THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTION ON PRAGMATIC DEVELOPMENT: TEACHING POLITE REFUSALS IN ENGLISH

ANTONIO JOSÉ BACELAR DA SILVA

University of Hawai'i

ABSTRACT

This study was set up to further investigate whether relatively explicit instruction may be facilitative for L2 pragmatic development, and the most appropriate and effective ways to deliver the pragmatic information to L2 learners. Adopting a pre-test/post-test design with treatment and control groups, it incorporated metapragmatic awareness into task-based methodological principles in its instructional treatment in order to teach the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic components of the speech act of refusals. Fourteen low-intermediate learners from various L1s (Japanese, Chinese, Taiwanese, Serbian, and Portuguese) were randomly assigned to both control (7) and treatment (7) groups. Data, collected by means of role-play, were transcribed, and a qualitative discourse analytic approach was used to examine the learning outcomes in the treatment group as compared to the control group. The findings illustrate that the instructional approach enhanced the L2 pragmatic ability of performing the speech act in focus. This suggests that L2 pedagogy which aims at providing learners with metapragmatic information associated with meaningful opportunities for language use may result in gains in learners' L2 pragmatic development.

INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) from an acquisitional perspective. More specifically, it investigates the effects of instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic knowledge by learners of English as a second language. Though, as Kasper and Schmidt (1996) point out, universals of language pragmatics may facilitate the development of interlanguage pragmatics (ILP), it has been observed that L2 learners display a noticeably different L2 pragmatic system than the native speakers of the L2, both in production and comprehension (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Kasper, 1997). There is evidence that this is true even among advanced L2 learners. One possible explanation for that is that learners, on the one hand, may either hesitate to transfer the L1 strategies that may be universal or at least common to L2, or, on the other hand, transfer

strategies, assuming them to be universal, thus transferable, when actually it is not the case (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, p. 155). In conclusion, instruction on L2 pragmatics is necessary at every level of learners' proficiency. The good news is that, studies that have attempted to teach pragmatic features of the L2, Kasper (1997), Kasper and Rose (1999), and Kasper (2001aa; 2001bb), have concluded that L2 pragmatics is teachable.

Interventional ILP Studies

A great amount of Instructed Second Language Acquisition research of the quasi-experimental and experimental effects of instruction type has appeared in the past decade (Doughty, in press). However, the number of studies which have investigated instructed L2 pragmatic acquisition and interlanguage pragmatic development is still limited (Kasper 2001a, 2001b). Also limited is the scope of pragmatic features investigated so far, as can be seen in Table 1 [for a complete review of these studies, refer to Kasper (1997), Kasper (2001a & 2001b), and Rose & Kasper (2001)].

Table 1

Interventional Studies to Date

Pragmatic routines	Wildner-Bassett (1994), House (1996), and Yoshimi (2001)
Apologies	Olshtain & Cohen (1990) and Tateyama (2001)
Implicatures	Bouton (1994) and Kubota (1995)
Compliments	Billmyer (1990), LoCastro (2000), and Rose & Ng Kwai-fun (2001)
Requests	LoCastro (1997), Fukuya & Clark (2001), and Takahashi (2001)
Socio-stylistic variation	Lyster (1994)
Hedges in academic writing	Wishnoff (2000)
Interactional norms	Liddicoat & Crozet (2001)
Refusals	King and Silver (1993); Morrow (1996), and Kondo (2001)

The majority of these studies have yielded findings which favor explicit approaches to the teaching of L2 pragmatics. In a recent quantitative synthesis and meta-analysis of studies on the effects of instruction on various linguistic features conducted between the years of 1980 and 1998, Norris and Ortega (2000) reported that explicit instruction proved to be more effective among the 49 studies included in their analysis. Though only two studies, Bouton (1994) and Kubota (1995), out of the 49 studies included in their pool, investigated the effects of explicit instruction on L2 pragmatics, Norris and Ortega have shown that in general focused L2 instruction results in large gains over the course of the intervention, both comparing performances from pre-tests to posttests and between

treatment and control groups' performances on outcome measures. They have also shown that L2 instruction seems durable and that explicit instruction procedures are more facilitative than implicit ones.

However, as Norris and Ortega (2000, p. 501) also point out, the interpretation of the cumulative findings for explicit/implicit instructional treatments should be tempered by several methodological observations. Testing of learning outcomes usually favors explicit treatments by asking learners to engage in explicit memory tasks and/or in discrete, decontextualized L2 use; the explicit treatments are typically more intense and varied than the implicit ones; and, implicit treatments may require longer-post intervention observation periods for non-linear learning curves to be detected (p. 501). (Doughty, in press) also discusses the research biases in favor of explicit types of treatment, which, according to her, has constituted a threat to the construct validity of the L2 instructional treatments and measures reviewed in Norris and Ortega. Bardovi-Harlig (1999) points out that, though studies on the effects of instruction on ILP have also revealed that explicit instruction may be facilitative for L2 pragmatic development, the most appropriate and effective ways to deliver the pragmatic information and the manner in which learners integrate such information into a developing interlanguage remain empirical questions.

This study takes the methodological issues in the previous paragraph into consideration, more specifically, the ones regarding outcome measures and construct validity, and aims at providing further evidence of the how instructed L2 learners may be helped regarding their developing L2 pragmatic ability. More specifically, I intend to investigate the effects of focused instruction on ESL learners' refusal strategies during role-play performance.

Previous Effect of Instruction Studies on English Refusals

To my knowledge, only three interventional studies on L2 pragmatic development to date have searched for evidence of the effect of instruction on learners' acquisition of polite refusal strategies. King and Silver (1993) present the findings of a study of refusals in English. In a pre-test/post-test treatment and control group design, they taught polite refusal strategies to six intermediate level learners of ESL (four native speakers of Japanese, one of Spanish, and one of Greek). Their treatment consisted of a discussion of

personal experience, reading and analysis of dialogs, explicit teaching, and role-plays during a seventy-minute class. Although the researchers had planned output practice through role-playing activities, because of time constraints, the learners only had limited opportunity for output practice. The control group did not receive any instruction on refusals. The study used a discourse completion questionnaire as pre-test and post-test. Besides the DCT, they also used telephone talks as delayed post-test. The results showed little effect of instruction on the written post-test and no effect on the delayed post-test. The authors speculate that if they had included presentation of natural data and/or a listening component as input as well as output practice opportunities in their instructional treatment, which would match up to telephone talk data collection technique, their study would have produced better results on the two outcome measures.

Morrow (1996) investigated the effect of instruction on learners' production of refusal and complaint speech acts. He adopted an explicit approach (metapragmatic judgment tasks, model dialogs, explanation of the semantic formulas, games, controlled output practice, and role-plays). The treatment lasted three hours and thirty minutes. His study followed a pre-test/post-test design, including a delayed post-test six months later. He did not use a control group. In order to assess learners' previous knowledge, two questionnaires were administrated: a pragmatic appropriateness judgment test and a pragmatic ability self-report. As outcome measures he used role-plays with holistic ratings. The data were analyzed using holistic ratings of clarity and politeness as well as comparison of pre-test and post-test distributions of discourse features with those of native English speakers. Statistical tests showed that participants in his study improved both in clarity and politeness, which were observed in comparisons between pre- and post-tests holistic mean scores on immediate post-tests. The comparison between pre-test and delayed post-test did not display a significant difference. He explains that he could not assess whether the gains were maintained up to post-test carried out six months after the treatment because of the small number of participants who came for the posttest and also due to the possible effect of naturalistic learning that happened between post-tests. The results on the immediate post-test then suggest that the instructional treatment in Morrow's study helped participants to perform complaints and refusals more clearly and more politely, and, to a limited extent, more native-like.

Kondo (2001) reports the findings of a study involving thirty-five Japanese learners of English (TOEIC average equaled 303) who were taught refusals in English. The study adopted a pre-post/post-test design without a control group. The instructional component consisted of implicit/explicit teaching, including models, explicit explanation, analysis of semantic formulas, controlled/free practice, and cross-cultural comparison, followed by discussion. A pre-test/post-test oral DCT was administered. Results showed a change toward the pattern of American English refusals, but, even after instruction, the Japanese learners of English (JE) retained some characteristics of their pragmatic behavior which they strongly prefer in the L1: Statement of regret, though approximating American English speakers, was still more frequent among JE.

These three studies showed some evidence of the effectiveness of instruction. King and Silver (1993) and Kondo (2001), though, acknowledged methodological limitations in the instructional components and data-collection strategies. In King and Silver (1993), the teaching approach was not clearly described, so it is hard to evaluate whether the limited effects of the instruction may have been due to inappropriate teaching. As Doughty (1983) points out, the difficulties in demonstrating the strengths of instruction in SLA acquisition lies in the failure to operationalize, or even describe the instructional component. In King and Silver's study, there was also a mismatch between the demands of one of the data-collection sessions, the telephone conversation, and presumable expected outcomes in the training sessions in study. Though Kondo's (2001) teaching approach was clearly presented, she acknowledges as a pitfall in her study the fact that the outcome measure did not elicit interactional data, which would better reflect the contexts in which language is really spoken; nor did it include a control group, which might have corroborated the effects of instruction as measured by the DCT. Similarly, Morrow (1996) did not include a control condition, as mentioned earlier, which would have made it possible to determine whether the effects found were really due to the treatment. Interestingly, the author points out that there were occasions in which the participants exhibited high linguistics skills yet were quite direct and impolite. Morrow adds that, since he did not use any kind of self-report data, it was not possible to identify whether the participants acted that way because they did not know how to perform appropriately (pragmalinguistic ability) or whether they did not know that they should

perform more politely in a given situation (sociopragmatic ability). As will be seen later, the present study included an immediate retrospective recall questionnaire in order to tap into learners thinking during the planning phase and during the actual acting out of the role-plays as a means to assess the effects of instruction on their sociopragmatic ability.

THIS STUDY

The Target of Instruction

According to Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990, p. 56), refusals are a major "sticking point" for nonnative speakers and are complex in nature. Gass and Houck (1999) add that part of the complexity of refusals lies in the fact that they may involve a long negotiated sequence and that, because they function as second pair part, they preclude extensive planning on the part of the refuser. Beebe et al. also comment that the risk of face-threat is so inherent to the speech act of refusal that some degree of indirectness is usually required. Also, refusals are sensitive to context variables such as relative status and distance of the interlocutors. They consist of a sequence of semantic formulae, varying in content, order, and frequency, depending on the eliciting speech act (invitation, request, offer, or suggestion). There are several features in refusal strategies that differentiate refusals by native speakers of American English from refusals by speakers of other L1s. This study focuses on refusals to invitations. In spite of Beebe et al.'s conclusion that refusals to invitations display more cross-cultural similarities than refusals to offers and suggestions, at least between Japanese and Americans, I have decided to teach this particular type of refusals to a group of beginners-to-low intermediate ESL learners, following Olshtain and Cohen's (1990, p. 50) argument that "regardless of the similarity between the general strategies for a particular speech act […], beginners in second language acquisition will need to familiarize themselves with the best equivalents in the target language to the explicit semantic formulas of their own language since straightforward translation does not usually work too well". What follows is a brief comparative discussion of this type of refusal to invitations, as realized by native speakers of American English, Japanese, Chinese, and Korean.

According to Beebe et al. (1990), regarding the order of the semantic formulae, both American English and Japanese speakers tended to begin refusals to invitations with adjuncts such as *well*, *thank you*, and *I'd love to go*, but the Japanese learners of English generally omitted expression of apology or regret when the refuser was higher in status, whereas the native speakers of American English tended to put an expression of regret into second position, right after a hesitation token, when in higher status position. Also, in contrast with the Japanese speakers, the American English speakers ordered refusal semantic formulae the same way in both lower and higher status positions. Among the American English speakers, negotiation is longer with status equal with familiar interlocutors (friends and acquaintances) than with intimates or strangers. Japanese speakers perceived the appropriateness of content and frequency more often than they did the order of semantic formulae.

As for the frequency and content of formulae, Beebe et al. (1990) point out that, in contrast with Japanese speakers, American English speakers did not set conditions, alternatives, and promises at all. They favored the statement of regret and used more formulae with acquaintances. Lyuh (1992) found out that native speakers of Korean normally used more semantic formulae and more polite strategies per response than native speakers of American English. Also, Korean speakers used more avoidance and gratitude formulae than native speakers of American English. The latter often used reference to their personal decisions and preferences in their excuses and preferences whereas the former resorted to circumstances beyond their control, de-personalizing their explanations. In addition, plain refusal such as *no* and *thank you* were rarely used by Korean speakers because, as Lyuh states, they are highly face-threatening. Finally, as for content of formulas, excuses were present for all groups, but they were less specific for Japanese and Korean speakers alike. Korean refusals were more elaborate, more indirect, and more accommodating to face needs. Regarding Chinese refusals to invitations, reason was the most frequently used refusal strategy, followed by alternative and direct refusal. This order of preference changed when refusing invitations, in which situation direct refusals were the second most preferred strategy. Chinese speakers' reasons for refusals could be considered specific, referring to prior commitments or obligations which went beyond the speaker's control. Direct refusals in Chinese were the most explicit and were

considered a very effective refusal strategy. As for statements of regret in Chinese refusals, in contrast to American refusals, they were less frequent and came at the end of the sequence (Chen, Lei, & Zhang, 1995). As we have seen, American patterns for refusals are quite consistent regardless of status level, thus, as Morrow (1996, p. 37) points out, it may be concluded that native speakers of American English tend to begin their refusal realization with *positive opinion*, e.g., *I'd like to* followed by *regret,* and conclude with *excuse*. This particular refusal pattern was chosen as the target of instruction in the current study.

Theoretical Framework, Methodological Principles, and Pedagogical Procedures

Searching for ways of resolving some of the methodological issues raised by Norris and Ortega (2000) and Doughty (in press), I have examined the literature and attempted to take the necessary steps in order to improve the construct validity of the instructional component. What follows is the presentation of the theoretical framework along with the methodological principles which have informed the present study.

Metapragmatic awareness in language use. In a recent discussion of metapragmatic awareness in language use, Verschueren (2000) argues that metalanguage should be seen from two perspectives: as an identifiable object, or language about language, and as a dimension of language, to be found in all language use, thus expanding the relevance of metalanguage. He adds that while the usefulness of the former notion is very limited, the latter is absolutely necessary. Its necessary relation to usage phenomena (the proper domain of linguistic pragmatics), he points out, is a reason to call the study of the metalinguistic dimension of language metapragmatics.

> Being a crucial aspect of what goes on when language is used (whether in uttering or in interpreting), pragmatic analyses have to come to terms with the role of consciousness, awareness, or salience—whatever the preferred term may be—in order to understand linguistic behavior. […] In other words, language users know more or less what they are doing when using language. Self-monitoring, at whatever level of salience, is always going on (p. 444)

"Knowing what they are doing" is to be understood as metapragmatic awareness, which comes in different degrees, depending on the pragmatic feature in question, i.e., more awareness might be present in the case of hedges or speech act verbs, less awareness in the case of many contextualization cues or deictic expressions.

Metapragmatic knowledge in L2 learning. Schmidt (1990) discusses the role of consciousness in second language learning. He starts by delimiting the scope of his thesis, which he states as pertaining to what learners do with input and to the role of consciousness in the learning process. Though acknowledging that both conscious and unconscious processes are involved in SL learning, he contends that conscious processes are a necessary condition for one step in the language learning process and facilitative for other aspects of learning. This one step Schmidt referred to is 'noticing', but he dissociates the concept of noticing from the common concept of consciousness because, besides entailing awareness at the experiential level, the concept of consciousness also entails explicit or declarative knowledge. For Schmidt (1990; 1993; 1995; 2001), 'noticing' has nothing to do with explicit or declarative knowledge because, as he puts it (personal communication, April 2003), "it is about online processing, not what one knows". He defines 'noticing' as focused awareness, referring to private experience, which may or may not be reportable. He also introduces 'understanding', another type of mental process, but at a higher level of awareness compared to 'noticing', though still at the level of experiential awareness, and not compared with the level of awareness involved in explicit or declarative knowledge. Thus far then, according to Schmidt's contention, awareness at the level of noticing and at the level of understanding is distinguished from the explicit, declarative knowledge type of awareness.

Schmidt (1993) extends this discussion about consciousness and learning to the field of Interlanguage Pragmatics. He focuses on the ways consciousness may be involved in learning the principles of discourse and pragmatics in a second language. He argues that pragmatic knowledge seems to be partly conscious and partly accessible to consciousness (p. 23). At this point, Schmidt returns to the distinction between 'noticing' and 'understanding' by saying that, citing Bowers (1984), "[w]hen we speak of consciousness as awareness, there is also a question of the degree or level of awareness. We may mean

that we simply noticed the occurrence of something or that we had a more abstract understanding of it" (p. 23). He reinforces his distinction between noticing (registering the simple occurrence of some event, i.e., what linguistic material is stored in memory) and understanding (recognition of a general principle, rule, or pattern, i.e., how the material is organized into a linguistic system). He adds that what he had been defending so far, regarding the role of awareness in L2 learning, was also relevant for the learning of pragmatics. He raises the following points: first, learners need to *notice* the specific relevant pragmalinguistic and contextual features of an event in order to trigger encoding, and that attention to input is a necessary condition for any learning at all, and that what must be attended to is not input in general, but whatever features of the input play a role in the system to be learned; second, consciously paying attention to linguistic features of the input and attempting to analyze their significance in terms of deeper generalizations are both highly facilitative; third, simple exposure to sociolinguistically appropriate input is unlikely to be sufficient, for second language acquisition of pragmatic functions is sometimes opaque to language learners and because the relevant contextual factors to be noticed are likely to be defined differently or may be son-salient for the learners.

The following two points also raised by Schmidt still in the same paper seem at first problematic in terms of where they fit within his theorization: Fourth, explicit teacher-provided information about the pragmatics of the second language can also play a role in learning, provided that it is accurate and not based solely on fallible native speaker intuitions (p. 36); and last, a consciousness-raising approach to pragmatics is justifiable (p. 36). The question here is whether he is still talking about awareness at the level of 'noticing' in these two last points, or whether, in the case of L2 pragmatic learning, awareness at the level of explicit or declarative knowledge may play a role.

Later, Schmidt (1995) associates *understanding* with explicit learning (learning on the basis of conscious knowledge, insights, and hypothesis) (p. 1), and that while all aspects of language learning require some degree of focal attention, different aspects may require more or less of it. It seems that, in contrast to his 1990 paper in which *understanding* was kept separate from explicit declarative knowledge, in this present paper (1995, p. 29, referring to Slobin, 1985; 1985), *understanding* takes on a new dimension:

I use 'noticing' to mean conscious registration of the occurrence of some event, whereas 'understanding,' as I am using the term, implies recognition of a general principle, rule, or pattern. Noticing refers to surface level phenomena and item learning, while understanding refers to deeper level of abstraction related to (semantic, syntactic, or communicative) meaning, system learning.

Further in the same paper, he clarifies the relationship between the "Noticing Hypothesis" and the learning of L2 pragmatics:

In pragmatics, awareness that on a particular occasion someone says to their interlocutor something like, "I'm terribly sorry to bother you, but if you have time could you look at this problem?" is a matter of noticing. Relating the various forms used to their strategic deployment in the service of politeness and recognizing their co-occurrence with elements of context such as social distance, power, level of imposition, and so on, are all matters of understanding. (p. 30)

It seems, then, that L2 pragmatic teaching should aim at both levels of awareness, 'noticing' and 'understanding', and that by understanding he means explicit or declarative knowledge.

More recently, Schmidt (2001) states that:

[M]y intention is to separate 'noticing' from 'metalinguistic awareness' as clearly as possible, by assuming that the objects of attention and noticing are elements of the surface structure of utterances in the input—instances of language, rather than any abstract rules or principles of which such instances may be exemplars. (p. 5)

It seems clear, then, that associating a metapragmatic type of instruction with Schmidt's 'Noticing' Hypothesis is not appropriate. Metapragmatic awareness is at the level of "understanding" (according to its recently evolved meaning) and can be accomplished through explicit teaching. In conclusion, metapragmatic awareness may be one of the goals of L2 pragmatic teaching, a view which is in line with Schmidt's (1993; 1995) ideas regarding the same matter.

Finally, the role of metapragmatic awareness, in the perspectives of Verschueren (2000) and Schmidt (1993; 1995), has important implications for L2 pragmatic teaching and research. Considering that learners need to pay attention to input, look for contextual clues as to why target language speakers say what they say, compare what they say with

what the target language speakers say in similar contexts, and focus on what specific forms are used a given context, the question is what type of instructional treatment would be the most suitable in assisting learners in their process of L2 pragmatic development. This is exactly what this study aims to investigate.

Methodological principles. In order to base the instructional procedures in this study on the theoretical orientations mentioned above as well as on recent empirical findings in second language acquisition research for the teaching of second languages, I have relied on the methodological principles (MP) of Task-Based Language Teaching (Doughty & Long, to appear; Long, 1985, and elsewhere) in assisting with operationalizing the treatment in this study. It is important to note at this point that these MP needed to be adjusted to cater for the specificities of interlanguage pragmatic development, as mentioned in the previous discussion. My ultimate goal in this study is to provide learners with opportunities which suit their communicative needs, assisting them in the development of their repertoire of pragmalinguistic forms and in their ability to make choices regarding the appropriateness of these forms to contextual and social factors in a given situation.

Again, since originally these MP do not address crucial issues regarding L2 pragmatic learning, I will discuss each of them here, as laid out by Doughty and Long (to appear), in the light of previous considerations in the field of L2 pragmatic teaching. In Table 2, I have included the MPs followed by a general description of the procedures adopted in the instructional treatment. Following Table 2, I provide detailed considerations regarding each MP and its role in L2 pragmatic instruction.

Table 2

Methodological Principles and Outline of the Treatment Procedures

Methodological Principles	*Treatment Procedures*
1. Use tasks, not texts, as unit of analysis.	Listening to genuine examples of realization of speech acts for refusing invitations by native speakers of Am. English; Listening for fragments of refusal realizations elaborated by means of focus questions. Role-playing aspects of the tasks themselves.
2. Promote learning by doing	Performing speech acts during role-playing an invitation/refusal situation.
3. Elaborate input	Focusing attention on speech act realizations in genuine interactions by means of focus questions.

		Modifying discourse to make it more comprehensible during learner-leaner interaction in role-plays.
4.	Provide rich input	Listening to genuine samples of interaction during invitation/refusals episodes
5.	Encourage inductive chunk learning	Focusing on pragmalinguistic chunks accompanied by comprehension/form focused questions
		Resorting to formulaic expressions to accomplish speech act goals
6.	Focus on form	Focusing attention on pragmalinguistic forms of speech acts.
7.	Provide negative feedback	Giving and receiving feedback on performance during treatment role-play
8.	Respect developmental process and 'learner syllabuses'	Having access to speech act and speech act realization choices based on teachability and learnability, i.e. learners' readiness in terms of the pragmalinguistic features involved in this particular speech act.
9.	Promote co-operative/collaborative learning	Planning performance in small groups, encouraging peer- feedback
10.	Individualize instruction	All of the above

According to MP 1, L2 instruction should aim at using tasks, not texts, as unit of analysis in course design. Tasks can be subdivided into target tasks and pedagogical tasks. While target tasks are defined as any piece of work undertaken for oneself or for others, freely or for some reward and examples of target tasks include buying a pair of shoes, making an airline reservation, borrowing a library book, and so forth, pedagogical tasks are increasingly approximations, according to communicative success (such as pragmatic appropriateness), to the target task which motivated their inclusion into a task-based syllabus. Pedagogical tasks are the tasks that teachers and students actually work in the classroom and reside in some aspects of the tasks themselves (Long & Crookes, 1993, p. 40-41). The MP 1 recommends as a pedagogical task, for example, that learners listen to examples of target discourse surrounding target-task completion or role-play some aspect of the target task. Role-playing invitations and refusals to invitations can be taken as either a target task in itself or as a pedagogical task leading to a more complex task, such as networking in a social event. MP 1 may be articulated with MP 4, which suggests that learners be presented with realistic samples of discourse use surrounding NS and NS-NNS accomplishment of target tasks. These two MPs are in line with Olshtain and Cohen's (1991) and Bardovi-Harlig et al.'s (1991) suggestions that models should be based on empirical data, i.e. natural language samples.

According to MP 2, instruction should promote learning by doing, combining language learning and action at various levels and, according to MP 3, it should provide learners with elaborated input. Doughty and Long point out that "elaboration is the term given to the myriad of NSs modified discourse, i.e. language use, provided to NNS to make it comprehensible", and it can occur in learner-learner discourse and in pre-scripted materials. Olshtain and Cohen (1991, p. 161) argue that learners should be engaged in role-playing and acting out dialog type activities for experimenting with the pragmatic component of the speech act. MP 2 can be articulated with MP 9, which suggests that instruction promote co-operative/collaborative learning. Bardovi-Harlig et al. (1991) point out that through collaborative group work, learners should be engaged in reconstructing infelicitous speech acts into felicitous ones.

MP 5 suggests that learners be encouraged to learn inductively. Olshtain and Cohen (1991, p. 158) talk about evaluating the situation, including the underlying principle for when to use a certain pragmatic feature, i.e., encouraging students to think for themselves about culturally appropriate ways to do something with the L2. This way instruction may awaken their own lay abilities for sociopragmatic analysis.

MP 6 relates to the focus on form approach to SL learning and teaching. It suggests briefly shifting learners' attention to linguistic features during a meaning-focused lesson. Kasper (2001a, p. 53) argues that "metapragmatic comment generated by students' pragmatic action (in authentic contexts, pedagogical tasks, role-plays) or observations would seem quite compatible with FonF." Olshtain and Cohen (1991) and Boxer and Pickering (1995) suggest that instruction on L2 pragmatics should help learners analyze the speech act into its semantic formula, since learners need to know how to realize the speech act itself. MP 6 can be articulated with MP 7, which states that learners should be provided negative feedback, i.e. corrective feedback on error. Olshtain and Cohen (1991) and Bardovi-Harlig et al. (1991) suggest the use of feedback and discussion sessions in which learners talk about their perceptions, expectations, and awareness of similarities and difference between L1 and L2 to help them identify areas of interference where pragmatic failure occurs.

MP 8 suggests that instruction respect developmental processes and learner syllabus. Olshtain and Cohen (1991) and Bardovi-Harlig et al. (1991) stress the importance of,

when teaching beginners, starting with a focus on the main strategies and providing more structured activities as a means to help learner manipulate the most common expression of a given speech act. Finally MP 10 suggests that instruction be individualized, which is accomplished, as Doughty and Long point out, through the MPs stated above, i.e., needs analysis, elaboration of input, respecting the learner syllabus, and so forth.

Doughty and Long (to appear) point out that "methodological principles are putative language teaching universals and that pedagogical procedures are quite the reverse" (see Doughty and Long, to appear, for further discussion on this issue). Researchers in the field of ILP have also discussed how principles of second language learning and instruction may apply to the teaching of pragmatics (Kasper & Rose, 1999; Rose & Kasper, 2001). Kasper (2001a, p. 51) argues that resorting to some approaches to SL teaching in L2 pragmatic instruction may require some "acrobatics", not so much in terms of pragmalinguistics, but in terms of sociopragmatics. Again, in order to incorporate the TBLT methodological principles to the instructional treatment in this study, some compromise needed to be made in a way which would reflect the specificities of the L2 pragmatic instruction, more specifically, the role of metapragmatic awareness, not at all accounted for by those principles. Since L2 learning necessarily encompasses second language use, and since the acquisition of L2 pragmatics is an essential part of it, this study seeks to allot the learning tools for assisting learners' in their ILP development. For a detailed account of the treatment in the present study, refer to the description of the instructional component in the next section.

METHOD

Participants

Fourteen low-intermediate learners (all female, age 20-30) from two classes at one of the ELS programs at University of Hawai'i volunteered to participate in this study. They were offered five dollars as a token of appreciation and were told that by participating they would be contributing to my project and would be getting a free conversation lesson. Prior to the invitation, some steps were taken to assure that the level of the participants would allow them to follow the instruction. I observed one of the participants' classes

and examined both their grades and one of their writing assignments, which had been collected by their teacher. In addition, I discussed the overall performance of the volunteers with the teachers, stratifying the learners into weaker and stronger groups. Next, I did a stratified random assignment of the 14 participants to control and treatment groups, seven each. The control group was scheduled to meet on one day, and the treatment group on the following day. All seven control group members showed up on the day of the experiment, but out of seven, only four participants of the treatment group came. See Table 3 for demographic information of the participants.

Table 3

Participants' Demographic Information

Group	Initials	Country of origin	L1	Time spent in the U.S.
Control	Ma	Japan	Japanese	1 month
	K	Japan	Japanese	7 months
	Ay	Japan	Japanese	1 month
	Yu	Japan	Japanese	1 year and 1 month
	Y	Japan	Japanese	11 months
	H	Japan	Japanese	7 months
	Yy	Taiwan	Chinese	3 months
Treatment	M	Japan	Japanese	2.5 months
	H	Serbia	Serbian	2 months
	S	Taiwan	Chinese	1 month
	L	Brazil	Portuguese	2 months

Procedures

This study adopted a pre-test/post-test design with a control group. As learners arrived, in both groups, treatment and control, they were thanked for participating and asked to sign a written consent form and to fill out a personal information sheet with demographic items. They were also provided with general information about the research procedures.

In the treatment group, learners received instruction as described below. The control group did not receive any instruction on the target feature, but were given a video activity about an episode of the TV series 'Friends' (see Appendix 1). Careful analysis of the episode was made to assure the learner would not be exposed to the any instances of refusals in the video episode. The lessons took 55 minutes in both groups.

Instruction. What follows is an outline of the lesson for the treatment group. Except for step 3, I refer the reader to the handouts in the Appendices for the exact sequence or the other instructional steps as well as directions to the learners.

1. Learners were presented three video segments from 'Friends' which depicted invitation/refusal events, accompanied by handout 1 (see Appendix 2). They followed the lesson as it appears in the handout. This handout consisted of questions focusing on the gist of the dialogs, transcripts with enhanced speech act realizations by means of focus questions, and explicit discussion of the sociopragmatics of the enhanced speech act and comparison of L1 and L2.

2. Next, learners were given handout 2, which consisted of an inductive presentation of semantic formulae and modifiers (see Appendix 3). This handout was followed by an information sheet consisting of further examples with description (form/function mapping) of semantic formulae, which the researcher went over with learners.

3. Learners engaged in a role-playing activity (see Appendix 4) which consisted of DiPietro's (1987) scenarios. In groups, learners planned the role-play, performed in front of the class, and received explicit corrective feedback in the form of comments on felicitous/infelicitous realizations of the speech acts from the researcher and their peers.

Assessment Instruments and Procedures

Instruction in both groups was preceded by a pre-test and immediately followed by a posttest. The treatment group learners were also given a retrospective recall questionnaire immediately after their performance on the last post-test role-play. In this section, I provide detailed information regarding outcome measures and retrospective recall.

As mentioned earlier, this study adopted role-plays as a means to assess the outcome of instruction. This type of elicitation technique has been shown to produce spontaneous data which, compared to other types of data collection procedures, closely resemble those of naturalistic settings (Turnbull, 2001). As for pre-test and post-test, learners were given four different role-plays, each role-play depicted an invitation for a different event, i.e., to see a movie, to dine out, to go to the North Shore on Oahu, and to go to Karaoke (see

Appendix 5). Two role-play situations were used as pre-test and the two others as post-test. In order to minimize the effect of the role-play situations on the results, the role-play situations were split in the following manner to counterbalance situations between pre- and post-tests: As for the pre-test, half of the participants worked on the 'movie' and 'karaoke' situations while the other half worked on the 'North Shore' and the 'dinner' situations. As for the post-test the situations were swapped among participants to assure they would be working on a different role-play. The inviter and refuser were planned to be of equal status, but not close or intimate friends, thus the inviter, as stated in the role cards, was always an American acquaintance from school, who the refuser had known for a short period of time. This way the interaction situation matched the refusal strategy chosen as the focus of the instruction (for a detailed discussion on this issue, see Beebe et al., 1990). The role of the inviter was played by a trained research assistant, a female graduate student working on her Ph.D. dissertation on the effects of instruction in SL pragmatics at the time of this study. In all role-plays, the participants individually interacted with the research assistant. In each and all role-play performances, the inviter made one initial invitation and two other attempts to convince the refuser to accept the invitation. Besides the intention to elicit more data, this procedure was meant to be in accord with Gass and Houck (1999, p. 2), who state that "refusals are often played out in lengthy sequences involving not only negotiation of a satisfactory outcome, but face-saving maneuvers to accommodate the noncompliance nature of the act."

Before administering the pre-test role-plays, learners were given detailed information about the role-play procedures, including a guideline sheet (see Appendix 6). For each role-play, participants were given a few minutes to read the role cards and clarify any doubts related to vocabulary or the situation itself. No further guidance in respect to the target feature was provided at this point. All participants were told not to talk about the role-plays with their peers anytime during the project. The role-play performances and lessons were audio-taped at all times.

Cohen and Olshtain (1993) point out the importance of describing, in detail, the processes involved in the production of speech act utterances by non-native speakers. In addition to collecting data as participants acted out each role play, this study also included a self-report component in order to tap into participants' thought processes

during planning and performance of the role-plays, and to find out how they would assess their performance and why. They were asked to fill out a retrospective verbal report questionnaire immediately after the second and last post-test role-play performances (see Appendix 7). This way, I hoped to be able to assess their sociopragmatic knowledge after instruction. Due to time constraints, it was not possible to fully train participants in the process of retrospection. I gave them directions individually and monitored them throughout the process to make sure they understood what they were asked to do.

Data Analysis

In this paper, I adopt a qualitative discourse analytic approach to the comparison of the participants' L2 conversational pragmatic behavior both during pre- and post-test. By using such an approach, this study aimed to identify and explore changes in the refusal strategies adopted by the participants in the treatment group during the post-test as compared to the pre-test. This way, I hoped to provide evidence for the effectiveness of the instructional procedures.

I was particularly interested in the relative improvement of the treatment group participants' politeness strategies for refusals to invitations. In order to verify how the participants constructed a systematic solution to the problem of refusing an invitation during on-line talk before and after instruction, I conducted a detailed analysis, locating all occurrences of semantic formulae for refusal within and across turns, and searching for patterns which pointed to incorporation of the target sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic focus of the instruction by the treatment group participants. Previous work which has elicited and examined refusals and produced a classification of the semantic formulae involved in this particular speech act has, for the most part, been conducted by means of a discourse completion test (DCT), as was the case with the well-known study by Beebe et al. (1990). The present study for the most part adopts the classification by Beebe et al., which to my knowledge provides the most comprehensive and widely used taxonomy of the semantic formulae for refusals to date (see the Appendix 8 for Beebe et al.'s classification table).

RESULTS

After examining several examples of refusal elicited in both groups during the pre-test and post-test on a case-by-case basis, what follows is a summary of the main patterns and variation drawn from a qualitative assessment of what went on in the discourse data collected from both the control and treatment groups. Next is the presentation and analysis of some excerpts from both conditions to illustrate the participants' use of refusals during pre-test and post-test role-play performances. (Transcription codes can be found in Appendix 9). The analysis of the data suggests that the instructional treatment had an effect on participants' sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic abilities as demonstrated by the changes in their choices of the refusal strategies from pre-test to post-test and their comments during the written retrospective questionnaires. The same changes were not found in the data collected from the control group.

Control Group

Participants in the control group displayed a considerable level of indirectness in both the pre-test and post-test, though direct refusal strategies were also very frequent. Statement of regret was almost non-existent, except for two instances in the pre-test, but none at all appeared in the post-test. Positive opinion was also rare in the control group corpus as a whole, not appearing in the following excerpts at all. Statements of reason appeared very frequently before and after instruction similarly. Regarding statement of reason, it is important to raise the point that all role cards provided the participant with a statement of the reason for not accepting the invitation as a way to prompt the participant to refuse the invitation. This may have played a strong role in participants' choice of such a semantic formula. However, I believed that not mentioning why they need to refuse the invitation on the role-play cards would have enormously raised the cognitive load of the task since they would have to create an excuse out of the blue (similar to lying about a situation in real life refusals, which is not the common behavior) at a time in which they would also have to be dealing with the linguistic choices in the L2.

As for the order of the semantic formulae, for the most part, participants started with a hesitation token followed by a reason equally in both pre-test and posttest situations. In

some cases, participants resorted to repetition of part of the invitation, verbal avoidance, in the first place, followed by a hesitation token and a reason. It is important to note that this pattern, as can be seen in a previous section of the paper, was not found at all among Americans in the data collected by Beebe et al (1990). Excerpts (A) and (B), pre-test and post-test respectively, illustrate the patterns and variations just mentioned. A is the person doing the invitation and Yu is the refuser.

(A) Pre-test

1.	A: Okay
2.	uhm you know
3.	I was thinking
4.	would you like to come to a Karaoke tomorrow with me?
5.	Yu: Uhm?
6.	Tomorrow?
7.	A: Yeah
8.	Yu: Oh
9.	but tomorrow is my good friend's farewell party
10.	So I must go to
11.	A: Oh
12.	Yu: his home
13.	A: Oh
14.	and what about going to Karaoke before the party?
15.	Yu: But I must to prepare the food things and take those things to her home
16.	A: Oh
17.	but you know
18.	I mean
19.	we can have a little fun because I know you sing very well
20.	Yu: @
21.	A: I would really like to go with you
22.	so do you think you can like cook before and then go to the Karaoke with me
23.	Yu: Cook before?
24.	But hmm I don't know
25.	because I'm not prepared the stuff
26.	A: Oh
27.	Yu: Already
28.	I'm not prepare very good
29.	so I must to @ buy something

(B) Post-test

1.	A: Oh good.
2.	I'm fine too.
3.	You know
4.	I was thinking
5.	would you like to come to the North Shore tomorrow with me?
6.	Yu: Tomorrow?
7.	A: Yeah
8.	Yu: Oh,
9.	I have a paper and not start to do yet
10.	I must to do that
11.	A: Oh,
12.	but you know
13.	I mean
14.	it won't take a lot of time just two hours go there and have lunch and coming back
15.	Yu: yeah
16.	A: What do you think?
17.	Yu: But I just have two days to finish my homework
18.	I I don't know
19.	maybe maybe I--
20.	because I must spend more time to do this
21.	A: But you know
22.	tomorrow is Saturday
23.	I mean
24.	you can
25.	Yu: Yeah
26.	A: You can do it on Sunday
27.	so would you like
28.	Yu: (0) But I'm afraid I cannot finish yet
29.	A: Oh,
30.	I see

In (A) , the pre-test, Yu responds to the first invitation move (2-4) with verbal avoidance by hesitating (5) and repeating part of the invitation (6), followed by pause filler (8) and a reason (9, 10, 12, and 14). In her reply to the second invitation attempt (16-22), she, again, resorts to verbal avoidance (23), and a reason (24, 25). In (B), the post-test, Yu replies to the initial invitation attempt (3-5) with verbal avoidance in first place, again repeating part of the invitation (6) and hesitating (8), and then, a reason (9,

10). After the inviter's second attempt (11-16), she starts with a reason (17), followed by verbal avoidance in the form of hedging (18, 19), and ends with a reason (20). To the inviter' following try (21-27), she replies with a direct refusal strategy, a non-performative statement of negative ability accompanied by a hedge, "But I'm afraid" (28).

Treatment Group

Moving on to the treatment group participants, they act very similarly to the control group participants before instruction. However, a comparison of their refusal realizations before and after instruction among the participants in the treatment condition suggests a considerable degree of improvement in their choices of refusal strategies towards the norms of native speakers of American English. On the post-test, as compared to pre-test role-plays, they use by far more indirect semantic formulae, decreasing the use of direct ones proportionally. While statements of regret were almost non-existent in the pre-test, they appear in all role-play situations for all participants on the post-test. It is important to note here that, statements of reason, though built into both the pre-test and post-test role-play cards, are used twice as frequently during post-tests. Non-performative refusals, such as negative ability, are less frequently used in the post-test. Verbal avoidance, e.g., repetition of part of the invitation, a strategy initially preferred by one of the participants, disappears during post-test. Positive opinion, a semantic formula only used once by two participants in the pre-test, appears twelve times and is used alike by all participants in the post-test. In addition, in contrast with both the control group participants and themselves in the pre-test, the participants in the treatment condition displayed a fairly high level of accuracy in terms of the order of the semantic in their refusal tokens in the post-test, as compared to the Americans in Beebe et al. (1990) . Below are the excerpts (C) and (D), from pre-test, followed by (E) and (F), from post-test, illustrating the observations just mentioned.

(C) Pre-test

```
1.    A: Yeah.
2.       I'm fine too.
3.       You know
4.       I was thinking
```

```
5.          would you like to go to the North Shore with me tomorrow?
6.    M: No,
7.          because I have to do--
8.          write my paper.
9.    A: Oh,
10.         I see,
11.         but you know
12.         it won't take a lot of time,
13.         just two hours going there having lunch and coming back.
14.   M: Yeah
15.         but I think it is not
16.         it is not enough time for me.
```

(D) Pre-test

```
1.    A: I'm fine too.
2.         You know,
3.         I was thinking
4.         uhm
5.         would you like to come.. to have dinner with me tomorrow?
6.    M: Oh,
7.         I'm sorry,
8.         I can't go to meet you there.
9.    A: Oh,
10.        but you know
11.        it would a very nice restaurant in Waikiki.
12.   M: Yeah,
13.        I know.
14.        I want to go with you,
15.        but I have to.. do something so.. tomorrow.
16.        I have promised.. already.
```

In (C), M. responds to the invitation with a direct "no" (6) and provides a reason (7, 8). At the inviter's third attempt, her refusal only consists of, besides a backchannel (14), an explanation. In (D), she adds a statement of regret, but still sticks to the direct refusal strategies, this time with the statement of negative ability "I can't go to meet you there" (8). Later in (D) M. expresses her positive feeling (14) towards the invitation and reason for not accepting (15, 16), albeit unspecific, after providing the inviter with a backchannel at the inviter's attempt to persuade her by saying how nice the restaurant was.

In (E and F) below, after instruction, M. manages to organize her refusal in one turn and approximating the norm (content and order found in the data by American English speakers), which was the focus of the instructional treatment. This strongly suggests that the teaching approach adopted in this study was beneficial for her.

(E) Post-test

```
1.    A: I'm fine too.
2.       You know,
3.       I was thinking
4.       ah
5.       would you like to go to the movies with me tomorrow?
6.    M: Uhm,
7.       that looks fun,
8.       but I'm sorry.
9.       I have to teach my student,
10.      so she'll have a.. test on Monday.
11.   A: Oh,
12.      I see.
13.      But you know,
14.      this movie is from uhm Honolulu Film Festival
15.   M: Yeah.
16.   A: so tomorrow is the only session
17.   M: Yeah.
18.   A: so
19.      would you like to come with me?
20.   M: So--
21.      I know.
22.      So--
23.      I want to go by all means,
24.      but I can't do that because to my student have to study--
25.      uhm
26.      no
27.      my student need my help.
28.   A: Oh,
29.      I [see]
```

(F) Post-test

```
1.    A: You know,
2.       in fact I was thinking of you.
3.       I was thinking
4.       would you like to go to a Karaoke with me tomorrow?
```

```
5.   M: Uhm,
6.      it's good idea,
7.      I'm sorry
8.      but I have to meet my friends tomorrow.
9.      So my friend will move.
10.  A: Oh,
11.     I see.
12.  M: Yeah.
13.  A: But you know
14.     I know you can sing very well and we will have very fun together.
15.  M: Yeah.
16.  A: I mean
17.     would--
18.     it would be very funny.
19.     Would you like to come?
20.  M: Yeah.
21.     So but tomorrow is not good day.
22.     If you change the other day,
23.     so I want to go there.
```

In line (6) in (E), M. starts the refusal with hesitation, "Uhm", then, in (7), she expresses positive feeling towards the invitation "that looks fun", followed by a statement of regret, "but I'm sorry" (8), and a specific reason, "I have to teach my student" (9), to which she adds "so she'll have a.. test on Monday" (10), making clear that the reason goes beyond her control, i.e., involving another person's need. Still in the same role-play, in lines (20-27), M. again displays her improvement in handling refusals in the L2. She provides a statement of positive opinion, "I want to go by all means" (23) and an explanation, "but I can't do that because to my student have to study…my student need my help" (24-27).

Again, comparing pre-test with post-test performances, (F) provides further evidence of M.'s improved ability to refuse invitations. In lines (5) through (9), she hesitates, expresses positive opinion, regret, and provides a reason for not accepting the invitation to the Karaoke, all in the same turn.

The Retrospective Recall Questionnaire

The following are the findings from the data collected, by means of retrospective verbal report questionnaire, in order to investigate participants' thought processes before and during their production of the speech act of refusals, as mentioned earlier in the section about assessment instruments and procedures. Despite the fact that participants' writing was quite fluent as demonstrated by their assignments for their regular classes, their answers to the questions in the self-report were quite brief, not yielding a substantial body of information. This may be seen as a possible weakness of written reports, which made it hard for me to elicit further information from respondents as they constructed their responses. The verbal reports were analyzed in terms of processing strategies involved in participants' choice of refusal strategies and of their assessments of their performances.

Regarding the question of what they were thinking during planning and performance of the role-plays, all participants reported they thought about how to say 'no' in a polite manner. When commenting about what she was thinking during the interaction, M said she thought about what she should respond to the invitation and quoted what she ended up saying "I want to do that by all means"; she then added that she also thought "It is best to turn down smoothly". S, another participant, explained that she rated her refusal responses the lowest (1) because she only used the American way to say 'no' once, and that when the inviter asked her the second time, she just said "No, I didn't come with her". She did not include why she acted like that in her response. Only one participant reported being concerned about grammar besides appropriateness. Thus, in general participants did not report planning what to say, except for one participant who mentioned she thought about sequence and clarity but did not provide further details, and all of them in one form or another mentioned a considerable amount of awareness of the need to adjust their refusals to suit the context. This may be attributed to the process of sociopragmatic awareness-raising which took place throughout the treatment.

Most participants rated themselves low even though the data from the role-play show that they were able to incorporate the content of the instruction into their performance of the refusals. M rated herself low (2). Although she reported having been concerned about the way to say 'no', she argues that she could not say it naturally. She did not explain

what she meant by naturally. H comments on her giving herself a (4) when judging the appropriateness of her response, saying "I was better because I learned about the answers." L gave herself a (4) and justified it by saying "I think that I was clear not rude, but clear. I think that I was not so bad. I was try to aswer gentle way."

The above findings suggest that, in spite of the lack of details, participants were quite aware of the sociopragmatic norms regarding the speech act of refusals in American English. Comparing their ratings to their actual performances on the post-tests, in general, points to a difficulty in assessing their own performances. Since conducting a self-report on their production of the speech act of refusals after the pre-test role-plays would have produced reactive effects on the subsequent speech act situations, it turned out to be impossible to assess any changes regarding their sociopragmatic awareness between pre-test and post-test role-plays.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study was set up to further investigate whether relatively explicit instruction may be facilitative for L2 pragmatic development, and the most appropriate and effective ways to deliver the pragmatic information to L2 learners. It has yielded findings which illustrate the effectiveness of teaching the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic components of the speech act of refusals in American English. More specifically, the instructional approach in this study aimed at providing learners with the opportunities necessary for enhancing their L2 pragmatic ability of performing the task in focus, i.e. refusing an invitation, by incorporating metapragmatic awareness into the task-based methodological principles. This way, in line with Schmidt's (1993, 1995) suggestions regarding the L2 pragmatic features that instruction directed at assisting learners with their ILP development should incorporate, I hoped to be able to cater to the specificities of interlanguage pragmatic development.

Thus, this study provided further qualitative evidence that a relatively explicit approach to L2 pragmatic teaching is likely to have positive effects on learners' L2 pragmatic ability through raising their awareness of L2 sociopragmatics and providing them with explicit inductive instruction on the L2 pragmalinguistic features. The subjects

in the treatment group not only displayed enhanced L2 pragmatic knowledge, as shown in the comparison between on-line pre-test and post-test role-play interactions, but also exhibited a considerable degree of L2 pragmatic awareness as demonstrated in the answers to the retrospective recall questionnaire. Gains in the latter respect cannot be attributed directly to the treatment given the fact that the retrospection was not carried out at the time of pre-testing, as explained earlier in this paper.

Given the following methodological constraints, certain measures can be taken in order to replicate the present study, enhancing the capability of finding more substantial evidence for its claims: First, the number of subjects was relatively small mainly due to the type of data analysis chosen. Second, even though role-plays are highly recommended for allowing access to learners' on-line production, they still present some problems like, for example, the need to incorporate the reasons for the refusals into the role cards, which may have influenced the participants choice of content for the semantic formula. Gass and Houck (1999, pp. 28-29) wonder to what degree role-plays really mirror the linguistic behavior of individuals in the real world. Even so, it may be reasonable to think that this particular detail did not invalidate the results of this study. Last, long-term effects could not be investigated due to practical constraints. Learners were at the end of their academic duties and were leaving on a long vacation or going back to their home countries.

Based on the theoretical framework which guided the present study and the findings reported here, further research which aims to implement an approach to L2 pragmatic teaching which seeks to combine metapragmatic awareness with the methodological principles derived from TBLT is recommended in order to collect further evidence of its effectiveness for learners' interlanguage pragmatic development.

AUTHOR NOTE

REFERENCES

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning, 49*, 449-465.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Hartford, B. A., Mahan-Taylor, M. R., Morgan, M. J., & Reynolds, D. W. (1991). Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversation. In T. Hedge & N. Whitney (Eds.), *Power, pedagogy, and practice* (pp. 4-15). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Billmyer, K. (1990). "I like your life style": ESL learners learning how to compliment. *Penn Working Papers, 6*, 31-48.

Bouton, L. F. (1994). Can NNS skill in implicatures in American English be improved through explicit instruction? In L. F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning monograph series* (Vol. 5, pp. 89-109). Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International Language: University of Illinois.

Bowers, K. (1984). On being consciously influenced. In K. Bowers & D. Meichenbaum (Eds.), *The unconscious reconsidered* (pp. 227-272). New York: Wiley.

Boxer, D., & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials. *ELT Journal, 49*, 44-58.

Chen, X., Lei, Y., & Zhang, Z. (1995). Refusing in Chinese. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Chinese as native and target language* (pp. 119-163). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 33-56.

Doughty, C. (1983). Second language instruction does make a difference. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 431-469.

Doughty, C. (in press). Instructed SLA: Constraints, compensation, and enhancement. In C. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Doughty, C., & Long, M. H. (to appear). Optimal psycholinguistic environments for distance foreign language learning. *Language Learning and Technology* (Special Issue: Distance Learning).

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

Gass, S., & Houck, N. (1999). *Interlanguage refusals: A cross-cultural study of Japanese-English*. New York: Mount De Gruyter.

House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 225-252.

Kasper, G. (1997). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* (NetWork #6) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved October, 26, 2001, from www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06

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

Kasper, G. (2001b). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied Linguistics, 22*, 502-530.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (1999). Pragmatics and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 19*, 81-104.

Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 149-169.

King, K. A., & Silver, R. E. (1993). "Sticking points": Effects of instruction on NNS refusal strategies. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 9*, 47-82.

Kondo, S. (2001, October). *Instructional effects on pragmatic development: Interlanguage refusal*. Paper presented at PacSLRF at University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Kubota, M. (1995). Teachability of conversational implicatures to Japanese EFL learners. *Institute of Research in Language Teaching Bulletin, 9*, 35-67.

Liddicoat, A. J., & Crozet, C. (2001). Acquiring French interactional norms through instruction. In K. 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*, 75-109.

LoCastro, V. (2000). Evidence of accommodation to L2 pragmatic norms in peer review tasks of Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal, 23*(1), 6-30.

Long, M. H. (1985). The role for instruction in second language acquisition: Task-based language teaching. In K. Hyltenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modeling and assessing second language development* (pp. 77-99). Cleveland, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1993). Unit of Analysis in syllabus design: The case for task. In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 9-54). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Lyster, R. (1994). The effects of functional-analytical teaching on aspects of French immersion students' sociolinguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics, 15*, 263-287.

Lyuh, I. (1992). *The art of refusal: Comparison of Korean and American cultures*. Unpublished manuscript, Indiana.

Morrow, C. (1996). *The pragmatic effects of instruction on ESL learners' production of complaint and refusal speech acts*. Unpublished manuscript, Buffalo.

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

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

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D. (1991). Teaching speech act behavior to nonnative
　　speakers. In Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second and foreign language*
　　(pp. 167-180). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Rose, K., & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge
　　University Press.

Rose, K., & Ng Kwain-fun, C. (2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments
　　and compliment responses. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language
　　teaching* (pp. 145-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

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

Schmidt, R. (1995). *Consciousness in foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of
　　attention and awareness in learning* (No. 9). Honolulu: University of Hawaii: Second
　　Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language
　　instruction* (pp. 1-34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Slobin, D. I. (1985). Crosslinguistic evidence for the language-making capacity. In D.
　　Slobin (Ed.), *The crosslinguistic study of second language acquisition* (Vol. 2, pp.
　　1157-1256). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic
　　competence. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp.
　　125-144). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tateyama, Y. (2001). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines: Japanese
　　'sumimasen'. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp.
　　200-222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turnbull, W. (2001). An appraisal of pragmatic elicitation techniques for the social
　　psychological study of talk: The case of request refusals. *Pragmatics, 11*(1), 31-61.

Verschueren, J. (2000). Notes on the role of metapragmatic awareness in language use.
　　Pragmatics, 10(4), 439-456.

Wildner-Bassett, M. E. (1994). Intercultural pragmatics and proficiency: Polite 'noises' for cultural appropriateness. *IRAL, 32*(1), 3-17.

Wishnoff, J. (2000). Hedging your bets: L2 learners' acquisition of pragmatic devices in academic writing and computer-mediated discourse. *Working Papers of the Department of ESL, 19*(1) , Retreived March 31, 2004 from www.hawaii.edu/sls/uhwpesl/on-line_cat.html

Yoshimi, D. R. (2001). Explicit instruction and JFL learners' use of interactional discourse markers. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 223-247). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX 1

CONTROL GROUP VIDEO ACTIVITY

Friends

(Pairs)

1. How do you do the following things in English? Write down your examples.

    a. (You have a guest) Offer something to drink to him/her.

    b. (Your friend looks worried) Find out what the problem is.

    c. (Your classmate is wearing a new 'Aloha' T-shirt and you think it's nice) Compliment him/her.

    d. (You have a bad cold) Ask for advice.

    e. (You can't decide what to eat) Ask for an opinion.

    f. (You need a pen) Ask to borrow something.

    g. (You lost your book) Ask where it is.

    h. (Your friend didn't show up for a meeting) Ask for an explanation.

    i. (You step on someone's foot) Apologize.

(Small groups)

2. Have you ever watched 'Friends'? What's it about? What are the names of the six friends?

3. Watch one episode of 'Friends' and find examples of what they say to do the things in question # 1.

(Small groups)

4. You haven't seen the end of the episode yet. Can you create an end to it before watching it? (What's going to happen at the end?) Write a short script and act it out.

APPENDIX 2

TREATMENT GROUP VIDEO ACTIVITY

Friends

<u>Before watching</u>

Have you ever watched the TV series 'Friends'? What's it about? What are the names of the main characters?

<u>Scene 1</u>

A. Read question 1 about scene 1:

1.   What's the relationship between Ross and Mr. Geller?

B. Watch scene 1 (without script) and answer question 1. Don't worry if you don't understand everything.

C. Read questions 2-5, then watch the scene again (with script) and answer the questions.

2.   What kind of father was Mr. Geller?

3.   What does Mr. Geller invite Ross to do?

4.   Underline the lines where Mr. Geller makes the invitation.

5.   Does Ross accept the invitation? Circle Ross's response to Mr. Geller's invitation.

Mr. Geller: I tell you one thing, I wouldn't mind having a piece of this sun-dried tomato business. Five years ago, if somebody had said to me, here's a tomato that looks like a prune, I'd say "get out of my office!"

Ross: Dad, before I was born, did you freak out at all?

Mr. Geller: I'm not freaking out, I'm just saying, if somebody had come to me with the idea and…

Ross: Dad, dad, dad, I'm talkin' about the whole uh, baby thing. Did you uh, ever get this sort of... panicky, "Oh my god I'm gonna be a father" kind of a thing?

Mr. Geller: No. Your mother really did the work. I was busy with the business. I wasn't around that much. Is that what this is about?

Ross: No, no, Dad, I was just wondering.

Mr. Geller: 'Cause there's time to make up for that. We can do stuff together. You always wanted

to go to that Colonial Williamsburg. How 'bout we do that?

Ross: Thanks, Dad, really, I ju... you know, I just, I just needed to know, um... when did you start to feel like a father?

Mr. Geller: Oh, well, I, I guess it musta been the day after you were born. We were in the hospital room, your mother was asleep, and they brought you in and gave you to me. You were this ugly little red thing, and all of a sudden you grabbed my finger with your whole fist. And you squeezed it, so tight. And that's when I knew.

(Ross is so moved by his father's charming story, that he stops eating.)

Mr. Geller: So you don't wanna go to Williamsburg?

Ross: No, we can go to Williamsburg.

Mr. Geller: Eat your fish.

D. How did Ross say 'no' to his father's invitation?

Scene 2

A. Read question 1 about scene 2:

1. Ross and Joey invite Rachel and Phoebe to come over to Ross's apartment to help putting together his new furniture. Do they accept the invitation?

B. Watch scene 2 (without script) and answer question 1. Don't worry if you don't understand everything.

C. Read questions 2-3, then watch the scene again (with script) and answer the questions.

2. Underline the lines where Ross makes the invitation.

3. Circle what Rachel and Phoebe say 'no' to the invitation.

Ross: So Rachel, what're you, uh... what're you up to tonight?

Rachel: Well, I was kinda supposed to be headed for Aruba on my honeymoon, so nothing!

Ross: Right, you're not even getting your honeymoon, God.. No, no, although, Aruba, this time of year... talk about your- (thinks) -big lizards... Anyway, if you don't feel like being alone tonight, Joey and Chandler are coming over to help me put together my new furniture.

Chandler: (deadpan) Yes, and we're very excited about it.

Rachel: Well actually thanks, but I think I'm just gonna hang out here tonight. It's been kinda a long day.

Ross: Okay, sure.

Joey: Hey Pheebs, you wanna help?

Phoebe: Oh, I wish I could, but I don't want to.

D. Why do you think people laugh when Phoebe says 'no' to Ross's invitation?

Scene 3

A. Read question 1 about scene 3:

    1. Monica and Chandler were planning to go out together without their friends. Rachel invites Monica to see a movie. Monica invents an excuse. What did Monica say she was going to do?

B. Watch scene 3 (without script) and answer question 1. Don't worry if you don't understand everything.

C. Read questions 2-3, then watch the scene again (with script) and answer the questions.

    2. Underline the line where Rachel makes the invitation.

    3. Circle what Monica says 'no' to the invitation.

Rachel: Hey Mon, what are you doing now? Wanna come see a movie with us?

Monica: Uhh, y'know actually I was gonna do some laundry.

Rachel: Oh.

Monica: Hey Chandler, wanna do it with me?

Chandler: Sure, I'll do it with ya.

Monica: Okay.

Rachel: Okay great, hold on a sec! (She runs to her room and returns carrying a huge bag of laundry.) Oh, here you go! You don't mind do ya? That would really help me out a lot! Thanks!

Monica: I mean I-I don't I think I have enough quarters.

Phoebe: I have quarters! (She holds up a bag of quarters.)

D. What reason did Monica give for not going to the movies with Rachel?

APPENDIX 3

Saying 'no' in English

A. Read this example:

Phil: Do you wanna see a movie tomorrow?

Chris: Uhm, I'd like to. Sorry, but I have to study for an exam tomorrow.

Chris and Phil are Americans. This example shows what they generally do to say 'no' politely.

B. Read the different parts of Chris's response and say what he did to say 'no' politely to Phil. Circle the correct answer.

1. When Chris says '*Uhm*', he:

a.	gives an excuse	c.	says he feels bad
b.	hesitates	d.	gives a positive opinion

a. When Chris says '*I'd like to*', he:

a.	gives an excuse	c.	says he feels bad
b.	hesitates	d.	gives a positive opinion

b. When Chris says '*Sorry*', he:

a.	gives an excuse	c.	says he feels bad
b.	hesitates	d.	gives a positive opinion

c. When Chris says '*but I have to study for an exam tomorrow*', he:

a.	gives an excuse	c.	says he feels bad
b.	hesitates	d.	gives a positive opinion

C. Look at the Chris's response again.

Chris: Uhm, I'd like to. Sorry, but I have to study for an exam tomorrow.

Note the sequence of phrases he uses in his response and complete the following statement about how Americans <u>generally</u> say 'no' politely.

First, Americans_____; second, they_____;

third, they_____; and then, they _____.

D. Read Monica's response to Rachel's invitation.

Rachel: Hey Mon, what are you doing now? Wanna come see a movie with us?

Monica: Uhh, y'know actually I was gonna do some laundry.

Put a check (√) mark next to the things she did in her response. Write down the exact part of her response that goes with it on the line provided.

____hesitates: _____

____gives an excuse: _____

____says she's sorry: _____

____gives a positive opinion: _____

She did not exactly do what Chris did. Explain.

E. Look at Phoebe's response to Ross again.

Oh, I wish I could, but I don't want to.

What did she do that made people laugh?

Other ways to say 'no' politely in Am. English:

Hesitate: Americans show they are not ready to agree by saying things that show that they're thinking about what to say.

> *'Mmm', well, uhm, etc*
>
> *Gee, I don't know.*
>
> *I'm not sure.*
>
> *I don't think I can.*

Monica's *Uhh, y'know actually* shows this.

Show that you feel bad about the situation:

In the beginning:	At the end:
Sorry…	*Sorry about that.*
I'm sorry to say that…	
I wish I could, but…	
I really wanted to, but…	

Give an excuse: Americans unusually expect some kind of explanation, specific reasons for saying no.

I have a headache.

My friend is coming over tonight.

APPENDIX 4:
INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE-PLAY

Role A:

You are preparing for a final exam, which will be given tomorrow. It is evening and your American friend calls you to invite you over. What will you do? Should you keep studying? Do you need a break? You know that this friend loves to talk and may keep you there for hours.

Role B:

It is close to the end of the college semester and today is the birthday of your friend (A). You and your other friends have organized a surprise birthday party for A. You know that A may be studying for finals, but it is your job to call him or her up and extend an invitation to come over to your place, where the party will be. Of course, you cannot reveal the real purpose for your invitation.

APPENDIX 5

PRE-TEST/POST-TEST ROLE-PLAYS

Role-play 1

Role A: Today is Friday. You tutor an elementary school student. He/She will have a test Monday, so he asked you to review the lessons with him/her tomorrow between 3:00 and 4:00 in the afternoon.

You meet an American classmate, <u>who you recently met</u>, in the cafeteria during the break and he/she invites you to go to see a movie that is playing in the Honolulu Film Festival at the same time tomorrow. You can't go at this time tomorrow. <u>Say 'no' to the invitation</u>.

Role-play 2

Role A: One of your friends is moving out of town. You want to say good bye to him/her, so you are going to his/her farewell party tomorrow night. You were told it is potluck dinner, so you are preparing some food from your country to take to the party.

You are talking to an American classmate, <u>who you recently met</u>, in class before the Professor comes in. He/she invites you to go to a Karaoke at the same time tomorrow. You can't go to the Karaoke at this time. <u>Say 'no' to the invitation.</u>

Role-play 3

Role A: You have a paper due next week and you haven't started working on it yet, so you only have this weekend to work on this paper.

You're studying with an American classmate, <u>who you recently met</u>, in the library when he/she invites you to spend this Saturday on the North Shore. <u>Say 'no' to the invitation.</u>

Role-play 4

Role A: You promised to help a friend with his school work tomorrow evening.

You bump into an American classmate, <u>who you recently met</u>, on the way home from school and he/she invites you to go to dinner with him or her at the same time tomorrow. <u>Say 'no' to the invitation.</u>

Role-play 1

Role B: A very good movie is playing tomorrow at the Honolulu Film Festival. You hate going to the movies alone, so you invite a classmate from school to go with you. This is the only session of the movie.

Role-play 2

Role B: You really want to go to a Karaoke tomorrow. You're in class now and you are talking to a classmate before the Professor comes in. You invite him/her because you know he/she can sing really well to go with you.

Role-play 3

Role B: You're studying with an American classmate in the library and you invite him/her to go to the North Shore with you. Everyone seems to be busy, so this friend is your last resort.

Role-play 4

Role B: You bump into a classmate on the way home from school and you invite a classmate to go to a nice restaurant tomorrow evening in Waikiki tomorrow.

APPENDIX 6
ROLE-PLAY GUIDELINES
TO PARTICIPANTS:

You will be asked to act out two role-plays at the beginning and at the end of today's lesson.

In each role-play, you talk with an American classmate from a school.

We will record your participation in order to evaluate the activity, <u>not you</u>.

You will have few minutes to prepare for the role-play.

Act as if it were a real life situation (begin with a greeting and say good-bye at the end).

Do the best you can.

<u>Important: Please, don't talk about the role-plays with the other participants today or before their next session. This is very important for the project.</u>

ROLE-PLAY GUIDELINES
TO THE RESEARCH ASSISTANT:

Play the role of the American classmate (B) of A's. You may act as natural as possible, as you would normally do in real life.

There are a few guidelines to follow to assure uniformity across participants and pre- and posttest situations.

1. Try as much as possible to keep your performance uniform across participants and pre- and posttests;

2. Pay attention to the situation depicted in the role-card so that you and the participant can give the encounter a quick introduction before starting the invitation;

3. When you make each invitation, always make 3 attempts to invite A (the first attempt plus two more insisting that he/she do what you're inviting him/her to do);

4. When you have problems understanding the participant, you may as for clarification, repetition, or confirmation; but you may not speak for the participant when he/she is having problems to communicate. Thank you!!!

APPENDIX 7

Name: _____

Please, answer the following questions about your performance in the role-plays.

First role-play:

A. What were you thinking as you planned the role-play?

B. What were you thinking as you responded to the invitation?

C. How appropriate/satisfactory do you think you're responses were?

(inappropriate/unsatisfactory) 1   2   3   4   5 (very appropriate/very satisfactory)

Explain.

Second role-play:

A. What were you thinking as you planned the role-play?

B. What were you thinking as you responded to the invitation?

C. How appropriate/satisfactory do you think you're responses were?

(inappropriate/unsatisfactory) 1   2   3   4   5 (very appropriate/very satisfactory)

Explain.

APPENDIX 8
CLASSIFICATION OF REFUSALS

I. Direct

    A. Performative (e.g., " I refuse")

    B. Nonperformative statement

        1. "No"

        2. Negative willingness ("I can't". "I won't". "I don't think so".)

II. Indirect

    A. Statement of regret (e.g., "I'm sorry…"; "I feel terrible…")

    B. Wish (e.g., "I wish I could help you…")

    C. Excuse, reason, explanation (e.g., "My children will be home that night."; "I have a headache.")

    D. Statement of alternative

        1. I can't do X instead of Y (e.g., "I'd rather…" "I'd prefer…")

        2. Why don't you do X instead of Y (e.g., "Why don't you ask someone else?")

    E. Set condition for future or past acceptance (e.g., "If you had asked me earlier, I would have…")

    F. Promise of future acceptance (e.g., "I'll do it next time"; "I promise I'll…" or "Next time I'll…"-using "will" of promise or "promise")

    G. Statement of principle (e.g., "I never do business with friends.")

    H. Statement of philosophy (e.g., "One can't be too careful.")

    I. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor

        1. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the request (I won't be any fun tonight" to refuse an invitation)

        2. Guilt trip (e.g., Waitress to costumers who want to sit a while: I can't make a living off people who just offer coffee.")

        3. Criticize request/requester, etc. (statement of negative felling or opinion);

        4. Request for help, empathy, and assistance by dropping or holding the request.

        5. Let interlocutor off the hook (e.g., "Don't worry about it." "That's okay." "You don't have to.")

   6. Self defense (e.g., "I'm trying my best." "I'm doing all I can do." " I no do

       nutting wrong.")

   J. Acceptance that functions as a refusal

   1. Unspecific or indefinite reply

   2. Lack of enthusiasm

   K. Avoidance

   1. Nonverbal

       a. Silence

       b. Hesitation

       c. Do nothing

       d. Physical departure

   2. Verbal

       a. Topic switch

       b. Joke

       c. Repetition of part of request, etc. (e.g., "Monday?")

       d. Postponement (e.g., "I'll think about it.")

       e. Hedging (e.g., "Gee, I don't know." "I'm not sure.")

Adjuncts to Refusals

   1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement ("That's a good idea…"; "I'd

       love to…")

   2. Statement of empathy (e.g., "I realize you are in a difficult situation.")

   3. Pause fillers (e.g., "uhh"; "well"; "oh"; "uhm")

   4.   Gratitude/ appreciation

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

APPENDIX 9
SYMBOLS OF DISCOURSE TRANSCRIPTION

Units	
-Intonation units	return key
-Truncated intonation unit	--
-Word	space
-Truncated word	-
-Speech overlap	[]
Transitional continuity	
-Final	.
-Continuing	,
-Appeal	?
Pause	
-Medium	...
-Short	..
-Latching	(0)
Vocal Noises	
-Vocal noises	()
-Laughter	@
-Nasal laughter	@N
Transcriber perspective	
-Uncertain hearing	<X X>
-Indecipherable syllable/word	X

Antonio José Bacelar da Silva

Department of Second Language Studies

1890 East-West Road

Honolulu, HI 96822

E-mail: ajbsilva@hawaii.edu