in line 7. It is possible that the speaker perceived a stronger influence of the hearer and matter so that she made a request with more utterances to sound more polite in this role play.

Most the role-play responses by both learners and native speakers had the discourse structures similar to those shown in Examples 42 and 43. It is possible that across the scenarios, both groups of speakers equally perceived the levels of the situational variables and attempted to develop the request discourse in the same way to express politeness.

Another possible explanation for the result is that the length of the written scenarios of the role plays may have motivated the speakers to develop a relatively long discourse in the same way. Because each written scenario included precise explanations and reasons for a request, the speakers may have attempted to include all the information of the scenario in their role-play responses.

More examinations are needed on the correlation between the various situational variables and the structures of request discourse by both learners and native speakers of Japanese.

5.2 Types of Sentence

The following discussion answers the second question of the present study: *What types of sentences do learners and native speakers of Japanese use to realize a request?*

Both learners and native speakers used interrogative or declarative sentences to realize requests, but with different frequency. The learners used interrogative sentences

more frequently than declarative sentences, whereas the native speakers used declarative sentence more frequently than interrogative sentences. An imperative sentence was chosen only once by one of the learners.

Such differences in the choice of sentence type were clearly shown in Situation 9 and 10 where speakers ask hearers to correct a composition. In Situation 9, a request to a teacher, all the native speakers used declarative sentences. One of their requests is shown in Example 44:

44. *sore o chotto yamada sensee ni*
 that PTCL little Yamada teacher PTCL
mite-itadakitai-n desu keredomo
 look.receive.want to do:SEPH:POL PTCL
 I would like Ms. Yamada to see it.
 (Kana, Situation 9)

On the contrary, all but one of the learners used interrogative sentences in the same request situation. One of their requests is shown in Example 45:

45. *naoshite-itadak-emasen ka?*
 correct.receive: POLITE: NEGATIVE PTCL
 Could you correct?
 (Nina, Situation 9)

The frequent use of requests in the forms of interrogative sentences is consistent with the previous studies of the use of requests by native speakers of other languages, such as Australian English, French, Hebrew, and Argentinean Spanish (Blum-Kulka, 1989); Indonesian (Hassall, 1999); and French and Dutch (Van Mulken, 1996), and by learners of other languages, such as American learners of Korean (Byon, 2004); Dutch learners of Spanish (le Pair, 1996); Japanese learners of English (Taguchi, 2006); and Danish learners of English (Trosborg, 1994). Like the speakers in these studies, the learners in the present study used requests in the forms of questions most frequently. This

implies that they share a similar strategy to choose a sentence form with speakers of these languages.

However, the results for the native speakers of Japanese in this study do not correlate with any of these previous study results. This implies that native speakers of Japanese prefer declarative forms to interrogative forms in their realization of requests. In fact, Kumai (1992) pointed out the frequent use of requests in declarative forms by native speakers of Japanese.

A possible explanation for such differences between the learners and native speakers is that the learners in this study may have a lack knowledge or skills necessary to request indirectly and politely using declarative sentences; and thus produced interrogative requests more frequently than declarative requests. This view will be elaborated by describing the difference between the requests in interrogative and declarative forms in the present study.

In the present study, most interrogative requests were realized with the benefactive auxiliary verbs *-kureru* ‘give’ and *-morau* ‘receive’ attaching to a verb in *te*-form. They are basic interrogative requests in Japanese. According to Miyagawa (1982), they are always understood as requests by the hearer more explicitly than other interrogative requests. Examples 46 and 47 are interrogative requests by learners in the present study.

46. *eego ni yakushite-morae-nai kashira?*
 English PTCL translate.receive: NEGATIVE PTCL
 Can you translate it into English?
 (Cary, Scenario 5)

47. *amerika-ryuugaku no taiken ni tsuite hanashite-kureru?*
 America.study abroad PTCL experiences PTCL about talk.give
 Can you talk about your experience in studying in America?
 (Luke, Scenario 14)

In Example 46, the sentence is made with the benefactive verb *-morau* and sentence-final question particle *kashira*. In Example 47, a rising tone marks the sentence composed of *-kureru* as an interrogative request. To express politeness, the speakers just need to replace the benefactive auxiliary verbs with the honorific equivalents of the verbs, *-kudasaru* or *-itadaku*. In Example 48, the sentence is composed of *shite-itadak-emasen*, a verb *suru* in *te*-form followed by the honorific verb of *-morau* in the negative form and then followed by a question particle.

48. *sensee no shigoto ni tsuite hanashi o shite-itadak-emasen ka?*
 teacher PTCL job PTCL about talk PTCL do.receive: HON:NEG
 PTCL.
 Could you talk about your job?
 (Justin, Situation 13)

Compared to the request made to a friend in the same situation, as shown in Example 47, this request sounds more polite because of the use of the honorific verb in the negative form. Downgrading and upgrading the degree of politeness is a simple procedure in the interrogative requests with benefactive verbs.

In contrast, requests in declarative forms are more complex in syntactic structure and pragmatic meaning, compared to those in interrogative forms. In the present study, many of the requests in declarative forms were realized with distinctive syntactic elements at the end of the sentence. They are particles such as *keredomo*, *ga*, *ne*, and *yo*; the verb *omou* ‘to think’; and combination of a few of those elements, implying the speaker’s invitation to the response from the hearer. Among them, the particle *keredomo*,

its variants, *keredo* and *kedo*, and combination of the verb *omou* and *keredomo* were used frequently by the native speakers. These sentence-final elements mitigate the force of the utterance that they accompany in spoken interactions (Mihara, 1995). The following examples are requests by the native speakers in the present study.

49. *chotto yakushite-morae-nai kana to omou-n da kedo*
 little translate.receive:NEG PTCL I think that.SEPH PTCL
 I wonder if you could translate it.
 (Rika, Situation 5)

50. *amerika-ryuugaku no taiken ni tsuite*
 America.study abroad PTCL experiences PTCL about
hanashite-hoshii-n da keredomo
 talk.want to do.SEPH PTCL
 I would like you to talk about your experiences in studying in America.
 (Jun, Situation 14)

Compared to the requests in Examples 46 and 47, the requests in Examples 49 and 50 have more complex syntactic structure, ending with *n desu kedo*, *n da kedo*, *n desu keredomo*, or *n da keredomo*. These endings are the combinations of a particle *no* or *n*, a copula verb *desu* or *da*, and another particle *kedo* or *keredomo*. The structure of the sentence in Example 49 is even more complex because of the embedded question, *chotto yakushite-morae-nai kana*, followed by *to omou* ‘I think that’. The use of *to omou* and *keredomo* was also seen in a more polite form of request addressed to a teacher, preceded by an honorific benefactive verb *itadaku*, as shown in Example 51.

51. *chotto sensee no o-shigoto ni tsuite chotto o-hanashi*
 little teacher PTCL job PTCL about little talk
shite-itadake-nai ka to omou-n desu kedo
 do.receive:HON:NEG PTCL think that:SEPH:POL PTCL
 I was wondering if you could give us a little talk about your job.
 (Kana, Situation 13)

Compared to the request realized for the same context in Example 48, this request sounds slightly more indirect and polite, with the main verb followed by a more complex

sentence ending; however, it does not differ greatly in the level of appropriateness and the nature of the message that are expressed to the hearer. That is, interrogative requests and declarative requests of the same proposition differ significantly only in the complexity of the form.

Expressing politeness in declarative sentences requires extra grammatical skills. Such differences might have motivated the learners to use interrogative requests more frequently than declarative requests in the present study. To avoid potential problems associated with the use of the complex forms of the declarative sentence, the learners may have realized requests in the interrogative counterpart in which their intention and politeness could still be expressed successfully. Such learner's attempt can be viewed as part of the learners' communication strategy to achieve their communicative goals (Færch & Kasper, 1983). The learners may have avoided complex declarative requests that they are not fully capable of using, but instead used interrogative requests as an alternative way to realize requests.

It can be argued that the learners' avoidance of the declarative sentences may have been associated with their problems with one of the essential syntactic elements to form a declarative request, *to omou, n da*, and *keredomo*. The learners may have avoided using one of those expressions incorrectly and consequently used declarative requests infrequently. The learners' preference for interrogative forms and the native speakers' frequent use of *keredomo* in requests were also reported by Kumai (1992). To understand the learners' avoidance of declarative requests, further examination is needed on their competence in producing and using declarative requests, particularly those realized with the syntactic elements, *to omou, n-da*, and *keredomo*.

5.3 Types of Strategies

The following discussion answers the third question of the present study: *What strategies do learners and native speakers of Japanese use to realize a request?*

The learners and native speakers do not differ in the frequencies of using direct, explicitly indirect, and implicitly indirect strategies, to realize requests. Both learners and native speakers used explicitly indirect strategies the most frequently, but they used direct and implicitly indirect strategies less frequently. This is consistent with the findings in the previous studies of requests by speakers of Japanese as well as many of the other languages (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989a; Fukushima, 1996; le Pair, 1996; Kashiwazaki, 1993; Trosborg, 1994). For example, in Trosborg's study, Danish learners of English used a type of explicitly indirect requests the most frequently, as shown in Example 52.

52. ...I wanted to ask you if you could if you could sort of help me lift the desk up to the second floor (Trosborg, 1994, p. 235)

Trosborg reported that the type of request that appeared in the data of all groups of participants, which included a group of Danish learners of English, native speakers of English, and native speakers of Danish, was a conventionally indirect. In the present study, the most frequently used utterances were a type of explicitly indirect requests, as shown in Example 53.

53. *nihongo no shukudai o tetsudatte-kureru kana?*
can you help me with my Japanese homework?
(Justine, Situation 3)

The present also found the significantly lower frequencies of the use of direct and implicit indirect strategies by both groups of speakers. The infrequent use of direct strategies is consistent with the results of previous studies, such as Takahashi (1987) and Trosborg (1994). The infrequent use of implicitly indirect strategies, however, does not

correlate with the results of these previous studies. For example, in Takahashi's study, a type of implicitly indirect request, as shown in Example 54, was frequently used.

54. ...*nobuko-san no baiorin no renshuu no koto de ohanashi ga arun desu kedo*
 ...I'd like to talk with you about Nobuko-san's violin practice
 (Takahashi, 1987, p. 143)

A speaker who made this request intended to ask a hearer to make her daughter stop playing the violin at night, however, he attempted to realize his request not by directly mentioning a desired action but by implicitly referring to the action. Such types of indirect requests were used rarely in the present study. Example 55 shows one of the implicitly indirect requests used by a native speaker.

55. *taro sa shinsain yatte-minai?*
 Taro, do you want to become a judge?
 (Tomo, Situation 16)

This utterance cannot be considered as a request without context; but it would be rather understood as an invitation.

The difference in the results between the previous studies and the present study might be related to the variables of the role-play situations. Blum-Kulka and House (1989) showed that situational variables influence the choice of request strategies. For example, in a request situation where speakers ask roommates to clean the kitchen and in a situation where police officers ask drivers to move a car, direct requests were used more frequently across languages. Blum-Kulka and House argued that some situations were considered more imposing than others. Kabaya et al. (1998) also explained that the forms of requests are determined by situational factors. For example, in Japanese, direct forms of requests are used in a situation where the speaker has authority. In contrast, implicitly indirect requests or requests in the form of consultation are used when the speaker feels

great difficulty in making a request (Kabaya et al., 1993). Lack of such types of situations may be related to the lower frequency of direct and implicitly indirect strategies. More various situations including highly imposing ones as well as less imposing ones should be used in role plays in the future studies of requests.

A significant difference was found between the learner group and native speaker group in the frequency of using the types of explicitly indirect request strategies. The three indirect strategies, *asking a hearer's desire* (HRD), *stating a speaker's desire* (SPD), and *asking a hearer's permission for a desired action* (PMT) were used by both learners and native speakers more frequently than any other indirect strategies. However, the frequencies of using those three strategies differ between the learners and native speakers. The strategy most frequently used by the learners and that by the native speakers were different. The learners used the HRD strategy the most frequently, whereas the native speakers used the SPD strategy most frequently. The learners used the SPD strategy the second most, and the PMT strategy the third most. In contrast, the native speakers used the HRD strategy the second most, and the PMT strategy the third most. The native speakers used *stating a speaker's expectation of a hearer's action in hypothetical situations* (EHA) strategy slightly more frequently than the learners.

The disagreement in the most frequently used strategy between the learners and native speakers is different from the result reported by le Pair (1996) and Trosborg (1994). However, these previous studies and the present study shared the results in terms of the difference in the preference for the use of substrategies. The learners' frequent use of the HRD strategy and native speakers' frequent use of the HRD strategy to realize requests were also observed in Kumai (1992).

A possible explanation for the difference in the results between the present study and previous studies is that the average language proficiency of the learners in the present study was lower than that of the Spanish learners in le Pair and that of English learners in Trosborg. The language proficiency contributed greatly to the discrepancy in the choice of strategies between the learners and native speakers of Japanese in the present study. The learners of Japanese in the present study lack skills and knowledge necessary to use the SRD strategy as often as the native speakers. This point will be elaborated on in the following discussion.

The learner did not use the SRD strategies because they may have lacked skills to make a request in declarative forms *keredomo*. The use of *keredomo* and its variants is necessary to realize requests by the SRD strategies. As has been discussed earlier, the learners may not be capable of using these sentence-final particles. Thus, they may have avoided using the SRD strategies to avoid problems associated with the use of *keredomo*.

It is also possible that the learners' limited knowledge of indirect speech strategies restricted their choice of indirect request strategies. The learners may not have understood that the two strategies, particularly SRD and HRD, differed in the degree of indirectness in Japanese: the former strategy is considered more indirect than the latter strategy. The request sentence with the benefactive auxiliary verbs *-morau* or *-kureru*, which fall under the HRD strategy, is one of the typical forms of requests (Kabaya et al., 1998). In contrast, the request sentence made by the SRD strategy is considered more indirect because it does not explicitly ask the hearers to tell the speakers whether or not to comply with their request. Kawaguchi (2003) argued that this type of statement itself in the discourse of request is only used to have the hearers understand what is stated. It is

not meant to elicit action from the hearer. It may be understood as a request for action according to the context of the discourse, so it is considered an indirect request. Not knowing the differences between the two strategies, the learners may have realized requests using the HRD strategy more often than the other.

Another possible explanation for the difference, also related to the learners' knowledge about indirect speech, is that the learners may have attempted to show indirectness by means of other pragmatic devices while realizing requests in the HRD strategy. For example, the honorific forms of copula verbs or benefactive verbs were used frequently by the learners in the request sentences made by *asking a hearer's desire* strategy, as shown in Example 56.

56. *sore chotto kashite-morae-masen ka?*
 that little lend.receive:NEG:POL PTCL
 can you lend me that?
 (Nina, Situation 1)

In this example, the learner asked her friend to lend her a book by attaching the copula verb in honorific negative form *-masen* to the benefactive verb *morau*. This request sounds more polite compared to the following request made by the native speaker for the same situation.

57. *sono hon chotto kashite-mora-eru?*
 that book little lend.receive
 Can you lend me the book?
 (Kana, Situation 1)

Because of a range of the social meanings and functions associated to the honorific forms of verbs (Cook, 2008), the learner's use of those verbs may not be limited to the expression of politeness. To understand the difference in the choice of indirect strategies between learners and native speakers, further examination may need to

be conducted on the choice of indirect request strategies by the learners of further advanced Japanese language skills in various situations.

5.4 Statement of Intention

The following discussion addresses the fourth question of the present study: *What is the reasoning behind Japanese speakers' choice of discourse structures and strategies in realizing a request?*

During the present study, a small number of the statements of intention regarding request sentences were collected. They were classified into three groups: the statements of intention to use *politeness strategies* (Polite), those to use *other strategies* (Other), and those to use *politeness and other strategies* (Both). In the verbal reports, learners of Japanese reported about the *Polite strategies* and the *Other strategies* equally frequently. In contrast, native speakers of Japanese reported the *Other strategies* more frequently than *the Polite strategies*.

Based on the low frequency of the *Polite strategies* (n = 8, 15.1%), native speakers of Japanese do not seem to intentionally use politeness strategies. However, it is apparent, from the high frequency of the *Both strategies* (n = 19, 35.8%), that they do use politeness strategies, often with other strategies. In fact, in the native speaker's group, the frequency of using the *Polite strategies* and the *Both strategies* is almost equal to the frequency at which the participants use the *Other strategies*. This implies that like learners of Japanese, native speakers of Japanese chose politeness strategies as frequently as other strategies. In addition, native speakers were simultaneously thinking of using politeness strategies and other strategies. Example 58 clearly indicates that many different strategies that Kana reported using during her role play in Situation 14.

58. (a) *kore wa taroo tte tomodachi na node sonnani kashikomatta iikata janakute de [...]* (b) *kotowarareru kamo shirenai kara kotowararenaiyooni iimashita amrika ni itteta jan mitai na kanji de [...]* (c) *yanwari toomawashi toomawashi janai desu kedo jibun ga omotte iru tte iuka*

(a) this (request) was from taro's friend so not a very formal form (is needed) (b) because it may be turned down I tried not to be refused by saying you went to America didn't you (c) softly, indirectly but not so indirectly I was thinking...

(Kana, Situation 14)

In this excerpt, Kana recalled using three different strategies. In the first and third parts (a) and (c), Kana described her politeness strategies. She reported that she was trying to be indirect but not too formal. The strategy she explained in the middle section (b) was used for a reason other than politeness. She explained that she intentionally pointed out a good reason for her hearer's complying with her request.

The learners' statements of the *Polite* strategies included the statements about the use of casual or friendly speech style by avoiding the honorific verbs or by adding the sentence-final particles *sa* or *ne*, in informal situations. They also included the use of honorific verbs and expressions of apology in formal situations. The native speakers' statements of the *Polite* strategies included the statements about the use of informal or less compelling manners during informal situations. They also reported the use of careful speech by planning discourse and choosing expressions, the use of apologetic manner, and the use of indirect and deductive explanations, in formal situations.

The learner's other strategies included the statements about the use of a speech style for requesting, discourse planning, and avoidance of communicating meaning. The native speakers' other strategies were mostly about the use of discourse planning.

Further categorization of the statements was not conducted due to the failure to identify any patterns in the small amount of data. There are two key reasons regarding the

methodology of data collection that may account for the failure to collect more data. First, in collecting verbal reports, the participants frequently mentioned that they did not remember their thoughts clearly during their role play. For this reason, they frequently described their speech in their role plays, not their thoughts and intentions during the role plays. Second, the participants may have failed to clearly verbalize their intentions during the role plays even if they were able to recall them. In the later session of the interview, many of the participants spoke less and avoided describing their intentions explicitly, especially if they were the same or similar to what they had said. To elicit more statements of intention using the same instruments, a future study should collect verbal reports from a larger number of participants after training them to explain more specifically about their intentions during the role plays.

Despite the failure to identify Japanese speakers' patterns of intended politeness strategies in the verbal reports, the results still provide valuable information to the present research as well as any future research. The frequent comments about using politeness strategies indicated that the learners and native speakers in the present study often assessed the appropriateness of expressions and used them or modified expressions to communicate meaning appropriately in the given situations. Example 59 shows an excerpt of the verbal report by a learner talking about the role play of a request to a teacher to give a talk in a meeting. She explained how she decided to use a polite form of the verb *hoshii* 'want' in her request.

59. Your paper said ‘*hanashi o shite-hoshii to omoi-masu* [you want her to talk]’. So I said ‘*shigoto ni tsuite hanashi o shite-hoshii* [I want you to talk about your job],’ and I cannot say *hoshii* [want] because it’s rude to *sensee* [a teacher]. I would think maybe this is one of my strategies that I consciously think what I would say when I want to be polite *te-itadaite* whatever, so you know, that’s why I did that.
(Alissa, Situation 13)

According to this verbal report, a learner Alissa first thought of realizing a request by saying *hanashi o shite-hoshii to omoi-masu* ‘I want you to talk,’ which was categorized as stating a speaker’s desire (SPD) strategy. This is a type of indirect request used second most frequently by learners of Japanese in the present study. The learner found the use of the verb *hoshii*, which was given in the scenario, was inappropriate to realize a request to a teacher and thus used the polite form of the same verb *itadaku*.

This verb was used frequently by both learners and native speakers of Japanese in the realization of other requests to teachers.

The use of the honorific verb forms was mentioned as their ways to express politeness. A similar assessment was commented by the other learners of Japanese.

A few comments about the appropriateness of expressions were also elicited from the native speakers of Japanese. Example 60 shows an excerpt of the native speaker’s verbal report about the role play of asking a friend to return her book. In the excerpt, the speaker explained how she decided to use an expression *zuibun mae* ‘very long time ago.’

60. *mazu zuibun mae ni tte itta-no wa anata nagai koto motte-imasu yo tte iu koto o sarigenaku iu tame de [...] demo sore o ni-kagetu toka ni-shuukan toka suuji o dashite iu-n-ja-nakute zuibun toka ashita toka soo to wa satorare-nai yoo ni*

I said *zuibun mae ni* [very long time ago] because I mean to say indirectly that you had kept my book for a very long time [...] not by using the numbers, such as *ni-kagetsu* [two months] or *ni-shuukan* [two weeks], but by saying *zuibun* [very long time ago] or *ashita* [tomorrow] so that my intention cannot be understood
(Rika, Situation 7)

According to this report, the native speaker Rika found the use of numbers in expressing periods of time was too imposing and thus used the expressions, such as *zuibun mae*, to vaguely describe similar lengths. She believed that in this way, she could indirectly point out the lengthiness of the hearer's possession of her book and politely ask the hearer to return it to her.

A similar assessment was noted by other native speakers of Japanese in their verbal reports about the same or the other role-play situations. According to the report, by assessing the appropriateness of expressions, the native speakers often avoided using expressions unsuitable in the given situation and communicated the meaning in different expressions. The use of ambiguous expressions called *aimai hyougen*, is one of the politeness strategies. According to the previous research, Japanese often use *aimai hyougen* to avoid stating something clearly. Whereas the learners focused on the assessment of the appropriateness of the verb form, the native speakers often focused on that of the semantic appropriateness of the choice of words.

The difference in the focus of the assessment implies that the difference in language proficiency may be related to the difference in the use of politeness strategies by the learners and native speakers. The studies of request realization by learners of different proficiency levels reported that the difference in the realization of requests between the learners and native speakers decreased with proficiency (Félix-Brasdefer, 2007; Rose, 2000; Taguchi, 2006; Trosborg, 1994). To examine the correlation between

language proficiency, the use of politeness strategies, and the focus of attention in the assessment of appropriateness, a future study should include a collection of data from learners of different levels through the use of both role-play interviews and retrospective verbal interviews.

5.5 Summary of Findings and General Discussion

The present study examined the differences and similarities in the realization of requests by learners and native speakers of Japanese. They were examined in the following four aspects of the realization of requests: discourse structures, sentence types of requests, types of request strategies, and types of intended strategies. Both similarities and differences were found in these aspects. First, no significant difference was found in the discourse structure. Both learners and native speakers of Japanese in the present study almost always added supporting statements before and after a request sentence. However, a significant difference was found in the sentence types. The learners realized requests most frequently by using interrogative sentences, whereas the native speakers realized requests most frequently by using declarative sentences. Third, both learners and native speakers commonly used explicitly indirect strategies more frequently than direct and implicitly indirect strategies. However, they were different in the use of the subtypes of explicitly indirect strategies. Whereas the learners realized requests most frequently by asking about the hearer's desire to perform a requested action, the native speakers realized requests most frequently by stating the speaker's desire to have the hearer perform a requested action. Finally, politeness and other strategies were mentioned more frequently than both strategies by learners of Japanese. The learners and native speakers are different in the assessment of the appropriateness of expressions. To sum up, the

realization of requests by learners and native speakers of Japanese agrees at least in the use of the supporting statements in the discourse structure, use of indirect strategy, and types of intended strategies. In contrast, they disagree in the use of sentence types to realize requests, preference for the subtype of explicitly indirect strategy.

The results in the present study are consistent with the results in the previous studies reporting the differences and similarities in the various aspects of the realization of requests by learners and natives speakers of Japanese and other languages (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989a; le Pair, 1996; Trosborg, 1994). The findings of the present study support the arguments in the previous studies that second language learners indirectly realize requests as well as native speakers do because of the universality in the use of indirectness across languages. The advanced fluency of the learners in the present study may have also helped them make a request sentence as completely as the native speakers did. The findings of the present study also support the argument that the learners often deviated from native speaker norms in the choice of specific indirect strategies because of the learners' inadequate language skills. Not knowing how to realize requests using sentence-final particles may have led the learners to avoid using explicitly indirect strategies in declarative forms. The results in the present study may be associated partly with the methodology. Further examination should be conducted with a larger study group and by giving those participants a greater variety of role play situations.

The findings of the present study suggest that the advanced learners of Japanese may lack syntactic skills to form polite request sentences in declarative forms that native speakers have. Such skills are, more specifically, those to form a complex declarative

sentence by using a verbal expression *to omou* 'I think that' and attaching a sentence-final particle, such as *keredomo*, *ga*, *ne*, and *yo*, to the sentence final position.

This interpretation of the findings leads to another. It can be assumed that the learners' poor syntactic skills are the source of their difficulty in realizing request in a situation that requires further indirectness. The verb *omou* and these sentence-final elements are used to make the sentence sound softer. In an utterance without using these syntactic elements, speakers can still convey their intention and realize a request. However, the speakers may involuntarily deliver the intention more directly and more abruptly than they wish.

Such learners' inappropriate expressions of politeness may cause problems in their interactions with speakers of Japanese. It has been reported that some of the learners' deviations from native speakers' pragmatic skills may cause discomfort to interactants and interrupt communication. For example, learners' utterances that contain irrelevant information and are longer than needed may annoy the hearers or get their meaning as a request blurred (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986). In her study of the use of requests by learners of English, Taguchi (2006) reported the learners' use of indirect requests was judged inappropriate by native speakers of English despite their use of implicit requests. Taguchi explained that the learners' utterances were so ambiguous in meaning that they were not considered as appropriate requests.

To avoid these communication problems, learners should be introduced to the use of sentence-final particles together with the forms and use of requests in the course of learning Japanese as a second language. The study found that learners may have avoided using the sentence-final particles to make requests in complex declarative sentences.

Therefore, practicing realizing requests in more complex declarative sentences in an appropriate context may improve the learners' frequency of using declarative requests. In addition, learners should be given sufficient time to practise making polite requests using the particles. In the verbal reports, the present study found both learners and native speakers frequently intended to use politeness strategies. It was also found that the learners focus on the appropriateness of verb forms. This may be related to the learners' limited attention to the other aspects in the realization of requests. Additional training in making requests will help learners develop stronger skills in realizing requests politely with correct verb forms and particles.

Further studies should be conducted to identify the causes of the differences in the use of request strategies by learners and native speakers of Japanese, including the relationship between the learners' language proficiency and their use of polite requests. In previous studies, sources of learners' deviations were suggested, such as factors related to learners' native languages (Blum-Kulka, 1982), learner-specific strategies (le Pair, 1996), methods of second language instruction (Hassall, 2001), and learners' second language proficiency (Félix-Brasdefer, 2007; Rose, 2000; Taguchi, 2006; Trosborg, 1994). In the studies of the use of Japanese requests (Kumai, 1992; Tsuchida, 2003), the learners' use of their first or other language knowledge of requests was reported to have resulted in some of the differences between learners and native speakers of Japanese. By understanding the causes of problematic deviations, language teachers will be able to provide learners with more effective advice or activities to help them avoid these problems in the future. In her discussion of cross-cultural pragmatic failure, Thomas (1983) stressed the importance of determining the causes of communication breakdowns

in second language interactions and carefully handling them, particularly those caused by the learners' misunderstanding of the cultural norms of the target language. Thomas argued that correcting such problems is more difficult for learners and teachers to handle because correcting those errors implies changing learners' social values.

6 Conclusion

The present study has examined the use of request strategies by advanced learners of Japanese, in comparison with that of native speakers of Japanese. Data were collected by role plays as well as a verbal report. The learners' use of request strategies was described, in comparison with that of native speakers of Japanese, in terms of the following categories: (a) patterns of discourse structures, (b) sentence forms and (b) request strategies, and (d) cognitive process in the realization of requests.

To achieve the goal, this study categorized each speech act of request performed by learners and native speakers of Japanese according to the types of discourse structures, sentence forms, and request strategies. It then examined frequencies of types of utterances in each category; described patterns in the use of utterances in each category; and, examined the similarities and differences in the patterns in the realization of requests by the learners and native speakers. The responses in the verbal reports were categorized into groups and used to describe variations in the reasoning behind their choice of the various aspects of request realization.

The following results were obtained from the present study.

1. Both learners and native speakers of Japanese in the present study almost always added supporting statements before and after a request sentence. The learners and native speakers do not significantly differ in the discourse structure.
2. The learners realized requests most frequently by using interrogative sentences, whereas the native speakers realized requests most frequently by using declarative sentences. The learners and native speakers significantly differ in the sentence types.

3. Both learners and native speakers commonly used explicitly indirect strategies more frequently than direct and implicitly indirect strategies. However, they were different in the use of the subtypes of explicitly indirect strategies. Whereas the learners realized requests most frequently by asking about the hearer's desire to perform a requested action, the native speakers realized requests most frequently by stating the speaker's desire to have the hearer perform a desired action.
4. The learners of Japanese intended to use the *Polite* strategies as frequently as the *Other* strategies. In contrast, the native speakers of Japanese intended to use the *Other* strategies more frequently than the *Polite* strategies. The learners and native speakers are different in the assessment of the appropriateness of expressions.

The results of the present study are consistent with those of the previous studies: learners and native speakers realize requests similarly in some aspects, but differently in other aspects (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989a). In the present study, both learners and native speakers used indirect requests more frequently than direct requests. Similar results have been reported by studies of requests in other languages and followed by an implication that the use of indirect strategies is universal across languages. The result of the present study supports such suggestions. The present study also found learners and native speakers used different types of explicitly indirect strategies. This result is consistent with the findings of the previous studies that the learners often deviate from native speaker norms in the choice of specific indirect strategies. As has been discussed in previous studies, it is because of the learners' inadequate language skills. Further examination should be conducted with more participants, including even more advanced levels of learners and through the use of various role-play situations.

The present study has also showed that advanced learners of Japanese lack grammatical skills to form request sentences in declarative forms. The absence of those skills may emerge as a serious problem in realizing requests or other speech acts in a situation that requires further indirectness. This result suggests that learners of Japanese may need comprehensive reviews and practices in the use of requests in declarative forms. One way in which this issue could be addressed is to instruct learners how to form a request in declarative forms prior to interrogative forms, even though they are usually introduced to the latter earlier than the former in Japanese language textbooks, such as *Minna no Nihongo* (Ijima, Shiba, Takamoto, & Murakami (1998) and *Genki* (Banno, Ohno, Sakane, & Shinagawa, 1999). Because requests in declarative forms were used by native speakers more frequently than those in interrogative forms, how to make requests in the former forms should be taught with more emphasis in classrooms of Japanese as a second language.

There were several limitations in the present study. The first was the limited number of participants in the groups. Because the focus was on advanced learners of Japanese who had similar academic backgrounds, it was difficult to recruit many volunteers. In addition, because the study was conducted in a Canadian university, Japanese learners and native speakers were not considered to be randomly chosen sample groups. Thus, these two groups were not representative of the general population of advanced learners and native speakers. The small group size may also have had an influence on the statistical analysis of the data.

The second was the homogeneity of the participants. In the learners group, one of the participants spoke Chinese as her first language, and English as her second language.

The remaining volunteers spoke English as their first language. Thus, the learners group cannot be considered as homogeneous in terms of their language background. In the native speakers group, one of the participants had lived in Canada for three years and ten months. As has been reported in previous studies (Blum-Kulka, 1982; Fukushima, 1996), different cultural and linguistic backgrounds of the participants may have had an influence on the responses that are given by the participants in their role plays.

Other limitations are related to the data and the method by which it was collected. First, request situations described in the role-play scenarios may not reflect those existing in the real world. They were developed by the researcher based on those used in previous studies. Although they were tested in pilot studies and proven to work, it is questionable whether or not each participant had experienced such situations before or whether nor not they truly experienced the situation at the time of the role play.

Second, the participants' verbal response in the role plays may have been affected by their nonverbal behaviours, such as poses, tone of voice, and body language. Japanese speakers frequently use paralinguistic expressions to show politeness in communication, and some linguistic expressions must be accompanied by a nonverbal action of politeness (Mizutani & Mizutani, 1988). The present study however focused on the linguistic aspects of the use of request strategies by Japanese speakers. For this reason, the role plays by the participants were only audio-recorded, and the use of paralinguistic expressions of politeness was not analyzed.

Finally, the participants' lengthy, repetitive performance of role plays may also have influenced their performance in subsequent role plays. Each participant enacted many role plays so that a sufficient amount of data could be collected. Consequently, they

may have intentionally or unintentionally realized the similarity of the requests in different scenarios for each role play focused on making requests. Role plays of different speech act situations, such as apologies and complains, could have been incorporated into the study; however, it was not possible given the limited time frame for data collection.

It is possible to replicate this study by eliciting a variety of requests from a larger study group. A greater number of participations would reduce the number and repetitive nature of the role plays the each volunteer would have to enact. Thus, a greater variety of speech act scenarios could be incorporated into the study. This would have a positive impact on the quality of data that is collected. To ensure the homogeneity of the participants in each group, the volunteers should be recruited in a setting where the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the potential participants are similar. In addition, role plays should be conducted in situations with different contextual variables, such as different types of relationships between the speaker and the hearer and different types of actions that the speaker requests the hearer to do. Additional information for data analysis could be acquired if a survey were conducted to identify those participants who may or may not have experienced the role-play scenarios prior to the study. As discussed above, the verbal report should be replicated with a larger study group, which would reduce the number of responses elicited from each participant. The reports from a greater number of participants may reveal more varieties of intended strategies. The methodology implemented in this study could also be used to examine the use of requests strategies by learners of Japanese at different proficiency levels and native speakers of Japanese. The data collected from learners of different proficiency levels or those collected from the same learners at different points of time could help to further examine the development of

the realization of requests. Such findings may help explain the relationship between language proficiency and the use of request strategies. Information obtained in any of the future studies suggested here will help the researchers and language teachers further understand the use of requests by learners and native speakers of Japanese.

7 References

- Achiba, M. (2003). *Learning to request in a second language: A study of child interlanguage pragmatics*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Aoyama, K. (2002). Request strategies at a Japanese workplace. In A. Bell, J. Shoemaker, & G. Sibley (Eds.), *Selected papers from the third college-wide conference for students in languages, linguistics and literature 1999* (pp. 3-11). Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii at Manoa. Retrieved May 12, 2008 from <http://webpages.acs.ttu.edu/kaoyama/aoyama10.pdf>
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford, England: Clarendon.
- Banno, E., Ohno, Y., Sakane, Y., & Shinagawa, C. (1999). *Genki: An integrated course in elementary Japanese*. Tokyo, Japan: The Japan Times
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (2005). Institutional discourse and interlanguage pragmatics research. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, & B. S. Hartford (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics : Exploring institutional talk*. (pp. 7-36). Mahwah, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, 3, 37-59.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1983). Interpreting and performing speech acts in a second language – A cross-cultural study of Hebrew and English. In S. D. Krashen, & R. C. Scarcella (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*. (pp. 36-55). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1989). Playing it safe: The role of conventionality in indirectness. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. (pp. 37-70). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & House, J. (1989). Cross-cultural and situational variation in requesting 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. (1989a). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G. (1989b). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. (pp. 1-34). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Levenston, E. (1987). Lexical-grammatical pragmatic indicators. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 9, 155-170.

- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 196-213.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1986). Too many words: length of utterance and pragmatic failure. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 8, 165-180.
- Breiner-Sanders, K. E., Lowe, P., Miles, J. & Swender, E. (2000). ACTFL proficiency guidelines – speaking revised 1999. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(1), 13-18.
- Brown, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (2nd ed., Vols. 1-13). Oxford, England: Elsevier.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Byon, A. S. (2004). Sociopragmatic analysis of Korean requests: Pedagogical settings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1673-1704.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards, & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication*. (pp. 2-27). New York, NY: Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Cohen, A. D. (2005). *Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts*. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2-3, 275-301.
- Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 33-56.
- Como, P. (2006). Elicitation techniques for spoken discourse. In *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (Vol. 4, pp. 105-109). Oxford, England: Elsevier.
- Cook, H. M. (2008). *Socializing identities through speech style: Learners of Japanese as a foreign language*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 1-23.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1984). *Protocol analysis*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Færch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Færch, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 20-60). Essex, England: Longman.
- Færch, C. & Kasper, G. (1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguage request realization. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 221-247). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2004). Interlanguage refusals: Linguistic politeness and length of residence in the target community. *Language Learning*, 54 (4), 587-653.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2007). Pragmatic development in the Spanish as a FL classroom: Across-sectional study of learner requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 4, 253-286.
- Fukushima, S. (1996). Request strategies in British English and Japanese. *Language and Science*, 18, 671-688.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goffman, E. (1967). On face-work. In *Interactional ritual: Essays on face-to-face behaviour* (pp. 5-45). Garden City, NY: The Anchor Books.
- Hassall, T. (1999). Request strategies in Indonesian. *Pragmatics*, 9, 585-606.
- Hassall, T. (2001). Modifying requests in a second language. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 39, 259-283.
- Hill, B., Ide, S., Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A., & Ogino, T. (1986). Universals of linguistic politeness: Quantitative evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10, 347-371.
- Holmes, J. (2006). Politeness strategies as linguistic variables. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (Vol. 9, pp. 684-697). Oxford, England: Elsevier.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp.269-293). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.
- Ijima, H., Shiba, K., Takamoto, K., & Murakami, M. (1998). *Minnano Nihongo Shokyu I*. Tokyo, Japan: Three A Network.
- Izaki, Y. (2000). Discourse strategies of "request" in contact situations: In the case of Japanese and French learners of Japanese. *Japanese Language Education around the Globe*, 10, 129-145.

- Iwasaki, S. (2002). *Japanese*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Kabaya, H., Kawaguchi, Y., & Sakamoto, M. (1998). *Keigohyogen*. Tokyo, Japan: Taishukan Shoten.
- Kabaya, H., Kawaguchi, Y., & Sakamoto, M. (1993). Irai hyoogen hooryaku no bunseki to kijyutu: Taiguu hyoogen kyooiku e no ooyooni mukete. [Description and analysis of strategies of making a request: Toward their applications to teaching politeness system] *Waseda University Bulletin of Center for Japanese Language*, 5, 52-69. Retrieved from <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110000470376/>
- Kashiwazaki, H. (1993). Hanashikake koudou no danwa bunseki: Irai yokyu hyougen no jizzai o chuushin ni [Discourse analysis of speaking behaviour: Focus on request expressions in natural contexts]. *Nihongo Kyoiku*, 79, 53-63.
- Kasper, G. (1996). Introduction: Interlanguage pragmatics in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 145-148.
- Kasper, G. (2008). Data collection in pragmatic research. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory* (2nd ed.) (pp. 316-341). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 215-247.
- Kawaguchi, Y. (2003). Hyogenruikeiron kara mita kino no gainen. Hatarakikakeru hyogen no teisho. [The concept of function in a typological perspective. A proposal for hatarakikakeru expressions] *Koza Nihongokyoiku*, 39, 29-41. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2065/3392>
- Kumai, H. (1992). Gaikokujin no taiguu koodoo no bunseki (1) Irai koodoo o tyuushin ni shite [An analysis of honorific behaviour of foreigner]. *Shizuoka Daigaku Kyooyoobu Kenkyuu Houkoku*, 28, 1-44.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). Linguistic theory and the real world. *Language Learning*, 25, 309-338.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York, NY: Longman.
- le Pair, R. (1996). Spanish request strategies: A cross-cultural analysis from an intercultural perspective. *Language Science*, 18, 651-670.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Marti, L. (2006). Indirectness and politeness in Turkish-German bilingual and Turkish monolingual requests. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 1836-1869.

- Matsumoto, K. (1993). Verbal-report data and introspective methods in second language research: State of the art. *RELC Journal*, 24, 32-60.
- Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, 403-426.
- Mihara, Y. (1995). Setsuzoku-joshi keredomo no shujoshi-teki yoohoo ni-kansuru ichi koosatsu. [A study of the sentence which ends with keredomo] *Yokohama Kokuritsu Daigaku Ryuugakusee Sentaa Kiyoo*, 2, 79-89. Retrieved December 25, 2009, from <http://hdl.handle.net/10131/1120>
- Miyagawa, S. (1982). Requesting in Japanese. *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 17, 123-142.
- Minami, F. (1974). *Gendai nihongo no koozoo*. [Structure of modern Japanese language] Tokyo, Japan: Taishuukan.
- Mizuno, K. (1996). "Irai" no gengo kodo ni okeru chukan gengo goyoron: Chugokujin nihongo gakushusha no baai. [Interlanguage pragmatics in requests: A case of Chinese learners of Japanese as a second language]. *Gengo Bunka Ronshu*, 17(2), 91-106.
- Mizutani, O., & Mizutani, N. (1988). *How to be polite in Japanese* (3rd ed.). Tokyo, Japan: The Japan Times.
- Niyekawa, A. (1991). *Minimum essential politeness: a guide to the Japanese honorific language*. Tokyo, Japan: Kodansha International.
- Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D. (1983). Apology: A speech-act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 18-35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Pavlenko, A. (2000). L2 influence on L1 in late bilingualism. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11, 175-205.
- Pearson, L. (2006). Patterns of development in Spanish L2 pragmatic acquisition: An analysis of novice learners' production of directives. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 473-495.
- Pizziconi, B. (2006). Politeness. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (Vol. 9, pp. 679-684). Oxford, England: Elsevier.
- Request*. (2011a). In *Collins free English online dictionary*. Retrieved March 10, 2011, from <http://www.collinslanguage.com/results.aspx>
- Request*. (2011b). In *Oxford English dictionaries online*. Retrieved March 10, 2011, from http://oxforddictionaries.com/view/entry/m_en_gb0702750#m_en_gb0702750

- Request*. (n.d.). In *Dictionary.com*. Retrieved March 10, 2011, from <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/request>
- Rintell, E. M., & Mitchell, C. J. (1989). Studying requests and apologies: An inquiry into method. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 221-247). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Robinson, M. A. (1992). Introspective methodology in interlanguage pragmatics research. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as native and target language* (pp. 27-82). Honolulu, HI: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Centre, University of Hawai'i.
- Rose, K. R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22, 27-67.
- Sadock, J. (2004). Speech acts. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 53-73). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Sasaki, M. (1998). Investigating EFL students' production of speech acts: A comparison of production questionnaires and role plays. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30, 457-484.
- Shibatani, M. (2006). Honorifics. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (Vol. 5, pp. 381-390). Oxford, England: Elsevier.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1983). Interaction, acculturation, and the acquisition of communicative competence: a case study of an adult. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 137-174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 59-82). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1-23.
- Suh, J. (1999). ESL Korean learners' use of external and internal modifications in request realizations. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED430400)
- Taguchi, N. (2006). Analysis of appropriateness in a speech act of request in L2 English. *Pragmatics*, 16, 513-533.
- Takahashi, S. (1987). A contrastive study of indirectness exemplified in L1 directive speech acts performed by Americans and Japanese. Unpublished master dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

- Takahashi, S., & DuFon, M. A. (1989). Cross-linguistic influence in indirectness: The case of English directives performed by native Japanese speakers. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED370439)
- Thesaurus.com* Web site (n.d.). Retrieved December 25, 2009, from <http://thesaurus.reference.com/browse/intend>
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4 (2), 91-112.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (2006). Think-aloud protocols. In *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (Vol. 12, pp. 678-686). Oxford, England: Elsevier.
- Trosborg, A. (1994). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints, and apologies*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Tsuchida, K. (2003). The discourse strategy of request used by Japanese native speaker and South Korean foreign students: From the perspective of pragmatic politeness. *Japanese Language Teaching Association in honor of Professor Fumiko Koide*, 11, 41-54.
- University of Victoria. (2008). *The University of Victoria Calendar 2008-2009* (Updated on May 19, 2009). Retrieved February 25, 2011 from <http://web.uvic.ca/calendar2008/index.html>
- Van Mulken, M. (1996). Politeness markers in French and Dutch requests. *Language Science*, 18, 689-702.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Weizman, E. (1993). Interlanguage requestive hints. In G. Kasper & S. Bulm-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (pp.123-137). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1985). Different cultures, different languages, and different speech acts: Polish vs. English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9, 145-178.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction* (2nd ed.). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

8 Appendices

8.1 Appendix A

Background questionnaire for learners

This is voluntary and confidential. Please provide information as long as you are comfortable. However, completing the questionnaire will help to insure the success of my research.

Date: / / 2008

1. Name: _____
2. Age: _____ years old
3. Sex: Male / Female
4. Major field of study: _____
5. Year: _____ in Undergraduate / Graduate
6. Native language: _____
7. Period of time you have studied Japanese total, in classroom instruction, and in Japan:
 - Total: _____ years _____ months
 - In classroom: _____ years _____ months
 - In Japan: _____ years _____ months
8. Name of place and period of time you have lived in Japan
 - Place: _____ Period: _____ years _____ months
9. Estimated Japanese language proficiency level:
 - Beginning Intermediate Advanced Near-native
10. The highest level of Japanese courses you have completed in University of Victoria and the time of completion
 - Course No: JAPA _____ Time: month _____ year _____
11. Other languages that you know and estimated proficiency level

Language	Proficiency level (Please circle)			
1. _____	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Near-native
2. _____	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Near-native
3. _____	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Near-native

8.2 Appendix B

Background questionnaire for native speakers

This is voluntary and confidential. Please provide information as long as you are comfortable. However, completing the questionnaire will help to insure the success of my research.

Date: / / 2008

1. Name: _____
2. Age: _____ years old
3. Sex: Male / Female
4. Native language: _____
5. Name of place and period of time you have lived in Japan:

Place: _____ / period: _____ years _____
months

Place: _____ / period: _____ years _____
months
6. Period of time you have lived in Canada:

7. Other languages that you know and estimated proficiency level

Language	Proficiency level (Please circle)			
1. _____	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Near-native
2. _____	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Near-native
3. _____	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Near-native

8.3 Appendix C

Role-play scenarios for learners

シナリオ 1:

あなたは 今週の週末、京都へ行こうと思っています。太郎さんは 京都のガイドブックを持っていて、それには安い旅館のことが書いてあります。太郎さんに ガイドブックを貸してほしいと思っています。太郎さんに何と言いますか。

Scenario 1:

You are going on a trip to Kyoto this weekend. You know Taro has a guidebook that has information on cheap accommodation in Kyoto. You want Taro to lend you the guidebook.

What would you be most likely to say to Taro?

シナリオ 2:

国際経営論のクラスで 課題のレポートが出ました。レポートを書く時、「日本企業」という本を読みたいと思っています。山田先生がちょうどその本を一冊持っています。あなたは 先生に その本を貸してほしいと思っています。山田先生に 何と言いますか。

Scenario 2:

You have been assigned to write a research paper in an international business class. You are interested in reading the book titled “Japanese corporation” when you write a paper. You know Ms. Yamada has the book. You want Ms. Yamada to lend you the book. What would you be most likely to say to Ms. Yamada?

シナリオ 3:

今日の午後 2 時、太郎さんと会うことになっています。太郎さんは あなたの宿題を手伝ってくれる予定です。でも、マネージャーが 昨日の夜 シフトを変えて、あなたは 今日、午後 2 時から 10 時まで アルバイトをしなくちゃいけなくなりました。太郎さんに 明日の授業の後に 会ってほしいと思っています。今、午後 1 時で、授業が終わったところです。太郎さんに、何と言いますか。

Scenario 3 :

You made an appointment to meet Taro at 2 pm this afternoon. He is going to help you with your Japanese assignment. However, your boss changed your job shift last night and told you that you have to work from 2pm to 10pm. Now you want Taro to meet you tomorrow after class.

It's 1 pm now, just after class. What would you be most likely to say to Taro?

シナリオ 4:

今日の午後 2 時に、山田先生に会って、宿題しゅくだいについて質問しつもんをすることになって
います。でも、マネージャーが 昨日の夜 シフトを変えて、あなたは 今日の
午後 2 時から 7 時まで アルバイトをしなくちゃいけなくなりました。山田先生
に 明日、オフィスアワーの時間に 会ってほしいと 思っています。

今、午後 1 時です。山田先生の研究室けんきゅうしつに来ました。先生に 何と言いますか。

Scenario 4:

You made an appointment to meet Ms. Yamada at 2 pm this afternoon to ask her questions about the assignment. However, your boss changed your job shift last night and told you that you have to work from 2pm to 7pm. Now you want Ms. Yamada to meet you tomorrow during her office hour.

It's 1 pm now. What would you be most likely to say to Ms. Yamada?

シナリオ 5:

あなたは 去年きょねんの夏なつにホームステイした 長野ながののホストファミリーのお父さんか
ら 手紙をもらいました。でも、それは手書きてがで、読みにくく、何と書いてある
か よくわかりません。太郎さんに 英語えいごに訳やくしてほしいと 思っています。
太郎さんに 何と言いますか。

Scenario 5:

You have received a letter from your host father in Nagano whom you stayed with last summer. It's handwritten and hard to read and understand what he is saying. You want Taro to translate the letter in English.

What would you be most likely to say to Taro?

シナリオ 6:

あなたは 文部科学省もんぶかがくしょうの奨学金しょうがくきんに申し込むつもりです。願書がんしょには、3 人の
推薦状すいせんじょうが必要です。山田先生に 推薦状すいせんじょうを書いてほしいと 思っています。
先生に 何と言いますか。

Scenario 6:

You are going to apply for a MEXT scholarship. You need recommendation letters from three referees. You want Ms. Yamada to write one for you.

What would you be most likely to say to Ms. Yamada?

シナリオ 7:

あなたは 太郎さんに 「カナダのエコツーリズム」という本を 二ヶ月前に貸しました。あなたは国際経営論のクラスで、二週間以内にレポートを書いて、出さなくては行けません、その本が必要だと気づきました。太郎さんに本を返してほしいと思っています。太郎さんに 何と言いますか。

Scenario 7:

You lent your book titled “Canadian Ecotourism” to Taro two months ago. You’ve realized that you need the book to write a term paper in two weeks. You want the book back soon.

What would you be most likely to say to Taro?

シナリオ 8 :

あなたは 山田先生に 「カナダのエコツーリズム」という本を 二ヶ月前に貸しました。あなたは国際経営論のクラスで、二週間以内にレポートを書いて、出さなくては行けません、その本が必要だと気づきました。山田先生に本を返してほしいと思っています。山田先生に 何と言いますか。

Scenario 8:

You lent your book titled “Canadian Ecotourism” to Ms. Yamada two months ago.

You’ve realized that you need the book to write a term paper in two weeks. You want the book back soon.

What would you be most likely to say to Ms. Yamada?

シナリオ 9:

あなたは 来週 日本の大学院に 願書を出すつもりです。願書と一緒に出さなくては行けない 研究計画書を書きました。これを来週の月曜日までに山田先生に 直してほしいと思っています。先生に 何と言いますか。

Scenario 9:

You are going to apply for a graduate school in Japan next week. You have written a statement of intent in Japanese that needs to be submitted with your application. You want Ms. Yamada to check your statement by next Monday.

What would you be most likely to say to Ms. Yamada?

シナリオ 10:

来週、日本語の授業で 課題の作文を出さなくちゃいけません。今週の週末、太郎さんに 作文を直してほしいと思っています。太郎さんに 何と言いますか。

Scenario 10:

You are going to submit your essay in a week that is part of the course requirement in your Japanese class. You want Taro to correct your essay this weekend. What would you be most likely to say to Taro?

シナリオ 11:

マーケティング論のクラスで、研究レポートを書かなくてははいけません。テーマは日本のコンビニで、データを集めるために アンケートをするつもりです。山田先生に、アンケートに答えてほしいと思っています。山田先生に 何と言いますか。

Scenario 11:

You are going to write a research paper as part of the course requirement in your marketing class. The theme is Japanese convenience stores, and you are planning to a questionnaire survey to collect data. You want Ms. Yamada to answer a questionnaire. What would you be most likely to say to Ms. Yamada?

シナリオ 12:

マーケティング論のクラスで、研究レポートを書かなくてははいけません。テーマは日本のコンビニで、データを集めるために アンケートをするつもりです。太郎さんに、アンケートに答えてほしいと思っています。太郎さんに 何と言いますか。

Scenario 12:

You are going to write a research paper as part of the course requirement in your marketing class. The theme is Japanese convenience stores, and you are planning to a questionnaire survey to collect data. You want Taro to answer a questionnaire. What would you be most likely to say to Taro?

シナリオ 13:

1月10日に、国際交流サークルの会合で、日本語教師の仕事について話をする事になっています。山田先生に、その会合で、先生の仕事について話をしてほしいと思っています。山田先生に 何と言いますか。

Scenario 13:

On January 10th, in the meeting of *Kokusai koryu saakuru*, the International friendship club, the club members will discuss the jobs of Japanese language teachers. You want Ms. Yamada to give a talk about her job in the meeting.
What would you be most likely to say to Ms. Yamada?

シナリオ 14:

1月10日に、^{こくさいこうりゅう}国際交流サークルの^{かいごう}会合で、^{かいがいりゅうがく}海外留学について話をする
なっています。太郎さんに、その^{かいごう}会合で、太郎さんの^{りゅうがく}アメリカ留学の^{たいけん}体験について話を
してほしいと思っています。
太郎さんに 何と言いますか。

Scenario 14:

On January 10th, in the meeting of *Kokusai koryu saakuru*, the International friendship club, the club members will discuss study abroad. You want Taro to give a talk about his experiences of studying in the USA in the meeting.
What would you be most likely to say to Taro?

シナリオ 15:

来週の土曜日、大学で日本語スピーチコンテストがあります。あなたはスピーチ
コンテストの^{うんえいいいん}運営委員です。頼んでいた^{たの}審査員^{しんさいん}の一人が^{つごう}都合で来られなくなっ
てしまいました。代わりに、山田先生に、^{しんさいん}審査員になってほしいと思っています。
山田先生に 何と言いますか。

Scenario 15:

Next Saturday, A Japanese speech contest is scheduled at the university. You are one of the organizers of the contest. You learned one of the judges is not able to come to the contest. You want Ms. Yamada to be a judge.
What would you be most likely to say to Ms. Yamada?

シナリオ 16:

来週の土曜日、大学で日本語スピーチコンテストがあります。あなたはスピーチ
コンテストの^{うんえいいいん}運営委員です。頼んでいた^{たの}審査員^{しんさいん}の一人が^{つごう}都合で来られなくなっ
てしまいました。代わりに、太郎さんに、^{しんさいん}審査員になってほしいと思っています。
太郎さんに 何と言いますか。

Scenario 16:

Next Saturday, A Japanese speech contest is scheduled at the university. You are one of the organizers of the contest. You learned one of the judges is not able to come to the contest. You want Taro to be a judge.
What would you be most likely to say to Taro?

8.4 Appendix D

Role-play scenarios for native speakers

See Appendix C for Scenarios 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16

シナリオ 5:

あなたは 去年の夏にホームステイした カナダのホストファミリーのお父さんから 手紙をもらいました。でも、それは手書きで、読みにくく、何と書いてあるか よく分かりません。太郎さんに 日本語に訳してほしいと思っています。太郎さんに 何と言いますか。

Scenario 5:

You have received a letter from your host father in Canada whom you stayed with last summer. It's handwritten and hard to read and understand what he is saying. You want Taro to translate the letter in Japanese.

What would you be most likely to say to Taro?

シナリオ 9:

あなたは 来週 カナダの大学院に 願書を出すつもりです。願書と一緒に 出さなくてはならない 研究計画書を書きました。これを来週の月曜日までに 山田先生に 直してほしいと思っています。先生に 何と言いますか。

Scenario 9:

You are going to apply for a graduate school in Canada next week. You have written a statement of intent in Japanese that needs to be submitted with your application. You want Ms. Yamada to check your statement by next Monday.

What would you be most likely to say to Ms. Yamada?

シナリオ 10:

来週、英語の授業で 課題の作文を出さなくちゃいけません。今週の週末、太郎さんに 作文を直してほしいと思っています。太郎さんに 何と言いますか。

Scenario 10:

You are going to submit your essay in a week that is part of the course requirement in your English class. You want Taro to correct your essay this weekend.

What would you be most likely to say to Taro?

シナリオ 13:

1月10日に、^{こくさいこうりゅう}国際交流サークルの^{かいごう}会合で、英語教師の^{しごと}仕事について話をする
ことになっています。山田先生に、その^{かいごう}会合で、先生の仕事について
話をしてほしいと思っています。
山田先生に 何と言いますか。

Scenario 13:

On January 10th, in the meeting of *Kokusai koryu saakuru*, the International friendship club, the club members will discuss the jobs of English language teachers. You want Ms. Yamada to give a talk about her job in the meeting.
What would you be most likely to say to Ms. Yamada?

8.5 Appendix E

Role-play instruction for learners

1. 会話の登場人物について (About the characters in the role plays):

i. あなたの役:

東京の大学に通う交換留学生です。2008年の4月にカナダから来ました。大学で、国際経営と日本語の授業を取っています。

You are an exchange student in a university in Tokyo. You came from Canada in April, 2008. In the university, you are taking courses in international business and Japanese language.

ii. あなたの相手の役

太郎はあなたの友だちです。同じ大学の日本人の学生で、あなたと同じ年です。国際経営を勉強しています。太郎さんはあなたが日本に来たときから友だちです。あなたは、太郎さんとクラスの外でもよく会って、宿題をいっしょにやったり、ご飯を食べに行ったりします。

Taro is your friend. He is a Japanese university student and the same age as you are. He is also studying international business. Taro and you have been friends since your arrival in Japan. You and he often meet outside classrooms, doing class assignments and going out for dinner etc.

山田先生はあなたの日本語の先生です。年は40代のようにです。あなたは日本に来た時から山田先生を知っています。前学期は、先生の日本語の授業をとって、いい成績をとりました。今学期もまた山田先生のクラスを取っています。

Ms. Yamada is a Japanese language instructor. She looks in her forties. You have known her since your arrival in Japan. You took her Japanese class last semester and did fairly well. You are taking another Japanese class of hers this semester again.

1. 会話の時間と場所 (Time and place of conversation):

- i. 今、2008年12月です。
It's December, 2008 now.

ii. 太郎さんとの会話:

授業の後、太郎さんは教室から出てきました。
After class, you see Taro walking out of the classroom.

iii. 山田先生との会話:

授業の後、山田先生の研究室に行きました。先生は研究室で仕事を
しています。
After class, you went to Ms. Yamada's office. She is working in her office.

2. ロールプレートの手順 (Role-play instruction)

i. 場面カードが渡されます。カードには、会話の場面についての説明が
書かれています。説明を読んで、その場면을想像してください。場面で
わからないことがあったら、質問してください。

You will be given a role-play card. The card has description about a situation where
you speak to the other. Read the card and imagine the situation. Ask questions if you
don't understand the situation.

ii. 場면을想像して、何と言うか考えてください。

Imagine the situation. Think about what you would likely to say in the situation.

iii. 準備ができれば、「始めます。」と言って始めてください。
終わるときは、「終わります。」と言って下さい。

When you start speaking, say "hajimemasu." When you finish speaking, say
"owarimasu."

iv. 一つの会話が終わると、次の場面カードが渡されます。同じように
ロールプレーをしてください。ロールプレーの場面は16ありますが、
それぞれ独立していて、関連がないものとします。

When you finish speaking, you will be given another role-play card with a different
scenario. Repeat the steps 1, 2, and 3. There are sixteen scenarios in total. They are
all different and not related to each other.

8.6 Appendix F

Role-play instruction for native speakers

1. 会話の登場人物について (About the characters in the role plays):

i. あなたの役:

東京の大学に通う大学生です。

大学で、国際経営と英語の授業を取っています。

You are a university student in a university in Tokyo. In the university, you are taking courses in international business and Japanese language.

ii. あなたの相手の役

太郎はあなたの友だちです。同じ大学の日本人の学生で、あなたと同じ年です。国際経営を勉強しています。太郎さんは四月に同じ授業を取った時から友だちです。あなたは、太郎さんとクラスの外でもよく会って、宿題を一緒にやったり、ご飯を食べに行ったりします。太郎さんは高校卒業までアメリカにいたので、日本語・英語どちらも分かります。

Taro is your friend. He is a Japanese university student and the same age as you are. He is also studying courses international business. Taro and you have been friends since you took the same class with him in April. You and he often meet outside classrooms, doing class assignments and going out for dinner etc. Because he lived in the USA until he graduated from high school, he understands both Japanese and English.

山田先生はあなたの英語の先生です。年は40代のようにです。あなたは四月に先生のクラスを取った時から山田先生を知っています。前学期は、先生の英語の授業を取って、いい成績を取りました。今学期もまた山田先生のクラスを取っています。

Ms. Yamada is an English language instructor. She looks in her forties. You have known her since your took her class in April. You took her English class last semester and did fairly well. You are taking another English class of hers this semester again.

2. 会話の時間と場所 (Time and place of conversation)

See Appendix E.

3. ロールプレーの手順 (Role-play instruction)

See Appendix E.

8.7 Appendix G

Stimulated recall instruction

Now I would like you to explain to me what you did and what you were thinking at the time you were doing role play with me. We will listen to the audio-recording of our role play. We will also review the role-play scenarios. After we listen to the recording, I will ask you the questions below:

1. What were you thinking at the time of this role play? Please tell me what you intended to do in the role play from the beginning to the end.
2. What were you thinking when you said what you said?
 - To clarify your response, I may ask you more questions that are not written here.
 - If you don't remember what was in your mind, it's OK. Just tell me as much as you can remember.
 - You can speak in Japanese or English, or both.