UC Riverside
Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title

The Effects of Recasting on the Production of Pragmalinguistic Conventions of Request by Chinese Learners of English

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/77m4d8tj

Journal

Issues in Applied Linguistics, 15(1)

ISSN

1050-4273

Authors

Fukuya, Yoshinori J.
Hill, Yao Zhang

Publication Date

2006

DOI

10.5070/L4151005079

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

The Effects of Recasting on the Production of Pragmalinguistic Conventions of Request by Chinese Learners of English

Yoshinori J. Fukuya and Yao Zhang Hill
University of Hawai'i at Manoa

This study examined the applicability of recasting to the acquisition of pragmatics. Specifically, this study investigated the effects of implicit feedback on Chinese learners of English in learning eight pragmalinguistic conventions of request. Both the pragmatic recast and control groups performed role-plays; the former received recasts on their request Head Acts (core requesting utterances), whereas the latter did not. Discourse completion tests showed that the pragmatic recast group performed better than the control group on measures of both pragmatic appropriateness and grammatical accuracy, with effect sizes of Cohen's (1988) d = 0.83 for pragmatic appropriateness and Cohen's d = 0.87 for pragmatic appropriateness and grammatical accuracy. The study highlighted the ways recasts can be implemented at the pragmatic level and demonstrated that pragmalinguistic recasting is a sound pedagogical option.

The last two decades have seen the steady development of interlanguage pragmatics. Because the vast majority of researchers have dedicated their work to an understanding of L2 learners' pragmatic comprehension and production, the history of instructed interlanguage pragmatics is brief. In the last 10 years, however, researchers' awareness of instructional intervention has gradually increased. A conceptual and methodological key issue of these empirical studies has been the effect of explicit and implicit instruction on pragmatic learning. The vast majority of such research has focused on explicit instruction. A few researchers have explored implicit instruction, but no researchers have applied recasts at the pragmatic level (see, nevertheless, Martínez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005). The purpose of this study, then, was to examine the effects of recasting on the learning of pragmalinguistic conventions of requests. We conclude that recasts are a sound option to teach requests.

BACKGROUND

Instructed Interlanguage Pragmatics

A number of instructional studies on interlanguage pragmatics were conducted between 1981 and 2006 (for a comprehensive review, see Kasper, 2001a, 2001b; Kasper & Roever, 2005; Kasper & Rose, 2002, Rose, 2005). These studies explored the teachability of different aspects of pragmatics (see Appendix A), such as speech acts (Bacelar Da Silva, 2003; Eslami-Rasekh, Eslami-Rasekh & Fatahi, 2004), conversational implicature (Bouton, 1994; Kubota, 1995), hedges (Fukuya, 1998; Wishnoff, 2000), gambits (Taylor, 2002), discourse strategies (Yoshimi,

Issues in Applied Linguistics ISSN 1050-4273
© 2005/2006, Regents of the University of California
Vol. 15 No. 1, 59-91

2001), and interactional norms (Liddicoat & Crozet, 2001). Moreover, the target languages and the learning contexts for investigation have expanded and can be categorized into the following four groups:

- Category I (ESL):
  ESL in the U.S. (e.g., Bouton, 1994; Fukuya & Clark, 2001; Morrow, 1995)
- Category II (EFL):
  EFL in China, Denmark, Germany, Hong Kong, Iran, Israel, Japan and Spain (e.g., Olshtain & Cohen, 1990; Rose & Ng, 2001; Shaw & Trosborg, 2000; Takahashi, 2001)
- Category III (Foreign languages other than English):
  French in Australia (Liddicoat & Crozet, 2001); German in the U.S (Wildner-Bassett, 1994); Japanese in the U.S. (Tateyama, 2001); Spanish in the U.S. (Pearson, 2001; Taylor, 2002)
- Category IV (Immersion program):
  French immersion in Canada (Lyster, 1994)

Of these studies, four (Kondo, 2001; Tateyama, 2001; Tateyama, Kasper, Mui, Tay, & Thananart, 1997; Wildner-Bassett, 1994) targeted beginning learners; other studies were directed at intermediate and advanced learners. Additionally, while only Lyster (1994) targeted children (grade-8 students) and Alcón (2005) high school students, the majority of studies targeted adult learners.

An assumption underlying all of these empirical studies is the relevance of explicit–implicit teaching/learning. Some researchers have examined the effects of explicit instruction (e.g., Billmyer, 1990; Bouton, 1994; Eslami-Rasekh, Eslami-Rasekh, & Fatahi, 2004; Wildner-Bassett, 1994). Operationally, explicit instruction has enjoyed a firmly established status through a wide range of classroom activities that provide learners with metapragmatic information or raise their consciousness of metapragmatic rules. Among them, an explanation and discussion of rules (Kubota, 1995; Olshtain & Cohen, 1990) is a common task. Other activities include metapragmatic judgment tasks (Morrow, 1995), introduction and analysis of prescribed speech-act formulae (Kondo, 2001; Morrow, 1995), narrative reconstruction (Liddicoat & Crozet, 2001), rule-discovery (Rose & Ng, 2001), comparison between the native language and target language (Safont, 2003) and consciousness-raising tasks employing the analysis worksheet that Rose (1993, 1994, 1997, 1999) recommends (Fukuya, 1998). The results show that the provision of metalinguistic information is effective for adult learners, regardless of proficiency level or language learning context.

Other researchers have compared explicit with implicit instruction (House, 1996; House & Kasper, 1981; Koike & Pearson, 2005; Pearson, 2001; Takahashi, 2001; Tateyama, 2001; Tateyama et al., 1997; Trosborg, 2003). In these studies, explicit instruction was shown to have some advantages over implicit instruction

with the exceptions of Tateyama (2001) and the open-ended dialogues in Koike and Pearson (2005). Of the seven studies including an implicit condition, House (1996) and House and Kasper (1981) withdrew all metalinguistic information from implicit instruction, but included such metalinguistic information in the corresponding explicit condition. Similarly, for an IPIF group (implicit pre-instruction plus implicit feedback), Koike and Pearson (2005) removed not only metalinguistic information but also correct answers after learners presented their responses. Other scholars have conceptualized implicit instruction as additional, simple exposure to pragmatic examples while an explicit group received metalinguistic information in addition to such examples. Learners in Pearson (2001), Tateyama (2001), and Tateyama et al. (1997) watched video clips; the meaning-focused group in Takahashi (2001) read NS-NS role-play transcripts to answer the comprehension questions. These conventional ways of conceptualizing and operationalizing implicit pragmatic instruction show that the researchers have concentrated primarily on simple exposure to pragmatic examples. Therefore, in contrast to explicit instruction studies, the pragmatic implicit instruction studies seem to be somewhat underdeveloped, both conceptually and methodologically.

Nevertheless, some researchers have recently compared explicit with implicit instruction by providing different operationalizations of the implicit condition. Fukuya, Reeve, Gisi, and Christianson (1998) employed "interaction enhancement" (Muranoi, 1996, 2000). A number of researchers (Alcón, 2005; Fukuya & Clark, 2001; Martínez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005; Moroishi, 1999) have applied input enhancement (Sharwood-Smith, 1991, 1993) and Takimoto (in press) has applied structured input tasks (VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993a, 1993b) to the implicit condition. These studies have provided unique understandings of pragmatic implicit instruction. Along this line of inquiry, the present study adds another dimension to implicit instruction of pragmatics by employing recasting in the implicit condition.

Recasts

The direct contrast hypothesis (Saxton, 1997) posits that implicit corrective feedback (i.e., recasts) promotes children's first language acquisition because when a child produces ungrammatical utterances to which an adult immediately responds with a grammatical form, the child may perceive the adult form as a correct alternative to the child form. On the basis of this assumption, second language researchers have operationalized recasts in two ways. In four studies (Ayoun, 2001; Carroll & Swain, 1993; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Rabie, 1996), learners were provided reformulated correct responses only. In Doughty and Varela (1998) and Long, Inagaki, and Ortega (1998), a teacher first repeated the learner's ill-formed utterance and then provided the reformulated correct form. The latter type of recasting is slightly more explicit than the former, yet it is unknown which type of recast leads to more effective learning. Nonetheless, these studies have demonstrated that recasts are more successful than positive evidence alone (i.e., modeling) when compared to a control condition in which learners receive no modeling or recasts. Studies have

focused on vocabulary acquisition in task-based interaction (Rabie, 1996), questions (Mackey & Philp, 1998), simple past verbs and past conditionals in an ESL science class (Doughty & Varela, 1998), adjective ordering and a locative construction in Japanese (Mito, 1993), direct object topicalization and adverb placement in Spanish (Long et al., 1998), dative alternation (Carroll & Swain, 1993), and French past tenses in a written mode (Ayoun, 2001). However, constrained by the length of recasts and number of changes made by them (Philp, 2003), recasts work when they are focused and only when linguistic structures are within reach of the learners' morpho-syntactic ability (Mackey & Philp, 1998; Oliver, 1995) as specified by the processability theory (Pienemann, 1998, 2003). Moreover, recasts seem to be most effective when the learner clearly understands that "the recast is a reaction to the accuracy of the form, not the content, of the original utterance" (Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada, 2001, p. 720).

Other researchers (Doughty, 2000; Doughty & Williams, 1998b; Long, 1996) have argued that learning objects have to be focused (i.e., centered on one learning problem), well identifiable, intensive, consistent, and unambiguously and promptly correctable. However, how recasts affect the development of pragmatic competence remains unclear (see, nevertheless, Martínez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005). The present study investigates this very issue.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

This study poses two research questions and two subsequent directional hypotheses. Theoretically motivated by the applicability of recasting to the pragmatic level, research question 1 (RQ1) involves the effects of recasts on learners' acquisition of request conventions in terms of pragmatic appropriateness. On the basis of the literature on syntax and vocabulary recasts, we created a subsequent directional hypothesis to RQ1:

> **RQ1**: Are pragmalinguistic recasts effective in teaching pragmatically appropriate requests?
> **Hypothesis 1**: A pragmatic recast group will outperform a control group in producing pragmatically appropriate Head Acts (HAs).[1]

Research question 2 (RQ2) also looks into the effects of recasts on learners' acquisition of request conventions, but with an emphasis on their grammatical accuracy. Whereas linguistic forms are part of teaching/learning pragmatics, grammatical competence is considered empirically and theoretically distinct from pragmatic competence (Bachman & Palmer, 1982; Garcia, 2004; Verhoeven & Vermeer, 1992, 2002 for the empirical distinction; Bachman, 1988, 1990; Bachman & Palmer, 1989, 1996; Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell, 1995; Leech, 1983; Swain, 1984 for the theoretical distinction). Thus, it seems reasonable to assess learners' grammatical constructs in addition to their

pragmatic appropriateness. Such considerations led us to pose our second research question (RQ2) and directional hypothesis:

> **RQ2**: Are pragmalinguistic recasts effective in teaching pragmatically appropriate and grammatically correct requests?
> **Hypothesis 2**: The pragmatic recast group will outperform the control group in producing pragmatically appropriate and grammatically correct HAs.

THE FOCI OF THE STUDY

Requests can be divided into six categories: needs statements, imperatives, embedded imperatives (e.g., *Would you …?*), permission directives, non-explicit question directives (e.g., *Is John there?* on the phone), and hints (Ervin-Tripp, 1976). A speaker's choice of these request types appears to vary according to three prime factors: (a) relative power (Brown & Levinson, 1987), (b) distance (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Lakoff, 1973), and (c) the degree of imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987; the *Tact Maxim* in Leech, 1983).[2] Employing a framework of these three sociolinguistic factors, this study enacted situations of two different combinations: Combination A (–Power, +Social Distance, +Imposition) and Combination B (+Power, –Social Distance, –Imposition). In Combination A, the interactions involve requests to a person with greater power than the speaker (–Power), who is unknown (+Distance), and for a relatively significant favor (+Imposition). In Combination B, the interactions involve requests to a person with lesser power than the speaker (+Power), who is known (–Distance), and for a relatively inconsequential favor (–Imposition). These two combinations consist of opposite "settings" of the Power, Distance, and Imposition variables, and therefore seem appropriate to help shed light on the contrast of the variables to learners. For the sake of convenience, Combination A was labeled Less Likely (LL), because requests of this kind seem to involve a relatively less likelihood of obtaining compliance. Conversely, Combination B was labeled More Likely (ML).

Eight specific request conventions were selected as the foci of the study with an instructional purpose in mind: four request conventions (*I was wondering if you could …*; *Would it be possible to …?*; *I'd be very grateful if you …*; *I'd really appreciate it if you …*) were associated with the LL situations; the other four conventions (*Do you want to …?*; *Do you mind ~ing…?*; *Would you mind ~ing …?*; *Do you think you can …?*) were associated with the ML situations.[3] We focused on requests because they contain these pragmalinguistic conventions, linguistic resources that are salient and convenient for recasts.

A FRAMEWORK OF PRAGMALINGUISTIC RECASTS

We define pragmalinguistic recasts as the interlocutor's (e.g., a teacher, a NS)

reformulation (i.e., modification of the head act and possible addition of hedges) of either (a) an utterance that is pragmatically inappropriate, or (b) an utterance that is pragmatically appropriate but grammatically incorrect and thereby results in a change of the linguistic structure of the head act.

Pragmalinguistic recasts can be divided into four categories according to their pragmatic usage and the linguistic forms of the request conventions. In this paper, these categories are referred to as Types I, II, III, and IV. Within this framework when a learner makes an inappropriate request, the teacher recasts it using one of the target request conventions. Additionally, when the learner makes an appropriate request but with an incorrect linguistic form, the teacher recasts the form. The teacher ignores all other cases.[4]

Figure 1: A Framework of Pragmalinguistic Recasts

		Linguistic accuracy	
		Correct form	Incorrect form
Pragmatic appropriate-ness	Correct usage	Type I: Accept a learner's utterance (No recast).	Type II: Recast only the linguistic form of the pragmalinguistic convention.
	Incorrect usage	Type III: Recast it by using one of the selected target pragmalinguistic conventions.	Type IV: Recast it by using one of the selected target pragmalinguistic conventions.

In Type I, a learner uses a target convention that is both pragmatically appropriate and grammatically correct. These examples are when *Would it be possible to …?* is used in the LL scenarios and when *Do you think you can …?* is employed in the ML scenarios. In Type I, the teacher never recast a learner's request. An example of Type II in the LL scenarios is a case in which a learner uses a target convention with a grammatically incorrect form, such as **I was grateful if you ~*. In this case, the recast reformulates only the linguistic form, with the correct form being *I'd be (very) grateful if you~*. In the ML scenarios (for Type II), a learner may say, **Would I mind ~?* Even though this was used in an appropriate context, it was linguistically inaccurate. In this case, the instructor would recast it by correcting the form (*Would you mind ~?*).

Unlike Type II, which focuses on linguistic forms, Type III concerns pragmatic appropriateness. For example, in a scenario involving a professor and his/her student in which the student says *I want you to take a look at my paper by next Monday*, this utterance is linguistically correct, but pragmatically inappropriate. It should thus be recast as, for instance, *I was wondering if you could take a look at my paper by next Monday.* This example represents a case of the LL scenarios. On the other hand, in an ML scenario, such as a situation where a manager is asking a waiter to set up a table for a party, the manager might use a command such *Set up the table for the party*. This form could be deemed inappropriately direct and

therefore should be recast as, for instance, *Do you mind setting up the table for the party?* In Type IV, a learner employs a target convention, which is both pragmatically inappropriate and grammatically incorrect. In the same hypothetical situation (the LL scenario) of a professor and student in which the student says, **I want you taking a look at my paper by next Monday*, the utterance can be recast as follows: *I was wondering if you could take a look at my paper by next Monday.*

The pragmalinguistic recasts adopted in this study differ from those on morphology, syntax, and lexis in three respects. First, the pragmalinguistic recasts concern both the pragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy of learners' utterances. Second, recasts of morphology and syntax have obligatory contexts. However, pragmalinguistic recasts do not have obligatory contexts; rather, they merely have a certain range of appropriateness. As an illustration, compare contexts for syntactic recasts in which learners must use the past tense of a verb, say, *took*, instead of the present tense, *take*. In this case the correction can take only one form. In contrast, many possible contexts exist for pragmalinguistic recasts in which learners could employ either *Could you possibly…?* or *I was wondering if you …*, but not *I want you to ….* Clearly, which forms are preferred by native speakers of English in varying contexts remains an issue to be more thoroughly explored.

Finally, unlike recasts of morphology, syntax, and vocabulary, pragmalinguistic recasts may more conspicuously interrupt ongoing interactions (G. Kasper, personal communication, December 2, 2002). While morphological, syntactic, and lexical recasts are brief in form—consisting of just one morpheme, one word, and a few structural elements—pragmalinguistic recasts are longer on the sentential level and thus may direct learners' attention away from the ongoing interaction more than morphological, syntactic, and lexical recasts. The instructor recruited for this study, also the second author, observed three ways in which the flow of the interactions were affected by pragmalinguistic recasts:

1. An interactant notices the instructor's recast, repeats the instructor's appropriate request convention, and continues with the interaction after a brief pause.
2. An interactant does not repeat the instructor's appropriate request convention, but pauses for a moment and continues with the interaction.
3. An interactant just ignores the recast and continues without a pause.

The first two cases are examples of interrupting the flow of the interaction.

Although such disruptions could be seen to have a significant effect on the interaction, it is our belief that this instructional interruption does not carry negative pedagogical or theoretical implications. On the contrary, pragmalinguistic recasts, even if interruptive, should be considered appropriate at the pragmatic level; instructors briefly intervene in the meaning-exchange for the purpose of an intermittent attentional shift to linguistic features (Doughty & Williams, 1998a; Long, 1991; Long & Robinson, 1998) and thus this focus on form involves the

learners' engagement in meaning. Following the findings in the psycholinguistic literature, Doughty (2000) suggests that the "cognitive window" (Doughty & Williams, 1998b) for focus on form may be as long as 40 seconds, during which time learners can rehearse linguistic items in the perceptual store. Also during this time, their previously stored interlanguage knowledge is engaged. This suggestion closely aligns with the current conceptualization of working memory, which Cowan (1988, 1993) views as a hierarchical construct representing the currently activated portion of the memory system that comprises the current focus of attention.

FOCUSED PRAGMALINGUISTIC RECASTS

As mentioned above, this study employed focused recasts of pragmalinguistic conventions of request. For example, the learner is told that s/he is a graduate student in need of a book belonging to Professor Aston. The student is told that s/he has never spoken to this professor before and that s/he must ask to borrow the book. The following request and recast ensued:

> Learner: … *I want you to let me borrow the book.*
> Teacher: *I want you to* ↑*You said?*↑ *I was wondering if you could let me borrow the book. Sí* ↑[5]

In this recast scenario, the teacher first repeated only the conventional part of an inappropriate request (*I want you to*) using a rising tone. Next, she added, *You said?* with another rising tone. She then provided an appropriate complete sentence and added *Sí* with a rising tone. With such a focused recast, we intend to indicate to learners an implicit contrast between inappropriate and appropriate pragmalinguistic conventions of requests. The combination of *You said?*↑ and *Sí* ↑, both of which may send implicit messages to learners, would seem to achieve this purpose.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The participants included 20 volunteer female Chinese learners of English who took both the pre- and post-tests. Eleven of the learners were in the treatment (= pragmalinguistic recast or PR) group and nine were in the control group. All participants were either freshmen or sophomores majoring in English. None had lived in an English-speaking country at the time of the study. The average length of receiving formal English instruction for both the treatment and control groups was eight years, suggesting that these 20 students may be considered intermediate learners of English. The instructor, a female native speaker of Chinese, taught two randomly formed groups (treatment and control) of students.

Procedures

This 10-day study in 2002 involved a pretest, a posttest, role-plays, a questionnaire, student question time, and a class evaluation. During this period, we spent seven 50-minute sessions over seven consecutive days engaging in 14 role-plays, seven of which were LL (–Power, +Distance, +Imposition) and seven of which were ML (+Power, –Distance, –Imposition) scenarios (see Appendix B). After receiving a card explaining the scenario, pairs of students practiced the role-play, and then partners switched roles. At this time, the teacher walked around to assist them, for example, by providing words and phrases they did not know. The teacher did not provide recasts for the students' utterances during the practice time in order to be able to balance the frequency of recasting for all students. Additionally, during the practice time, the teacher did not observe any students providing recasts to their partners on recasts, our research target. Following the practice session, individuals role-played with the instructor in front of the class. The instructor-student role-plays were the only times the teacher provided recasts. By the end of the treatment, the instructor had roughly balanced the number of uses of the eight recast target forms by counting the frequencies. When learners used two HAs in one role-play scenario, the teacher recast both of them. Only one operational difference existed between the two groups: the teacher gave focused pragmalinguistic recasts to the treatment group, whereas she did not do so with the control group.

Assessment

We employed 40-minute written discourse completion tests (DCTs) as a form of assessment. These forms were chosen because they are a form of free constructed response and can therefore elicit the request HAs. Both the pre- and post-tests in this study contained the same 14 items, but the item order was altered between the pretest and posttest. Seven of these 14 items were composed of LL (–Power, +Distance, +Imposition) scenarios, while the other seven items were composed of ML (+Power, –Distance, –Imposition) scenarios.[6] These 14 DCT items were distinct from the 14 role-play scenarios. Additionally, only the PR group took the post-treatment questionnaire, which consisted of two questions. The purpose of the questionnaire was three-fold: to find out (a) whether the participants actually noticed the recasts; (b) whether they attempted to discover the rules of making requests via the recasts; and (c) to what extent they were able to articulate the rules, even though the participants encountered the rules implicitly during the ongoing role-play interactions.

DATA ANALYSIS

We identified and coded 560 request HAs (20 participants x 14 items x the pre- and post-tests) by initially employing 27 coding categories of HAs and later introducing an additional seven categories where necessary. Part of the original categories was derived from Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989), Hill (1997),

and van Mulken (1996). Before calculating the inter-rater reliability of the posttest categorization, we considered 30 of the 280 items. Because one of us considered these 30 items to have two HAs, we decided which HAs to choose for data analysis. We did not initially concur with four of the 280 HA categorizations of the posttest data because one of us originally categorized these four HAs into hints. Taking the divergent case into consideration, the inter-rater reliability between the two researchers for the posttest was r = 0.986. We discussed the inconsistencies until we reached agreement.

While we independently identified and coded the HAs, we scored each of the HAs together. To rate the responses, we analyzed two aspects of the HAs: pragmatic appropriateness and grammatical accuracy. The scoring system for pragmatically appropriate HAs (with respect to RQ 1) was one point per target form, but no points for non-target forms. Similarly, the scoring system for grammatically correct HAs (with respect to RQ 2) was one point per target form, but no points for non-target and/or grammatically incorrect forms. In other words, only when participants employed the eight request conventions in a pragmatically and grammatically appropriate (LL or ML) manner were they awarded HA points. The reason for this was that the grammatical accuracy of the request conventions was the secondary focus of this study following pragmatic appropriateness.[7]

RESULTS

The Overall Frequency of Request Conventions Used on the Posttest

The overall frequency of request conventions used by the two groups on the posttest indicated that, for the PR group, 72.72% of all the items were of the eight target form types, regardless of whether or not these forms were used in appropriate situations. In contrast, for the control group, only 23.01% of all the items were target form types. Another difference was that the PR group used *Can/Could/Will/Would you ~?* for 13.64% of the items, whereas the control group used them 42.86% of the time. The predominant use of these preparatory questions by the control group is consistent with the current understanding of L2 request use (Hassall, 1999, 2001; le Pair, 1996; Nonaka, 1998; Rose, 2000; Takahashi, 2001; Trosborg, 1995). In the control group, these preparatory questions were followed by Mood Derivables, Hints, and *I was wondering if you could ~*, respectively (7.14%). The PR group never used *Can/Could/May I ~?*, but the control group did for 9.52% of the items. Overall, the control group used these two types of request conventions (the preparatory questions and *Can/Could/May I ~?*) in more than half of the situations (52.38%).

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 concerned the effects of recasting on the production of pragmatically appropriate requests. We set $\alpha = .05$ for the study. Because we conducted two-way ANOVAs five times, we had to apply Bonferroni's procedure

to the statistical analyses, thereby resulting in an alpha level of .01.[8]

The pretest

On the pretest, all of the target forms were used incorrectly in the LL situations. In the ML situations, the PR group used the target forms ten times out of 77 items (11 participants x 7 items), which is 12.98% of the time; the control group used the target forms four times out of 63 items (9 participants x 7 items) or 6.35% of the time. With a between-subject factor (Group) and a within-subject factor (Linguistic Assembly, indicating the two groups of request conventions—LL and ML), a repeated two-way (2X2) ANOVA was conducted on the pretest HA data. No statistically significant difference was found between the PR and control groups in using the eight target forms on the pretest, F (1, 136) = 1.69, p = .20.

The posttest

Table 1 illustrates the frequency and percentage of the target and non-target forms used in the posttest. On the LL items of the posttest, the PR group responded correctly 32.47% of the time, whereas the control group responded correctly only 12.70% of the time.

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage of the Target and Non-Target Forms Used on the Posttest

Request conventions		PR (n = 11)		Control (n = 9)	
		Freq	%	Freq	%
LL	I was wondering if you…	21	13.64	8	6.35
	I'd appreciate it if you…	7	4.55	3	2.38
	I'd be very grateful if you…	14	9.09	0	0
	Would it be possible to…?	8	5.19	5	3.97
	Sub-Total	50	32.47	16	12.70
ML	Do you mind ~ing…?	10	6.49	1	0.79
	Do you want to…?	6	3.90	2	1.59
	Do you think you can…?	3	1.95	0	0
	Would you mind ~ing…?	14	9.09	1	0.79
	Sub-Total	33	21.43	4	3.17
Non-target forms		71	46.10	106	84.13
Total		154	100	126	100

Note: PR = Pragmalinguistic recast; LL = Less Likely; ML = More Likely; Freq = Frequency; Non-target forms are pragmatically incorrect forms.

As Table 2 shows, the PR group had a mean of 0.65 (SD = 0.48); the control group had a mean of 0.25 (SD = 0.44). The range of these mean scores must be

between 0 and 1, as one point was awarded for the target form, but no point was assigned for a non-target form. On the ML items of the posttest, the former group used the target forms 21.43% of the time, whereas the latter group used the target forms only 3.17% of the time (see Table 1). Overall, the PR group had a mean of 0.43 (*SD* = 0.50), while the control group had a mean of 0.08 (*SD* = 0.27) (see Table 2).

Table 2: Means and Standard Deviations of the Pragmatically Appropriate Request HAs on the Posttest

		LL		ML	
Group	NI	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
PR	77	0.65	0.48	0.43	0.50
Control	63	0.25	0.44	0.08	0.27

Note: LL = Less Likely; ML = More Likely; NI = Number of Items; PR = Pragmalinguistic recast.

A two-way (2 X 2) ANOVA with repeated measures on the Linguistic Assembly was conducted on the posttest HA data, which yielded a statistically significant difference between the two groups, F (1, 136) = 47.74, $p < .01$; the PR group outperformed the control group (see Table 3 below). A statistically significant difference was also found between the two LAs, F (1, 136) = 15.36, $p < .01$. The four request conventions associated with the LL were used significantly more often than the ones associated with the ML. However, an interaction between the Group and LA was not found to be statistically significant, F (1, 136) = 0.20, $p = .65$.

Table 3: Analysis of Variance for the Pragmatically Appropriate Request HAs on the Posttest

Source	*df*	*F*	*p*
Group	1	47.74*	< .01
LA	1	15.36*	< .01
Group x LA	1	0.20	.65
Error	138		

*$p < .01$. LA = Linguistic Assembly (see Note 7).

Cohen's (1988) d was calculated for the effect size estimate: $d = 0.83$ and the 95% confidence intervals of the effect size were computed: Upper limit, $d = 1.07$; lower limit, $d = 0.59$.[9] The strength of association was computed to be $\eta^2 = 0.257$. For the reliability of the DCT, Cronbach's Coefficient alpha was calculated to be $\alpha = 0.86$ for the seven LL items, which can be considered "good" (George & Mallery, 2003, p 231) and $\alpha = 0.67$ for the seven ML items.

Research Question 2

The pretest

Research Question 2 concerned the effects of recasting on the production of pragmatically appropriate and grammatically correct requests. Because neither the PR group nor the control group used any target forms that were both pragmatically appropriate and grammatically correct, no statistical analyses were conducted on the pretest HA data.

The posttest

On the LL items of the posttest (see Table 4) for the PR group, 24.03% of all the items were target forms, but for the control group the target forms constituted only 3.97%. As Table 5 shows, the PR group had a mean of 0.48 (*SD* = 0.50), while the control group had a mean of 0.08 (*SD* = 0.27). On the ML items of the posttest, the former group used target forms 17.53% of the time, whereas the latter group used the target forms only 3.17% of the time (see Table 4). Here, the PR group had a mean of 0.35 (*SD* = 0.48), while the control group had a mean of 0.06 (*SD* = 0.25) on the ML items (see Table 5).

Table 4: Frequency and Percentage of the Grammatically Accurate Target Forms Used on the Posttest

		PR (*n* = 11)		Control (*n* = 9)	
	Request conventions	Freq	%	Freq	%
LL	I was wondering if you…	16	10.39	1	0.79
	I'd appreciate if it you...	4	2.60	0	0
	I'd be very grateful if you...	13	8.44	0	0
	Would it be possible to...?	4	2.60	4	3.17
	Sub-Total	37	24.03	5	0.79
ML	Do you mind ~ing?	10	6.49	1	0.79
	Do you want to...?	6	3.90	2	1.59
	Do you think you can...?	3	1.95	0	0
	Would you mind ~ing?	8	5.19	1	0.79
	Sub-Total	27	17.53	4	3.17
Non-target forms		90	58.44	117	92.86
Total		154	100	126	100

Note: PR = Pragmalinguistic recast; LL = Less Likely; ML = More Likely; Freq = Frequency; Non-target forms include (a) pragmatically incorrect, (b) pragmatically correct, but grammatically incorrect, and (c) both pragmatically and grammatically incorrect forms.

Table 5: Means and Standard Deviations of the Pragmatically Appropriate and Grammatically Correct Request HAs on the Posttest

		LL		ML	
Group	NI	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
PR	77	0.48	0.50	0.35	0.48
Control	63	0.08	0.27	0.06	0.25

Note: LL = Less Likely; ML = More Likely; NI = Number of items; PR = Pragmalinguistic recast.

A two-way (2X2) ANOVA with repeated measures on the Linguistic Assembly was conducted on the posttest HA data, which yielded a statistically significant difference between these two groups, F (1, 136) = 48.70, $p < .01$, where the PR group outperformed the control group (see Table 6). However, a statistically significant difference was not found between the two LAs, F (1, 136) = 2.73, p = .10. Additionally, the interaction between the Group and LA was not found to be statistically significant, F (1, 136) = 1.42, p = .24.

Table 6: Analysis of Variance for the Pragmatically Appropriate and Grammatically Correct Request HAs on the Posttest

Source	*df*	*F*	*p*
Group	1	48.70*	< .01
LA	1	2.73	.10
Group x LA	1	1.42	.24
Error	138		

*$p < .05$. LA = Linguistic Assembly (see Note 7).

In a measure of Cohen's (1988) d, the effect size was estimated to be d = 0.87, with the 95% confidence intervals of the effect size being an upper limit of 1.11 and a lower limit of 0.63.[10] The strength of association was computed to be $\eta^2 = 0.2608$.

DISCUSSION

Research Question 1

The statistical analysis found that the PR group used the target forms substantially more often than did the control group. In the PR group, 53.9% of the items were of the target forms (32.47% for the LL situations plus 21.43% for the ML situations). In the control group, the target form constituted only 15.87% of the items (12.70% for the LL situations plus 3.17% for the ML situations) (see Table 1). Hypothesis 1 was supported, and therefore, the implicit feedback treatment had notable effects on Chinese learners of English in learning acceptable requests. The effect size of the pragmatic recast treatment in relation to the control

group in terms of appropriateness was $d = 0.83$, which is considered a large effect (Cohen, 1988). This effect size is close to Norris and Ortega's (2000) finding that focused L2 instructional treatments outperformed control (including comparison and baseline) conditions ($d = 0.96$). Moreover, the strength of association ($\eta^2 = 0.257$) indicates that 25.7% of the variance in appropriate use of the target request conventions was attributable to the treatment of the pragmatic recasts.

The posttest results of the PR group appear to indicate their reasonably successful attempt at internalization of the cognitive mapping instead of mere imitation of the request conventions. During the treatment, not only do they seem to have recognized the linguistic forms, their function (i.e., request), the situations (role-plays), and the appropriateness of the target request conventions, but they also seem to have reasonably established the cognitive mapping of these inextricably linked pragmatic parameters on their interlanguage system through implicit feedback. This study's design will serve to illuminate the learning of the PR group. Situations were set up in the role-play scenarios requiring the PR participants to make requests. During their interactions, the instructor let them figure out the pragmatic appropriateness of the request conventions through the diametrically opposite settings of power, distance, and imposition variables, not to mention provision of the linguistically accurate forms. More importantly, one of the participants' tasks was—though they were unaware of it—to establish relationships of the pragmalinguistic forms with these sociolinguistic components. In brief, the posttest results are indirect evidence of the participants' cognitive learning. Had the PR group not accomplished the cognitive mapping even reasonably well, the posttest results would not have shown the positive effects of the pragmatic recasts.

We speculate that there were two reasons why the pragmatic recasts were seemingly successful in aiding the learning of the target request conventions. The PR learners seemed to have noticed the linguistic contrast between the HAs they provided and the target HAs they received from the instructor. The post-treatment questionnaire inquired whether the PR participants, during the role-plays, noticed the teacher's pedagogical resource, … *"You said ↑ Sí ↑"* All of them ($n = 11$) expressed that they had noticed it. All of the subjects articulated that their ways of making requests were "not appropriate" or "not suitable" for a situation, and therefore the instructor would encourage them to speak appropriately. In addition to the cognitive mapping of pragmatic parameters (explained earlier), noticing, a psycholinguistic component, was also likely involved in their learning. Schmidt's "noticing" hypothesis (1990, 1993a, 1993b, 2001), in a nutshell, states that focal awareness of language features must exist at the time of learning. The recasting also concerns the learners' cognitive comparisons between two linguistic structures. In first language acquisition, based on Nelson's (1987) rare event cognitive comparison theory, the direct contrast hypothesis (Saxton, 1997, p. 155; Saxton, Kulcsar, Marshall, & Rupra, 1998, p. 706) assumes that children's and caretakers' linguistic forms are directly juxtaposed with each other. Recasts can inform children (if the children notice them) not only that their caretakers' form is grammatically

correct, but also that the child's utterance is ungrammatical. Explicitly stated, the adult rejects the child's form while preferring an alternative form. This interaction thus provides the child with an ideal opportunity to observe the contrast in usage between the two forms. In second language acquisition, the concept of "noticing the gap" (Schmidt & Frota, 1986; Swain, 1995) corresponds with the idea of cognitive comparison; learners notice the gap between their interlanguage and the target language. With this cognitive comparison, learners receive negative and positive evidence. Their improvement through recasts is likely to be due to enhanced positive evidence for certain linguistic forms (e.g., in Spanish agreement of determiners and adjectives with the noun modified in gender and number) rather than implicit negative evidence (Leeman, 2003).

The participants' level of proficiency may have helped their learning via pragmalinguistic recasts. Although we could have targeted beginning learners, the pragmatic recasts on the bi-clausal request conventions (e.g., *I was wondering if you could…*; *I'd be very grateful if you…; I'd really appreciate it if you…*) may not be particularly effective for beginning learners, because they are not likely to notice a discrepancy between their interlanguage and the target language during real-time interactions. Even if beginners do notice the linguistic discrepancy, they may not be able to incorporate the target language form into their interlanguage system. Additionally, beginning learners may be overwhelmed by the cognitive demands of processing a linguistic form as well as the mapping of the inextricably linked pragmatic components in dynamic interactions. The effects of pragmatic recasts on beginning learners are, nevertheless, an empirical question. Other pragmalinguistic forms may be more appropriate for recasts.

Despite the efficacy of the pragmalinguistic recasts as a group relative to the control group, the cognitive mapping of the PR participants was far from complete after the seven 50-minute treatments. The PR group's posttest indicated that the eight target forms constituted 72.72% of the items regardless of whether these forms were used in appropriate situations or not; 53.9% of the items were used in appropriate situations (either LL or ML). Hence, in this group, the eight target forms constituted 18.82% (= 72.72% – 53.9%) of all the items in inappropriate situations, which is indicative of their incomplete cognitive mapping. However, three PR participants contributed to the majority of this 18.82%, which was the primary reason for the high within-group variability as the standard deviations in Table 2 indicate. In short, these three particular participants did not benefit much from the recasts. This finding implies that the pragmalinguistic recasts interacted with individual factors, probably ones other than those which this study held constant—cultural background (Chinese), gender (female), age, and length of residence in an English-speaking country. A possible topic for future research then is to further explore the interactions between pragmalinguistic recasts and individual variables such as aptitude. Indeed, some researchers have conducted (de Graaff, 1997; Robinson, 1995, 1997, 2002) and recommended (DeKeyser, 2003; Skehan, 1998) empirical studies on the interaction between explicit/implicit learning and

aptitude on the syntactic level.

Research Question 2

We analyzed the HA data with a focus on the target forms (i.e., when a learner produced non-target forms that were grammatically correct, we excluded these HAs from the statistical analysis). This is because, in the treatment, only when a PR participant provided target request conventions that were grammatically inaccurate did the instructor give recasts to the linguistic forms. The ANOVA results showed that the PR group used the grammatically correct target forms substantially more often than did the control group. Overall, as Table 4 displays, in the PR group, the grammatically correct target forms constituted 41.56% of the items on the posttest (24.03% for the LL situations plus 17.53% for the ML situations). In contrast, in the control group, the grammatically correct target forms constituted 7.14% of the items (3.97% for the LL situations plus 3.17% for the ML situations). Hypothesis 2 was supported; because none of the learners produced the grammatically correct target forms on the pretest, the pragmatic recasts had a positive effect in their learning of the grammatically correct target request forms. Regarding effect size, the pragmatic recast treatment in relation to the control group in terms of grammatical accuracy had an effect size of 0.87, which is, again, considered a large effect (Cohen, 1988), and is similar to Norris and Ortega's (2000) finding. The average effect size of the four recast treatments was 0.81, two treatments being from Long et al. (1998), and the other two from Mackey and Philp (1998), all of which focused on syntax. Finally, the strength of association ($\eta^2 = 0.2608$) indicates that 26.08% of the variance in grammatically accurate use of the target request conventions was attributable to the treatment of the pragmalinguistic recasts.

The learners' success rate regarding grammatical accuracy was high. To illustrate this rate, let us compare the eight target forms that were used only pragmatically appropriately with the same eight target forms that were used appropriately in terms of pragmatics and correctly with respect to grammar. The posttest of the PR group (see Table 1) demonstrated that the eight target forms that were pragmatically appropriate constituted 53.9% of the items (32.47% for the LL situations plus 21.43% for the ML situations). Correspondingly, Table 4 shows that the pragmatically appropriate and grammatically correct eight target forms constituted 41.56% of the items (24.03% for the LL situations plus 17.53% for the ML situations). This disparity implies that, for the PR group, the eight target forms that were grammatically incorrect constituted only 12.34% (53.9% minus 41.56%) of the target items.

In terms of grammatical accuracy, we speculate that there were two reasons for the seeming success of pragmalinguistic recasts in aiding the learning of the target request conventions. The Chinese learners did not have to go through a syntactic analysis of the request HAs. Instead, they may have simply combined the linguistic chunks with some creative constituents since these request conventions may represent formulaic speech that learners process and use as unanalyzed units.

Grammatical correctness (along with high frequency and delimitation by pauses or hesitations) is a factor enabling identification of formulaic speech (Girard & Sionis, 2003; Raupach, 1984). Formulaic speech, as described by Hakuta (1974, 1976) and Krashen and Scarcella (1978), can involve routines (i.e., learners internalize whole utterances as memorized chunks) or patterns (i.e., learners learn part of the utterances as memorized chunks and produce them by combining them with other creative constituents). The request conventions for the present study seem to fall into the latter type. Furthermore, each of these formulaic speech types entails two elements to successfully function as a request: conventions that denote semantic structures that have a standardized illocutionary force and conventions that refer to particular linguistic formulations associated with an illocution (Clark, 1979; Kasper, 1995). An error analysis of grammatically incorrect target forms (i.e., in which the request conventions were used in an appropriate LL or ML situation, but were grammatically incorrect) in the PR group demonstrated that one particular participant combined *Would you mind …* with bare forms of verbs without ~ *ing* six times. This is a case in which this participant failed to combine a chunk with a creative constituent. Some participants used *Was it possible to …* instead of *Would it be possible to …*; others employed *I wonder if I can …* in place of *I was wondering if you …*. These pragmatically appropriate but grammatically incorrect examples seem to demonstrate that the Chinese learners stored and accessed these expressions as patterns.

A match between the teaching modes and the participants' learning styles might also have reinforced their learning of formulaic speech. The way the instructor taught the conventions seems to be in accordance with the way Chinese learners learned the linguistic forms of the conventions, although this cognitive learning remains speculative. The instructor orally presented the conventions without analyzing them grammatically in ongoing interactions; this instructional process may have guided many of the PR learners through a "cognitive window" (Doughty & Williams, 1998b) enabling the learners to process the conventions in a certain manner. In cognitive psychology, the exemplar-based processing model claims that individuals store memories of whole exemplars (Brooks, 1978, 1987; Jacoby & Brooks, 1984). Following this model, the present study was designed to assist the learners in storing memories of request conventions as whole exemplars through implicit feedback. Moreover, one of the defining characteristics of implicit learning is that the acquired knowledge is difficult to express (Berry, 1997; Berry & Dienes, 1993; Reber, 1967, 1989; Winter & Reber, 1994). The post-treatment questionnaire thus asked the Chinese learners to verbalize the rules of making requests, even though the instructor employed an implicit instructional technique. Only one of the 11 PR participants correctly articulated which request conventions are supposed to be used when speaking to "a person with a higher position" and "a person with a lower position." The juxtaposition of this low rate of their verbalization and the high rate of their appropriate use of the request conventions seems to be a reasonable indication of their implicit learning.[11]

In summary, learning through pragmalinguistic recasts involves the coordination of, at least, attention (Schmidt, 2001; Simard & Wong, 2001; Tomlin & Villa, 1994), cognitive comparison, exemplar-based processing, working memory, and cognitive mapping, which can lead to pragmatic restructuring.

CONCLUSION

This section addresses two issues: the validity of discourse completion tasks (DCTs) and the investigative scope of the study. This study employed DCTs, which are generally considered to have limited ecological validity, that is, the degree of correspondence in the ways participants behave in the laboratory (DCTs in this case) and the natural environment. The limited ecological validity of DCTs could be considered problematic, particularly when researchers investigate learners' use of speech acts. These limitations, however, may not be as serious to our study, which focuses on the acquisition of request HAs, as it is to empirical studies looking into speech act use. The reason is that, at this embryonic stage of pragmalinguistic recasting, we were interested in exploring what the participants *can* do (Wilkinson, 1995) as a result of the instruction rather than observing what they actually *do* in natural settings. On the post-instructional DCT, the participants could not produce HAs that were not in their repertoire, although their use of the target request HAs on the DCT does not necessarily mean that they will use them in natural settings. As Kasper (2000) observes, "When carefully designed, production questionnaires are useful to inform about speakers' pragmalinguistic knowledge of the strategies and linguistic forms by which communicative acts can be implemented." (p. 329). Learners of English in both ESL and EFL settings as well as native speakers of English employed similar types of request head acts across written DCTs and role-plays (Rintell & Mitchell, 1989; Sasaki, 1998). In short, we found DCTs to be a valid instrument to investigate the acquisition of pragmalinguistic knowledge of request HAs.

All research studies need to limit their investigative scope for practical reasons; the present study was no exception. The present study focused on the eight target forms of request conventions, four of which were considered appropriate for LL situations, and four of which were considred appropriate for ML situations. In spite of these associations between the target forms and their appropriate situations in the present study, the fact is that a speaker can make an appropriate request by using a HA not included in these target forms. The *Can/Could/Will/Would you ~* form is an example of this for the ML situations. Conversely, a speaker can make an inappropriate request by using one of the target forms, especially when internal and external modifications are not at a speaker's disposal. Therefore, this study may not have really cultivated the Chinese learners' sense of pragmatic appropriateness. The concept of request is holistic, and the eight target HA forms are a small part of the construct. By limiting the scope, the primary purpose of the study was not to remarkably improve the learners' interactional competence (e.g. their level of

pragmatic appropriateness), but to examine the effects of pragmatic recasts on their learning. It was our intention that the learners, through implicit feedback, would establish cognitive mappings of the linguistic target forms, the function (requesting), the situations (role-plays and DCT) in which the three sociolinguistic variables are embedded, and the appropriateness of the target request conventions. This study has indirectly demonstrated that the PR group actually did so.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our gratitude to the following people: Professor Wenpei Xu and the staff of the English Department at Heilongjing University, China, for their assistance, Mr. Ye Tian for his assistance with the pilot study in China, Professors Thomas Hill, Thom Hudson, Emily Detmer, James D. Brown, and the National Foreign Language Resource Center at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa (Director: Richard Schmidt) for granting us permission to use their DCT items, Professors Shuqiang Zhang, Gabriele Kasper, Catherine Doughty, Craig Chaudron, and James D. Brown, for their comments on an earlier version of this article, and the anonymous reviewers of *Issues in Applied Linguistics* for their insightful comments. Any errors or omissions are ours.

NOTES

[1] Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) define a Head Act as "the minimal unit which can realize a request; it is the core of the request sequence" (p. 275).

[2] Relative power is a complex construct, which may include age (Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1986; Snow, Perlmann, Gleason, & Hooshyar, 1990), gender (Holmes, 1990; Zimin, 1981), and speakers' relative social positions (Becker, Kimmel, & Bevill, 1989; Ervin-Tripp, O'Connor, & Rosemberg, 1984). According to Lakoff (1973), distance is a composite picture of social distance (a function of age, sex, and social status) and psychological distance (an interlocutor's perception of his or her relationship with others). The degree of imposition involves the legitimacy of a request and an interlocutor's willingness to accept the request (Herrmann, 1982).

[3] These eight target forms were derived from Fukuya and Clark (2001) and the pilot study of the present study. In the pilot study native speakers of American English took a discourse completion test. In addition, because many different but perfectly appropriate request conventions exist in any one context, we took other factors into consideration: (a) we eliminated query preparatory (*Can/Could/Will/Would you ~?*) and permission (*Can/Could/May I ~?*) in the ML situations because the participants presumably knew them, and (b) we excluded *Could you perhaps ...?* in the LL situations because it was not our intention to teach the function of hedges such as *perhaps* in this study (unlike Fukuya, 1998, and Wishnoff, 2000).

[4] In this framework, some exceptions exist: query preparatory (*Can you ~?*; *Would you ~?*) in ML scenarios. Although these request conventions are acceptable, we recasted these requests by using the target forms for an instructional purpose. On the last day of the experiment, the instructor mentioned to the students that although expressions

like *Can you ~?* and *Would you ~?* were appropriate for these situations, she implicitly corrected them for instructional purposes.

[5] Our use of *sí* in Spanish for Chinese learners has been criticized. We should have employed *OK* or *right* instead.

[6] We collected the 14 DCT items from Fukuya and Clark (2001), Fukuya et al. (1998), Hill (1997), and Hudson, Detmer, and Brown (1995). We not only revised most of the DCT situations to make them easier for a prospective Chinese target population to understand, but we also provided Chinese translations for some vocabulary words in the items. We then piloted these DCT items on two native speakers of American English in the U.S. and two Chinese learners of English in Harbin, China, whose English proficiency levels were presumably similar to the level of the target population.

[7] A few examples of our decision in terms of grammatical correctness are as follows: (a) Intensifiers, *very* and *really*, in I*'d be very grateful if you …* and *I'd really appreciate it if you …*, were optional. (b) Both *Do you mind if I …?* and *Would you mind if I …?* were awarded.

[8] We asked two more research questions: (RQ 3) Which linguistic assembly of request conventions, those associated with the LL or those associated with the ML are more learnable through pragmalinguistic recasts? Linguistic assembly signifies the two groups of request conventions. (RQ 4) Can pragmalinguistic recasts boost learners' confidence in making requests? For these questions, we conducted a repeated two-way ANOVA five times: (a) 2 (Group) X 2 (Linguistic assembly) on the pretest HA data in terms of pragmatic appropriateness; (b) 2 (Group) X 2 (Linguistic assembly) on the posttest HA data in terms of pragmatic appropriateness; (c) 2 (Group) X 2 (Linguistic assembly) on the posttest HA data in terms of pragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy; (d) 2 (Group) X 2 (Linguistic assembly) on the confidence-level pretest data; and (e) 2 (Group) X 2 (Linguistic assembly) on the confidence-level posttest data. We omitted a report on RQs 3 and 4 because of limited space.

[9] For the calculation of Cohen's (1988) *d*, descriptive statistics regarding the pragmatic appropriateness (for RQ 1) are as follows: treatment group (n = 11; Mean = 0.54; SD = 0.50) and control group (n = 9; Mean = 0.17; SD = 0.37).

[10] For the calculation of Cohen's (1988) *d*, descriptive statistics concerning the grammatical accuracy (for RQ 2) are as follows: treatment group (n = 11; Mean = 0.42; SD = 0.49) and control group (n = 9; Mean = 0.07; SD = 0.26).

[11] A word of caution is in order here. Learners' inability to state a rule does not necessarily mean that they have implicitly learned something. Conversely, just because learners can state a rule does not mean that they have explicitly learned it.

REFERENCES

Alcón, E. S. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *SYSTEM*, *33*(3), 417–475.

Ayoun, D. (2001). The role of negative and positive feedback in the second language acquisition of the *passe compose* and *imparfait*. *The Modern Language Journal*, *85*(2), 226–243.

Bacelar Da Silva, A. J. (2003). The effects of instruction on pragmatic development: Teaching polite refusals in English. *Second Language Studies*, *22*(1), 55–106. Retrieved from http://www.hawaii.edu/sls/uhwpesl/on-line_cat.html

Bachman, L. F. (1988). Problems in examining the validity of the ACTFL oral proficiency interview. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 10*, 149–164.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, S. A. (1982). The construct validation of some components of communicative proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*(4), 449–465.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, S. A. (1989). The construct validation of self-ratings of communicative language ability. *Language Testing, 6*(1), 14–25.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, S. A. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Becker, J. A., Kimmel, H. D., & Bevill, M. J. (1989). The interactive effects of request form and speaker status on judgments of requests. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *18*, 521–531.

Berry, D. (1997). Introduction. In D. Berry (Ed.), *How implicit is implicit learning?* (pp. 1–12). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Berry, D., & Dienes, Z. (1993). Towards a working characterization of implicit learning. In D. Berry & Z. Dienes (Eds.), *Implicit learning: Theoretical and empirical issues* (pp. 1–18). Hove, UK/Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Appendix: The CCSARP coding manual. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 273–294). Norwood, N J: Ablex.

Bouton, L. F. (1994). Can NNS skill in interpreting implicature in American English be improved through explicit instruction? – A Pilot study. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, vol. 5 (pp. 88–109). Urbana, IL: Division of English as an International Language Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Brooks, L. R. (1978). Nonanalytic concept formation and memory for instances. In E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and categorization* (pp. 169–211). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brooks, L. R. (1987). Decentralized control of categorization: The role of prior processing episodes. In U. Neisser (Ed.), *Concepts in conceptual development: Ecological and intellectual factors in categorization* (pp. 141–174). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

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

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language peda-

gogy. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 2–28). New York: Longman.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1–47.

Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *15*, 357–386.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specification. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *6*(2), 5–35.

Clark, H. H. (1979). Responding to indirect speech acts. *Cognitive Psychology*, *11*, 430–477.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cowan, N. (1988). Evolving conceptualizations of memory, storage, selective attention, and their mutual constraints within the human information processing system. *Psychological Bulletin, 104*, 163–191.

Cowan, N. (1993). Activation, attention, and short-term memory. *Memory and Cognition, 21*, 162–167.

de Graaff, R. (1997). *Differential effects of explicit instruction on second language acquisition*. The Hague: Holland Institute of Generative Linguistics.

DeKeyser, R. (2003). Implicit and explicit learning. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 313–348). Oxford/New York: Basil Blackwell.

Doughty, C. (2000). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206–257). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative Focus on Form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114–138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998a). Issues and terminology. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 1–11). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998b). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 197–261). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society*, *5*, 25–66.

Ervin-Tripp, S., & Gordon, D. (1986). The development of requests. In R. L. Schiefelbusch (Ed.), *Language competence: Assessment and intervention* (pp. 61–95). San Diego, CA: College-Hill.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M., O'Connor, M., & Rosemberg, J. (1984). Language and power in the family. In C. Kramarae, M. Schultz, & W. M. O'Barr (Eds.), *Language and power in the family* (pp. 116–135). Belmont, CA: Sage Press.

Eslami-Rasekh, Z., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Fatahi, A. (2004). The effect of explicit metalinguistic instruction on the speech act awareness of advanced EFL students. *TESL-EJ*, *8*(2), 1–12.

Fukuya, Y. J. (1998). *Consciousness-raising of downgraders in requests*. Paper presented

at Second Language Research Forum '98, University of Hawai'i at Manoa. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED466100)

Fukuya, Y. J., & Clark, M. K. (2001). A comparison of input enhancement and explicit instruction of mitigators. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, vol. 10 (pp. 111–130). Urbana, Ill: Division of English as an International Language Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Fukuya, Y. J., Reeve, M., Gisi, J., & Christianson, M. (1998). *Does Focus on Form work for teaching sociopragmatics*? Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 452736)

Garcia, P. (2004). Pragmatic comprehension of high and low level language learners. *TESL-EJ*, *8*(2), 1–14.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 11.0 update* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Girard, M., & Sionis, C. (2003). Formulaic speech in the L2 classroom: An attempt at identification and classification. *Pragmatics*, *13*(2), 231–251.

Hakuta, K. (1974). Prefabricated patterns and the emergence of structure in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, *24*(2), 287–297.

Hakuta, K. (1976). Becoming bilingual: A case study of a Japanese child learning English. *Language Learning*, *26*, 321–351.

Hassall, J. T. (1999). Request strategies in Indonesian. *Pragmatics*, *9*(4), 585–606.

Hassall, J. T. (2001). Modifying requests in a second language. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *39*, 259–283.

Herrmann, T. (1982). Language and situation: the *pars pro toto* principle. In C. Fraser & K. R. Scherer (Eds.), Advances in the social psychology of language (pp. 123–158). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, T. (1997). *The development of pragmatic competence in an EFL context*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Japan.

Holmes, J. (1990). Politeness strategies in New Zealand women's speech. In A. Bell & J. Holmes (Eds.), *New Zealand ways of speaking English* (pp. 252–276). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18*, 225–253.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1981). Zur Rolle der Kognition in Kommunikationskursen (The role of cognition in communication courses). *Die Neueren Sprachen*, *80*, 42–55.

Hudson, T., Detmer, E., & Brown, J. D. (1995). *Developing prototypic measures of cross-cultural pragmatics*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Jacoby, L. L., & Brooks, R. L. (1984). Nonanalytic cognition: Memory, perception, and concept learning. *The psychology of learning and motivation*, *18*, 1–47.

Kasper, G. (1995). Routine and indirection in interlanguage pragmatics. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, vol. 6 (pp. 59–78). Urbana, Ill: Division of English as an International Language Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Kasper, G. (2000). Data collection in pragmatics research. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking* (pp. 316–341). London & New York: Continuum.

Kasper, G. (2001a). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 33–60). Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.
Kasper, G. (2001b). Learning pragmatics in the L2 classroom. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (pp. 1–25). Urbana, Ill: Division of English as an International Language Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
Kasper, G., & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 317–334).
Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic development in a second language. *Language Learning: Supplement 1*, *52*.
King, K. A., & Silver, R. E. (1993). "Sticking points": Effects of instruction on NNS refusal strategies. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *9*, 47–82.
Koike, D. A., & Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in the development of pragmatic competence. *SYSTEM*, *33*(3), 481–501.
Kondo, S. (2001). Instructional effects on pragmatic development: Refusal by Japanese EFL learners. *Publications of Akenohoshi Women's Junior College*, *19*, 33–51.
Kondo, S. (2004). Raising pragmatic awareness in the EFL context. *Sophia Junior College Faculty Bulletin*, *24*, 49–72.
Krashen, D. S., & Scarcella, R. (1978). On routines and patterns in second language acquisition and performance. *Language Learning*, *28*, 283–300.
Kubota, M. (1995). Teachability of conversational implicature to Japanese EFL learners. *The Institute for Research in Language Teaching Bulletin*, *9*, 35–67.
Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness: Or minding your P's and Q's. In C. Corum, T. C. Smith-Stark, & A. Weiser (Eds.), *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 292–305). Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and second language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *25*(1), 37–63.
le Pair, R. (1996). Spanish request strategies: A cross-cultural analysis from an intercultural perspective. *Language Sciences*, *18*(3/4), 651–670.
Liddicoat, A. J., & Crozet, C. (2001). Acquiring French interactional norms through instruction. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 125–144). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
LoCastro, V. (1997). Pedagogical intervention and pragmatic competence development. *Applied Language Learning*, *8*(1), 75–109.
Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San Diego: Academic Press.
Long, M. H., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal, 82*(3), 357–371.
Long, M. H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15–41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lyster, R. (1994). The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion students' sociolinguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, *15*(3), 263–287.

Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, *82*(3), 338–356.

Martínez-Flor, A., & Fukuya, Y. J. (2005). The effects of instruction on learner's production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *SYSTEM*, *33*(3), 463–480.

Mito, K. (1993). *The effects of modelling and recasting on the acquisition of L2 grammar rules*. Unpublished manuscript.

Moroishi, M. (1999). Explicit vs. Implicit learning: Acquisition of the Japanese conjectural auxiliaries under explicit and implicit conditions. In N. O. Jungheim & P. Robinson (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd Pacific Second Language Research Forum*, *2*, Pragmatics and Pedagogy (pp. 217–230). Tokyo: Aoyama Gakuin University.

Morrow, K. C. (1995). *The pragmatic effects of instruction on ESL learners' production of complaint and refusal speech acts*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Muranoi, H. (1996). *Effects of interaction enhancement on restructuring of interlanguage grammar: A cognitive approach to foreign language instruction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University.

Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on form through interaction enhancement: Integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classrooms. *Language Learning*, *50*(4), 617–673.

Nelson, K. (1987). Some observations from the perspective of the rare event cognitive comparison theory of language acquisition. In K. E. Nelson & A. van Kleek (Eds.), *Children's language* (pp. 289–331). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Nicholas, H., Lightbown, M. P., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning*, *51*(4), 719–758.

Nonaka, K. (1998, February). Proficiency and request strategies: Is there a developmental path? Paper presented at 12th Pragmatics and Language Learning Conference, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, *50*(3), 417–528.

Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *17*(4), 459–481.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, D. A. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behavior. *TESL Canada Journal*, *7*(2), 45–65.

Pearson, E. L. (2001). *Pragmatics in foreign language teaching: The effects of instruction on L2 learners' acquisition of Spanish expressions of gratitude, apologies, and directives*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on "Noticing the gap." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *25*(1), 99–126.

Pienemann, M. (1998). *Language processing and second language development: Processability theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pienemann, M. (2003). Language processing capacity. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 679–714). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Rabie, R. S. (1996). *Negative feedback, modeling, and vocabulary acquisition in task-based interaction*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Raupach, M. (1984). Formulae in second language production. In W. H. Dechert, D. Mohle, & M. Raupach (Eds.), *Second language productions* (pp. 114–137). Tubingen:

Narr.
Reber, S. A. (1967). Implicit learning of artificial grammars. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, *77*, 317–327.
Reber, S. A. (1989). Implicit learning and tacit knowledge. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *118*(3), 219–235.
Rintell, E. M., & Mitchell, C. J. (1989). Studying requests and apologies: An inquiry into method. In J. H. S. Blum-Kulka & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 248–272). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
Robinson, P. (1995). Aptitude, awareness, and the fundamental similarity of implicit and explicit second language learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention & awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 303–358). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
Robinson, P. (1997). Individual differences and the fundamental similarity of implicit and explicit adult second language learning. *Language Learning, 47*, 45–99.
Robinson, P. (2002). Effects of individual differences in intelligence, aptitude and working memory on adult incidental SLA: A replication and extension of Reber, Walkenfield and Hernstadt (1991). In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Individual differences and instructed language learning* (pp. 211–266). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Rose, K R. (1993). Sociolinguistic consciousness-raising through video. *The Language Teacher*, *17*, 7–9.
Rose, K. R. (1994). Pragmatic consciousness-raising in an EFL context. In L. F. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, vol. 5 (pp. 52–63). Urbana, Ill: Division of English as an International Language Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
Rose, K. R. (1997). Pragmatics in the classroom: Theoretical concerns and practical possibilities. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, vol. 8 (pp. 267–295). Urbana, Ill: Division of English as an International Language Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
Rose, K. R. (1999). Teachers and students learning about requests in Hong Kong. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 167–180). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rose, K. R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *22*(1), 27–67.
Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *SYSTEM*, *33*(3), 385–399.
Rose, K. R., & Ng, C. K. (2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 145–170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Safont, M. P. J. (2003). Instructional effects on the use of request acts modificatoin devices by EFL learners. In A. F. Martínez, J. E. Usó, & A. G. Fernández (Eds.), *Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching* (pp. 211–232). Castelló, Spain: Universitat Jaume I.
Safont, M. P. J. (2004). An analysis on EAP learners' pragmatic production: A focus on request forms. *Iberica*, *8*. 23–39.
Safont, M. P. J. (2005). *Third language learners. Pragmatic production and awareness*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Safont, M. P., & Alcón, E. (2001). Elicitation instruments in analyzing the use of requestive strategies by foreign language learners of English. In E. González-Álvarez & A. Rollings (Eds.), *Studies in Contrastive Linguistics. Proceedings of the 2nd Interna-*

tional Contrastive Linguistics Conference (pp. 925–933). Santiago de Compostela, Spain: Servizo de Publicacións da Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.

Salazar, P. C. (2003). Pragmatic instruction in the EFL context. In A. F. Martínez, J. E. Usó, & A. G. Fernández (Eds.), *Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching* (pp. 233–246). Castelló, Spain: Universitat Jaume I.

Sasaki, M. (1998). Investigating EFL students' production of speech acts: A comparison of production questionnaires and role plays. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *30*, 457–484.

Saxton, M. (1997). The contrast theory of negative input. *Journal of Child Language*, *24*, 139–161.

Saxton, M., Kulcsar, B., Marshall, G., & Rupra, M. (1998). Longer-term effects of corrective input: An experimental approach. *Journal of Child Language*, *25*, 701–721.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129–158.

Schmidt, R. (1993a). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13*, 206–226.

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

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. N. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237–326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Sharwood-Smith, M. (1991). Speaking to many minds: On the relevance of different types of language information for the L2 learner. *Second Language Research*, *7*(2), 118–132.

Sharwood-Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *15*(2), 165–179.

Shaw, P., & Trosborg, A. (2000). Sorry does not pay my bills: customer complaints in a cross cultural setting. In D. Lynch & A. Pilbeam (Eds.), *Heritage and progress. From the past to the future in intercultural understanding* (pp. 204–214). Bath, UK: LTS training and consulting in association with SIETAR Europa.

Simard, D., & Wong, W. (2001). Alertness, orientation, and detection. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *23*, 103–124.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Snow, C. E., Perlmann, R. Y., Gleason, J. B., & Hooshyar, N. (1990). Developmental perspectives on politeness: Sources of children's knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *14*(2), 289–305.

Swain, M. (1984). Large-scale communicative testing: A case study. In S. Savignon & M. Berns (Eds.), *Initiatives in communicative language teaching: A book of readings* (pp. 185–201). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp.

171–199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Takahashi, S, (2005). Noticing in task performance and learning outcomes: A qualitative analysis of instructional effects in interlanguage pragmatics. *SYSTEM*, *33*(3), 437–461.
Takimoto, M. (in press). The effects of explicit feedback on the development of pragmatic proficiency. *Second Language Research*.
Tateyama, Y. (2001). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatics routines: Japanese *sumimasen*. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 200–222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tateyama, Y., Kasper, G., Mui, L. P., Tay, H., & Thananart, O. (1997). Explicit and implicit teaching of Japanese pragmatics routines. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning* vol. 8 (pp. 163–177). Urbana, Ill: Division of English as an International Language Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
Taylor, G. (2002). Teaching gambits: The effect of instruction and task variation on the use of conversation strategies by intermediate Spanish students. *Foreign Language Annals*, *35*(2), 171–189.
Tomlin, R., & Villa, V. (1994). Attention in cognitive science and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *16*(2), 183–203.
Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints, and apologies*. Berlin: Mouton DeGruyter.
Trosborg, A. (2003). The teaching of business pragmatics. In A. F. Martínez, J. E. Usó, & A. G. Fernández (Eds.), *Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching* (pp. 247–281). Castelló, Spain: Universitat Jaume I.
van Mulken, M. (1996). Politeness markers in French and Dutch requests. *Language Sciences*, *18*(3/4), 689–702.
VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993a). Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *15*(2), 225–243.
VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993b). Input processing and second language acquisition: A role for instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *77*, 45–57.
Verhoeven, L., & Vermeer, A. (1992). Modeling communicative second language competence. In L. Verhoeven & J. H. A. L. De Jong (Eds.), *The construct of language proficiency* (pp. 163–173). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
Verhoeven, L., & Vermeer, A. (2002). Communicative competence and personality dimensions in first and second language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *23*, 361–374.
Wildner-Bassett, M. A. (1984). *Improving pragmatic aspects of learners' interlanguage*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
Wildner-Bassett, M. A. (1986). Teaching "polite noises": Improving advanced adult learners' repertoire of gambits. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Learning, teaching and communication in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 163–178). Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
Wildner-Bassett, M. A. (1994). Intercultural pragmatics and proficiency: 'Polite' noises for cultural appropriateness. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *32*(1), 5–17.
Wilkinson, J. (1995). Direct observation. In G. M. Breakwell, S. Hammond, & C. Fife-Schaw (Eds.), *Research methods in psychology* (pp. 213–229). London: SAGE Publications.
Winter, B., & Reber, A. (1994). Implicit learning and the acquisition of natural languages.

In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 115–145). London: Academic Press.

Wishnoff, R. J. (2000). Hedging your bets: L2 learners' acquisition of pragmatic devices in academic writing and computer-mediated discourse. *Second Language Studies*, *19*, 119–157. Working Papers of the Department of Second Language Studies, University of Hawai'i at Manoa. http://www.hawaii.edu/sls/uhwpesl/on-line cat.html

Yoshimi, D. R. (2001). Explicit instruction and JFL learner's use of interactional discourse markers. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 223–244). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zimin, S. (1981). Sex and politeness: factors in first- and second- language use. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, *27*, 35–58.

APPENDIX A: TARGET FEATURES AND LEARNING CONTEXTS IN INTERVENTIONIST STUDIES

Target feature	Study	L1	L2 and context
Discourse markers and strategies	House & Kasper (1981)	German	EFL in Germany
	Yoshimi (2001)	Mainly English	JFL in the U.S.
Pragmatic routines	Tateyama (2001)	Mainly English	JFL in the U.S.
	Tateyama et al. (1997)	Mixed	JFL in the U.S.
	Taylor (2002)	English	SFL in the U.S.
	Wildner-Bassett (1984, 1986)	German	EFL in Germany
	Wildner-Bassett (1994)	English	GFL in the U.S.
Pragmatic fluency	House (1996)	German	EFL in Germany
Implicatures	Bouton (1994)	Mixed	ESL in the U.S.
	Kubota (1995)	Japanese	EFL in Japan
Sociostylistic variation	Lyster (1994)	English	French immersion in Canada
Interactional norms	Liddicoat & Crozet (2001)	English	FFL in Australia
Hedges in academic writing	Wishnoff (2000)	Mixed	ESL in the U.S.
Politeness in requesting opinions and dis/agreeing	LoCastro (1997)	Japanese	EFL in Japan
Apologies	Olshtain & Cohen (1990)	Hebrew	EFL in Israel
Complaints	Shaw & Trosborg (2000)	Danish	EFL in Denmark
	Trosborg (2003)	Danish	EFL in Denmark
Compliments and compliment responses	Billmyer (1990)	Japanese	ESL in the U.S.
	Rose & Ng (2001)	Cantonese	EFL in Hong Kong
Refusals	Bacelar Da Silva (2003)	Mixed	ESL in the U.S.
	King & Silver (1993)	Mixed	ESL in the U.S.
	Kondo (2001, 2004)	Japanese	EFL in Japan
Requests	Alcón (2005)	Spanish	EFL in Spain
	Fukuya (1998)	Mixed	ESL in the U.S.
	Fukuya & Clark (2001)	Mixed	ESL in the U.S.
	Fukuya et al (1998)	Mixed	ESL in the U.S.
	Fukuya & Hill (the present study)	Chinese	EFL in China
	Safont (2003, 2004, 2005)	Spanish	EFL in Spain
	Safont & Alcón (2001)	Spanish	EFL in Spain
	Salazar (2003)	Spanish	EFL in Spain
	Takahashi (2001, 2005)	Japanese	EFL in Japan
	Takimoto (in press)	Japanese	EFL in Japan
Suggestions	Koike & Pearson (2005)	English	SFL in the U.S.
	Martínez–Flor & Fukuya (2005)	Spanish	EFL in Spain

Multiple speech acts	Eslami-Rasekh et al. (2004)	Persian	EFL in Iran
	Morrow (1995)	Mixed	ESL in the U.S.
	Pearson (2001)	English	SFL in the U.S.

Note. ESL = English as a Second language. EFL = English as a Foreign language. FFL = French as a Foreign language. GFL = German as a Foreign language. JFL = Japanese as a Foreign language. SFL = Spanish as a Foreign language.

APPENDIX B: EXAMPLES OF LL AND ML ROLE-PLAY SCENARIOS

A LL scenario: You are revising your thesis, which is due in two weeks. You need five articles recently published on your topic, *The Computer of the 21st Century*. Although the library on campus does not have them, the library can ask other libraries in other states to send you the copies. It usually takes at least one month to receive them. Because these five papers deal with the recent development of your topic, it will add much weight to your thesis if you include them. This will also increase the chance of getting your paper published. You go to the head of the Book Management Office (Miss. Anderson) to ask her to get these five articles in one week.

A ML scenario: You are the director of a computer lab. A graduate assistant, Joan, is instructed to delete trash files from the computer every day. Today you wanted to install software onto the computer. However, you found out that the trash files took too much space. It seems that Joan has not deleted the trash files for several days. You ask Joan to delete them immediately.

Yoshinori J. Fukuya is interested in interlanguage pragmatics and L2 classroom research. His research articles have appeared in journals such as *Language Learning*, *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, and *SYSTEM*.

Yao Zhang Hill is pursuing a Ph.D. in second language acquisition at University of Hawai‘i at Manoa. She is interested in language assessment, program evaluation, TBLT, and learner motivation and self-regulation.