March 2019

Acquiring Native-like Norms Of Making A Request In Spanish During Short-term Study Abroad In Argentina and Spain

Christine H. Song
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

ACQUIRING NATIVE-LIKE NORMS OF MAKING A REQUEST IN SPANISH DURING SHORT-TERM STUDY ABROAD IN ARGENTINA AND SPAIN

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

In

The Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures

by
Christine H Song
B.A., Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, 2016
May 2019

Acknowledgements

To begin with, I am grateful to God for giving me the opportunity to learn, grow, and study in this program. I would like to thank my family in Korea for giving me unconditional love and support. I am grateful to have a family who always prays for me. Also, I would like to thank my husband and best friend, Juhyun David Cha, for being a good listener; for believing in me; for encouraging me to work; and for making me laugh. Without my family and my husband, I would not have been accomplished so much.

Also, I would like to thank my instructors, the participants from my thesis, my professors, and my colleagues, who have provided me with a wonderful experience at LSU. I am also thankful to my closest friends, María García and Vanessa Cárdenas, for always helping me with everything and for being my best friends and family. *Las quiero mucho*.

I would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Jeremy King, Dr. Jill Brody, and Dr. Rafael Orozco, for being my committee members and sharing a great amount of knowledge. Lastly, I am especially thankful to Dr. Jeremy King for being the chair of my committee and for guiding me patiently with his expert advice throughout this difficult project.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

The current study examines if L2 learners of Spanish acquire native-like norms of making a request during short-term study abroad in Argentina and Spain via Discourse Completion Tasks (DCT). The investigation included 3 groups of the participants: an experimental group of 15 U.S. students who studied in Argentina or Spain; a control group of 12 U.S. students who had not studied abroad; and a control group of 7 native speakers of Spanish. The results show that students in the study abroad group became more native-like in making a request to a certain extent. Firstly, the students in the experimental group used "conventionally indirect strategies" (Blum-Kulka et. al. 1989) more frequently in the posttest than they did in the pretest. Native speakers showed a strong preference for those strategies as well. Secondly, the students in the study abroad group showed a similar pattern to the participants in the native speaker group in the usage of the politeness marker. However, they still showed a high frequency of speaker-oriented strategies in some situations, whereas native speakers showed an absolute preference for hearer-oriented strategies in every situation. Lastly, two students in the study abroad group started to use the pronominal form *vos*, which is the most common pronominal address form in the country they visited, Argentina. Few studies on the impact of short-term study abroad programs on the development of pragmatic competence of L2 speakers have been conducted. Therefore, the current investigation contributes to the field of second language acquisition pragmatics as well as to our current knowledge of study abroad programs and their impact on the pragmatic development of L2 learners as well.

Chapter 1.
Introduction

The current project investigates if the L2 speakers of Spanish can acquire native-like norms of making a request during short-term study abroad program in Argentina and Spain. Making a request is one of the most common forms of communication across the world and it requires pragmatic competence for a speaker to politely ask a hearer to do something, lessening the imposition of the request (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Even though making a request seems simple, this performance necessitates not only one's grammatical competence, but also one's ability to understand the social norms on making requests in the specific community. This perspective has led to the inquiry on how second language (L2) speakers produce appropriate requests in their target language, considering the different first language (L1) cultural background. Therefore, it is recommended that L2 learners be immersed in the target language environment. Ideally, SA programs provide those perfect opportunities for L2 learners to encounter different cultures, to gain linguistic proficiency, and most importantly develop pragmatic competence.

The rise of the global society and the increased recognition of globalization has enhanced the importance of being engaged in other parts of the world and understanding them. It has been more common for people to experience different cultures in their own countries or even to live in different countries. Learning a foreign language is one of the best ways to understand diverse cultures and vice versa. Being involved in the foreign countries can be an optimal way to learn a different language. It is often recommended for language learners to be immersed in the target language environment, such as study abroad (SA), assuming that it provides the best opportunities and environment for language learning. Accordingly, SA is quickly becoming a desirable college experience among foreign language learners at universities. According to Institute of International Education, (2018), throughout the academic year of 2015 and 2016, a total of 325,339 U.S. students studied abroad for academic credit.

However, SA is not an easy option for college students to choose due to the financial burden and the lack of time. That is why more and more students are opting for a shorter SA period, that is generally four to eight weeks. Institute of International Education (2018) showed that summer term was the most popular time to SA, with 38% of the students choosing a SA program during the summers of 2015 and 2016, which indicates a growing interest in short term programs among students Short-term SA programs offer students classes without sacrificing their on-campus life and provide possibilities for interaction with the community, cross-cultural experience, language skill building outside of the classroom, etc.

Despite of the several advantages of the short-term SA, many researchers have raised a question regarding how short-term SA programs are beneficial for the language learners. It is still an open question if the students become more proficient in their target languages after their short-term SA. Therefore, investigating the effect of the short-term SA has been one of the fascinating issues among SLA pragmaticists and other language researchers. Accordingly, the current research is dedicated to investigating how students who participated in the short-term SA become more native-like in their production for request behaviors from the perspective of the pragmatics.

The current investigation examines how L2 speakers of Spanish acquire native-like norms of making requests during short-term SA program in Argentina and in Spain via qualitative analysis. In the second chapter of the paper, a variety of studies are presented in order to provide theoretical frameworks for the current investigation: Austin's speech act theory (1962), Searle's speech act theory (1969; 1975; 1976), politeness theory by Brown and Levinson (1987), and Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) by Blum-Kulka et. al (1989). Following that, several studies regarding sociopragmatic variation on making requests in different Spanish-speaking countries are presented. In the following section, the definition of terms with respect to pragmatic competence, second language

acquisition is presented; Various research relating to L2 speakers' pragmatic development in the SA program are described. Chapter 3 presents the methodology of the current research and the results are discussed in Chapter 4. Lastly, Chapter 5 is dedicated to answering the research questions, stating limitations of the current paper, and describing the future studies.

Chapter 2.
Literature Review

2.1. Pragmatics

2.1.1. Speech act theory

During the early 1970s, the concept of human language was quite different from that of today: the language was a mere "…combination of 'sound and meaning'; or a set of correct sentences" (Mey, 2001, p. 93). However, such perspective shifted to the idea that the language is related to action and production. 'Speech act theory' defines the word as an 'action' and it describes the links between language, intention, and action. British philosophers Austin (1962) and Searle (1969; 1975; 1976), became pioneers of speech act theory, and influenced significantly linguistic philosophy, accordingly, linguistics and pragmatics.

2.1.1.1. Austin & Searle

British language philosopher Austin, who is the founder of speech act theory, perceived that "… the uttering of the sentence is, or is a part of, the doing of an action, which again would not normally de described as, or as 'just' saying something" (Austin, 1962, p.5). He differentiated two kinds of utterances: 'Performative' utterances are doing an action and 'constative' utterances are statements that explain, describe or constate something, which convey information that can be judged as true or false in statements. He cited several utterances which do not describe or report the situation but accompany actions, such as vowing or christening. According to Austin, if the action is not accomplished or is considered as a failure in those circumstances: the utterance is generally 'unhappy', not false. In other words, performative utterances can be evaluated as 'happy' or 'unhappy', instead of true or false, based on if the intended action was carried out or not. Differentiating between performative utterances and constative utterances was difficult due to the ambiguity and complexity of the utterances.

In *How to Do Things with Words* (1962), Austin defined three kinds of acts: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts: "…the locutionary act (and within it the

phonetic, the phatic, and the rhetic acts) which has a *meaning*; the illocutionary act which has a certain *force* in saying something; the perlocutionary act which is the *achieving of* certain *effects* by saying something" (p. 121). Here are the examples of these acts[1]:

(a) He said to me 'Eat the cake!'

(b) He urged me to eat the cake.

(c) He got me to eat the cake.

(a) is an example of a locutionary act since it shows that the speaker uttered the sentence 'Eat the cake'; (b) has the illocutionary act, conveying the speaker's action and intention; and finally (c) conveys the perlocutionary act, insofar as performing the locutionary or illocutionary act and shows the effect of the consequences of the illocutionary act.

One of the most significant achievements of Austin is the distinction between performatives and constatives, as well as distinguishing among the component parts of a speech act: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts. He contributed to further pragmatic investigation on speech act theory by distinguishing between what is intended (the illocutionary act), and what is actually done, indicating the perlocutionary act.

Searle (1969), who was one of Austin's disciples, followed Austin's principal idea regarding speech acts. He argued that the speech act is a central role of linguistic communication: it is "… the basic or minimal unit of linguistic communication" (p. 16). However, in his book, *Speech Acts: An Essay in The Philosophy of Language*, Searle explicitly states that he does not accept Austin's distinction between locutionary and illocutionary acts. He subdivided Austin's locutionary acts into 'utterance acts' and 'propositional acts', that is, he attempted to distinguish between "…the illocutionary act and the propositional content of the illocutionary act" (p. 30). More precisely, Searle tried to separate out the propositional

[1] These examples were taken from Austin's book (1962, p.101-102) and were simplified by the researcher.

content of the illocutionary act from the illocutionary act and classify it as part of the locutionary act. This distinction has been significant since the same propositional acts can refer to different illocutionary acts. For instance, the utterance '*The water is boiling*' can be an assertion or a warning; the other utterance '*Is the water boiling?*' can be asking for information; they both share the same propositional content.

In addition, Searle was influenced by Grice (1975), yet did not completely agree with him and developed his idea on the speech act more systematically. Grice argued that ordinary conversation does not occur through convention, but by a speaker's intentions and a hearer's success in identifying them. According to Searle, both convention and intention of the utterance are pivotal, which coincides with Austin's opinion. In great detail, Searle contended that speaking language is performing speech acts according to 'constitutive rules', that is to say, it is 'rule-governed' and he gave explanations and examples of 'regulative rules' and 'constitutive rules.' Regulative rules govern existing forms of behavior, whereas constitutive rules not only regulate but also constitute the possibility of new forms of behavior (Searle, 1969, p. 33-35). Considering the analogy of the game of chess, the constitutive rules of chess create the nature of the game, not that of poker. Unlike these rules, the regulative rules of chess regulate the behavior of the players; however, it cannot change essence of the game.

Based on these rules, Searle also showed certain conditions and speech act rules for making promises. In the utterance '*I promise you I will buy you a drink*', it demonstrates that the proposition predicates a future act of the speaker 'I' (propositional content conditions) and that the act predicated is an act that the hearer 'you' would favor. Additionally, it was understood by both the speaker and the hearer that the speaker would do it for the hearer (preparatory conditions). Also, through this utterance, the speaker shows his or her intention of buying a drink for the hearer (sincerity condition) and finally, the speaker means to put himself or herself under an obligation of doing it (essential condition).

Searle's notable accomplishment regarding on speech acts is to systemize Austin's idea, to establish rules of speech acts and to classify illocutionary acts, which will be presented in the following subsection.

2.1.1.2. Classification Typology

Austin (1962) made the classification of the illocutionary forces through the listing of verbs in a dictionary. The classification of illocutionary forces is described as: "verdictives, those that deliver a finding, official or unofficial, upon evidence or reasons as to value or fact"; "exercitives, those that refer to the exercising of powers, rights or influence"; "commissives, those that commit the speaker to doing something, including declarations or announcements of intention"; "behabitives, those that have to do with attitudes and reactions to social behavior"; and "expositives, those used in acts of exposition involving the expounding of views, the conducting of arguments, and the clarifying of usages and references" (p.151-162). Nevertheless, the classification was not clear-cut, given that some verbs can be classified in both categories, or certain category, like behabitives, included diverse verbs.

Searle (1976) developed Austin's classification of illocutionary forces and his classification consists of five categories: "'Assertives/representatives', telling people how things are"; "'directive', trying to get people to do things"; "'commissive', committing ourselves to doing things"; "'expressive', expressing our feelings and attitudes"; and "'declarations', bringing about changes through utterances" (p. 23). This paper concentrates on the usage of directive speech act, such as, ask, command, plead or request, etc.

2.1.1.3. Indirect speech acts

Indirectness is embedded in common conversations in daily life, which makes it difficult for people to explain how it functions between speakers and hearers. Searle (1975) elucidates indirect speech acts and introduces several terminologies, such as "primary illocutionary act" and "secondary illocutionary act" (p. 170). In his example of a conversation

between speaker X, suggesting 'Let's go to the movies tonight' and Y replying 'I have to study for an exam': On account of its meaning, Y's utterance is simply a statement about Y; nonetheless, it actually conveys the rejection of X's suggestion. According to Searle, Y's utterance has two illocutionary acts: the rejection is the "primary illocutionary act" and making a statement is the "secondary illocutionary act". This utterance shows an example of the indirect illocutionary acts since Y's utterance serves as rejection of X's proposal without explicitly saying 'No, I'm not going to the movies tonight.' Searle aggregates this concept with other speech acts theory and general conversation principles to explain indirect speech acts. Especially, he focuses on the directive speech acts, owing to the fact that "requirements of politeness normally make it awkward to issue flat imperative sentences or explicit performatives" (p. 171) and politeness is the principal motivation for indirectness in directives. Searle not only elucidates the indirect speech acts, but also mentions conventionality used in the performance of indirect directives.

Convention plays a critical role in the indirectness of the utterance, inasmuch as in indirect speech acts, the hearer and the speaker communicate more than they say in the utterance (p. 169); therefore, they must mutually share background, and the shared background can lead to a type of conventionality. He listed several conventional conditions in directives which consist of six general categories: Hearer (H)'s ability to A; Speaker (S)' wishes or want for H to do A; H's doing A; H's desire or willingness to do A; reasons for doing A; and sentences embedding one of the elements and an explicit directive illocutionary verb inside one of these contexts. While Searle expounded the 'facts' and the steps of the conventional indirect sentences, he draws attention to the concept of the 'conventionality' and the connection between politeness and indirectness. Conventionality makes it possible for hearer and speaker to communicate more than what they say. As a result, it is possible to make more indirect speech acts while this indirect illocution can enhance the degree of politeness in the same propositional

content. According to Searle (1975), the main reason for indirectness is being polite while making requests owing to two factors: "Firstly, X does not presume to know about Y's abilities, as he would if he issued an imperative sentence; and, secondly, the form gives-or at least appears to give-Y the option of refusing, since a yes-no question allows no as a possible answer" (p.177). Therefore, complying with a request can be made to seem a free act rather than forcing an order.

The current section is dedicated to presenting speech act theory and indirect speech acts. This section suggested that indirect speech acts are closely related to politeness. Therefore, the following section will explore politeness theory by Brown and Levinson and by Fraser and others.

2.1.2. Politeness theory

2.1.2.1. Brown & Levinson

Brown and Levinson's face-saving view indicates that "all competent adult members of a society have face, which is the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself, consisting in two related aspects: negative face and positive face" (p.61). Regarding politeness theory by Brown and Levinson, negative face is a person's desire to not be imposed upon by others, in other words, a person's wanting to have to their self-territory, while positive face is a person's desire to be approved of or appreciated by others, to wit, a person's wanting to be affiliated to a group (p. 62). Their theory argues that negative face is weightier than positive face, which indicates that the desire to be free from others should be considered more important than the desire to be approved of by others.

Based on these concepts, they contended that certain speech acts inherently 'threaten' the face needs of the speaker and/or hearer and they are termed 'face-threatening acts (FTAs)'. According to the authors, directives and commissives threaten the addressee's negative face since the speaker is violating the hearer's self-territory and make them do a specific act or

hinder them from doing a particular act. On the contrary, expressives, such as apologies, compliments or gratitude, are threatening addresser's positive face owing to the fact that speaker is damaging his/her own face in the process (p.64-68). In their theory, speaker and hearer attempt to utilize a variety of strategies so as to mitigate the imposition of the FTAs: On record with redressive action, using positive politeness, using negative politeness, on record without redressive action, off record or not doing the FTA at all (p. 69). Accordingly, Brown and Levinson argued that the face of speaker and/or hearer is continuously being threatened by speech acts and they proposed how to estimate the degree of politeness in a specific situation. The more social distance (D) that exists between speaker and hearer, the higher the hearer's relative social power (P) is and the greater the absolute ranking of impositions (R) in the society in question is, the heavier the weight of the FTAs (W) is (p. 74-77).

Politeness theory by Brown and Levinson (1987) has been considered crucial in the field of linguistic pragmatics since it is a full-fledged empirical theory, unlike other theories of politeness which have been posited. However, their theory has been questioned by others on the grounds of their claim of universality of the concept of face and the weight of FTAs. The following subsection discusses politeness theory from a different point of view.

2.1.2.2. Fraser & others

Fraser (1990) attempted to elucidate the definition of politeness according to four major perspectives: the social-norm view; the conversational-maxim view; the face-saving view; and the conversational-contract view.

The social-norm view of politeness surmises that the respective society has particular social norm that determines a specific behavior or a way of interacting with people. But according to Fraser, this point of view reflects normative view regarding politeness, which is associated with grammar. The author concludes that this approach had few supporters among researchers, even at the time of publication.

The conversational-maxim view is principally based on the work of Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP). Grice's conversational maxims are instructions for rational use of the language in conversation and do not mainly focus on grammar but on linguistic forms. Based on Grice's CP, Lakoff (1973) endeavors to account for politeness and extends the notion of well-constructed forms of sentences to pragmatics. Similar to Lakoff, Leech accepts the framework by Grice; unlike Grice or Lakoff, he intends to differentiate between a speaker's illocutionary goals and the speaker's social goals. This leads to his establishing more detailed principles and maxims, such as Interpersonal Rhetoric, Textual Rhetoric; Politeness Principle (PP) and Irony Principle (IP). Nevertheless, Leech's model seemed too assertive and strong for Fraser, since Leech contended that certain sorts of illocutionary acts are 'inherently' polite or impolite.

Fraser also accounted for the face-saving view by Brown and Levinson (B&L). While summarizing their politeness theory, the author challenged B&L's approach to politeness and the model of calculating weight of an FTA. First of all, the concept of face may vary within a single culture, therefore it may be not adequate to generalize and apply the definition of face. Also, it is hard to calculate the accurate degree of politeness or indirectness in their model, since the empirical evidence is not sufficient.

Lastly, the conversational-contract view is presented and elaborated by Fraser. This view incorporates Grice's CP and Goffman's notion of face, which is different from the concept as used by B&L. Fraser views the conversation as interaction between a speaker and a hearer, in which exists renegotiation of the conversational contract (CC). Some terms of a conversational contract may be seldom renegotiable such as imposed through convention, or by social institutions. Yet, more renegotiable factors exist during conversation, such as "the status, the power, and the role of each speaker, and the nature of the circumstances" (p. 232). They can be established by previous encounters or the particulars of the situation or context,

which are crucial in determining the speaker's utterances. Therefore, understanding current CC will play a significant role during conversation. Also, Fraser considers politeness as a thing that one expects "to exist in every conversation" (p.233). In other words, people notice not "that someone is being polite, rather that the speaker is violating the CC" (p.233). He also contends that sentences which people are producing cannot be polite, rather the speakers are polite, which disagrees with Leech and Lakoff, who argued that certain illocutionary acts are inherently polite. Also, he acknowledges that certain utterances can convey politeness because of their meaning, yet he tries to differentiate between deference and politeness as put forth by B&L. According to Fraser (1990), "Deference is a component of an activity, and is not associated with an activity, per se" (p.233). In conclusion, Fraser not only summarizes four principal views on politeness but also makes an essential point: polite or impolite behavior is subject to spontaneous and unique contextually-negotiated factors during interaction, that cannot be defined by normative rules.

The present section explored politeness theory from different perspectives and suggested the concept of politeness can vary under different social factors and contexts. The following section presents various cross-cultural research regarding speech act realization.

2.1.3. Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP)

2.1.3.1. Blum-Kulka et al.

Blum-Kulka (1982) investigated the speech acts of American learners of Hebrew as a second language and compared them with those of native Hebrew speakers. The results indicate that for any given situation, most native speakers consider one form to be more acceptable than others, while learners do not conform to this pattern. A few years later, the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Patterns project (CCSARP) was set up, which aimed at examining patterns of request and apology realizations under different social constraints across a number of languages and cultures. The goal of this study was to research the similarities and differences

in the realization of patterns of the speech acts in different languages; to investigate effects of social variables on the realization patterns of the speech acts within certain communities; and to examine the similarities and differences in the realization patterns of the speech acts between native speakers and nonnative speakers of a certain language. In other words, this research investigated cross-cultural variation, sociopragmatic variation, and interlanguage variation (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989).

Discourse-completion Tests (DCT), scripted dialogues that represent socially differentiated situations, were used as the instrument of the project. A brief description of the situations and incomplete dialogue is given to participants so that they can complete the conversation considering social and cultural context. Even though DCT has been criticized for not being able to collect 'natural' data, it enables researchers to acquire "prototype[s] of the variants occurring in the individual's actual speech and to evaluate participants' metalinguistic judgment" (Hill et al., 1986, p. 353).

Strategy types follow the classification of Blum-Kulka (1982), which classifies nine head acts mutually exclusively based on a scale of (in)directness of the requests: mood derivable, explicit performatives, hedged performatives, obligation statements, want statements, suggestory formulae, query preparatory, strong hints, and mild hints. Mood derivables are utterances in which the grammatical mood of the verb signals illocutionary force; Explicit performatives are utterances in which the illocutionary force is explicitly named; Hedged performatives are utterances in which the naming of the illocutionary force is modified by hedging expressions; Obligation statements are utterances which state the obligation of the hearer to carry out the act; Want statements are utterances which state the speaker's desire that the hearer carry out the act; Suggestory formulae are utterances which contain a suggestion to do something; Query preparatories are utterances containing reference to preparatory condition as conventionalized in any specific language; Strong hints are utterances containing partial

reference to object or element needed for the implementation of the act; Finally, mild hints are utterances that make no reference to the request proper (or any of its elements) but are interpretable as requests by context. Mood derivables, explicit performatives, hedged performatives, obligation statements, and want statements are classified by the author as "direct strategies" (p. 18) because the speaker explicitly specifies what he or she wants the hearer to do; suggestory formulae and query preparatories are classified as "conventionally indirect strategies", which are conventionalized in usage of the utterances containing suggestion and preparatory condition; and strong hints and mild hints are classified as "nonconventionally indirect strategies", which do not contain conventionalized usage in utterances and are the least direct strategies, relying on the context (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p.18).

In Blum-Kulka et. al's investigation, 'perspectives' show different emphasis on roles of request: speaker-oriented or hearer-oriented. Speaker-oriented requests emphasize the role of the agent ('Can I eat it?'); hearer-oriented requests emphasize the role of the recipient ('Can you do that for me?'); Inclusive requests include the speaker and the hearer in the requests ('Can we go now?'); and finally impersonal requests do not mention the speaker or the hearer ('It needs to be cleaned.').

'Internal modifications' indicate internal modifying elements within the request utterance, which are not essential in structuring head act but are multi-functional in two distinct aspects: "indicating devices and sociopragmatic devices" (p. 19). Specifically, modifiers can work as downgraders that soften or mitigate the act or as upgraders that stress its degree of pressure of the act ('awfully' dirty house). The examples of the downgraders of the internal modifications can be like 'darling', 'if you have time tomorrow', or politeness marker 'please'. Syntactic downgraders are related to factors such as grammatical systems of each language, which might affect the imposition of the request (can/could; will/would in English) (p. 19).

2.1.3.2. Cross-cultural studies regarding Spanish variation and regarding L2 speakers

Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) used the same framework to compare requesting behaviors across speakers of Argentine Spanish, Australian English, Canadian French, and Hebrew. Their results revealed that Argentine Spanish speakers used higher levels of directness in their requests in comparison with English speakers. Spanish cross-cultural studies have extensively studied speech acts like directives and expressives: Vázquez Orta (1995) studied requests in Peninsular Spanish and British English; Marquez Reiter (2000) examined requests and apologies carried out in Uruguayan Spanish and British English; Placencia (1998) investigated requests in service encounters in Ecuadorian Spanish and Peninsular Spanish; and García (2002) mostly focused on Venezuelan Spanish relating to requests for a service encounters. Also, Choi (2008) compared Korean and Peninsular Spanish compliments and Liu (2012) investigated how Chinese and Spanish speakers' compliments are different.

The cross-cultural studies on L2 speakers have also been widely investigated to show how differently NNS perform certain speech acts as compared to native Spanish speakers. Generally, they select a variety of linguistic forms to perform a speech act whereas NS mostly consider one form to be more adequate than others in the situation. (Blum-Kulka, 1982) Numerous research studies about Spanish as second language have been carried out: Koike (1989) carried out research on requests and commands in American learners' Spanish and American English; Le Pair (1996) investigated requests in a range of contexts in Dutch learners' Spanish and Peninsular Spanish with 'oral' DCT; and Félix-Brasdefer (2003) explored refusals to invitations in Spanish among Latin Americans and refusals in English by Americans via a role play.

2.1.4. Sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics

The distinction between sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic aspects of communication plays crucial roles for both learners and teachers of foreign languages

(Trosberg, 2010). Also, the paper aims to explore L2 learners' sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competence, therefore, this section is devoted to defining these terms and presenting relevant studies.

2.1.4.1. Definition and research

To begin, Márquez Reiter and Placencia (2005) differentiated definition between research in sociolinguistics and sociopragmatics before giving a detailed account: the former primarily concentrates on the ways in which spoken and written discourse relates to social variation, such as gender, age, race or occupation, and so on; the latter is the examination of meaning in interaction, where negotiation of the meaning between speaker and hearer, the context utterance and the prospective meaning of what is being said occurs. Accordingly, sociopragmatic variation can be described as the way in which speakers differ in their use of language in similar situational contexts with similar communicative purposes; therefore, they involve different communicative patterns. In other words, research in sociopragmatics essentially aims to investigate differences in meaning in interaction as affected by sociocultural factors, such as institutional context and family context (p.192-93). As Kasper and Rose (2001) stated, sociopragmatics is the intersection of sociology and pragmatics and refers to "the social perceptions underlying participants' interpretation and performance of communicative action" (p.2).

On the other hand, Leech (1983) defined pragmalinguistics as ''the particular resources which a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions'' (p. 11). Also, Rose and Kasper (2001) stated that pragmalinguistics is "the linguistic resources available for conveying communicative acts and performing pragmatic functions" and includes "pragmatic strategies such as directness and indirectness, routines and a large range of linguistic forms which can intensify or soften communicative acts'' (p. 2). Therefore, pragmalinguistics concentrates on the meeting of pragmatics and linguistic forms, which comprises the knowledge of the use of

the conventions of meaning and conventions of forms (Mirzaei, A., Roohani, A., Esmaeili, M., 2012, p. 82). In other words, whereas sociopragmatics is more related to sociological aspects of pragmatics, pragmalinguistics aims to research appropriate linguistic elements to realize speech acts.

The studies in pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics in Spanish that have been carried out can be classified as: variation in speech act realization, variation in conversational organization, and politeness variation. The research focuses on speech act and request; therefore, the studies regarding variation in speech act realization and politeness variation in Spanish are mentioned here. Placencia (1994) investigated differences in the opening of the domestic telephone calls in Peninsular and Ecuadorian Spanish and also compared requests in service encounters in Madrid and in Quito (1998); Puga Larraín (1997) investigated requests and other speech acts in Chilean and in Peninsular Spanish; Hardin (2001) examined orders, suggestions, and recommendations in Chilean, American and Peninsular Spanish; Curcó (1998) and Curcó and De Fina (2002) compared requests and other speech acts in Mexican (Mexico City) and Peninsular Spanish (Barcelona); and Márquez Reiter (2002) researched differences in requests in a range of contexts in Uruguayan and Peninsular Spanish through an open role play.

2.2. Research on Spanish pragmatic variation

As discussed briefly in the previous section, research on sociopragmatic variation in Spanish has been explored including in Spain, Uruguay, Mexico, Peru, etc. The current project does not mainly concentrate on investigating Spanish variation on speech acts. However, it is still important to mention the studies regarding sociopragmatic variation on speech acts, for future investigation on the realization of speech acts of L2 speakers and native speakers. This section mostly discusses pragmatic variation in Spain and Argentina, including other countries.

2.2.1. Spain

The majority of the research on pragmatic variation has focused on comparison between Spaniards and speakers in other Spanish speaking countries. Placencia (1994) initiated research in sociopragmatic variation and studied different openings in telephone calls in Peninsular Spanish and Ecuadorian Spanish. She found out that Spaniards tended to use more direct forms compared to Ecuadorians (Ecuadorian Spanish: *Sí, ¿con quién hablo?* 'Yes, with whom do I talk?'; Peninsular Spanish: *Sí, ¿quién eres?* 'Yes, who are you?') (p. 70). According to Márquez Reiter (2002), both Uruguayans and Spaniards tend to utilize more indirect request with people who they are not familiar with. Nonetheless, they show differences in tentativeness: Uruguayan Spanish requests were more tentative than those in Peninsular Spanish indicated by making their requests longer and showing a preference for more external and internal modification of the downgrading type (p. 151).

Márquez Reiter et al. (2005) examined conventional indirectness from British English and Peninsular Spanish via open role play, post-performance interviews, and questionnaires. They stated that "Spanish conventionally indirect requests were a lot less tentative and rarely mitigated, and lacked any embedded grounders" (p. 13). Additionally, overall the Spaniards showed higher certainty than the British participants. British people considered their neighbors as strangers and they did not know what their reaction would be, so they showed lower certainty than the Spaniards in the investigation. Therefore, the author concluded that the use of strategies was different according to different social meanings based on different social values.

López Sánchez's (2010) investigation showed some interesting results on request behaviors in American English and Peninsular Spanish. It showed that Spaniards find being 'coercive' acceptable more often than Americans do. Although the most recurrent type of the head acts was conventionally indirect types, Spaniards had higher tolerance for directness compared to American, although, not in all situations. Specifically, they show different

strategies when the addressee is a family member or someone with less social power than the addresser; Spaniards employed impositive or 'coercive' realizations more frequently in these situations. In Peninsular Spanish, mitigating politeness was rarely employed between family members and in the workplace. The author gave explanation of this phenomena: "Spaniards tend to have a less territorial and bound notion of self than Americans" (p. 35). In other words, in some situations where American participants may feel uncomfortable to impede or threaten other people's negative face, Spaniards people may not necessarily consider it is harmful to invade someone's self-territory in a certain degree. Therefore, the author found a cross-cultural difference and raised a question on the universality of Brown and Levinson's view on positive and negative face.

2.2.2. Argentina

In CCSARP, Blum-Kulka (1989) investigated Argentinian Spanish and found out that 58% of the Argentinian Spanish speakers use the conventionally indirect strategy, whereas the direct strategy usage was preferred by 49% of the informants. In this project, Argentinian speakers show a tendency to employ query preparatories (*Judith, ¿podes prestarme los apuntes de la clase anterior por favor?* 'Judith, can you lend me your notes from the previous class?') more frequently among conventionally indirect strategy types. Also, "the speakers of the Argentinian Spanish are the least bothered by consideration of perspective", showing a great preference (about 97%) to use a hearer-oriented strategy (*¿Me prestas los apuntos de la clase de ayer?* 'Will you lend me your notes from yesterday?') (p. 55).

Alba-Juez (2007) explored important theoretical and empirical studies of politeness on Argentinian and Uruguayan Spanish. The author mentioned several research studies on politeness in Argentinian Spanish. Weber de Kurlat (1941) investigated address forms in Buenos Aires, and especially described how the pronoun *tú* could still be used in Buenos Aires during the 1940s, which was a transitional form between the intimate *vos* and the respectful

usted. A more recent study by Rigatuso (2000) focused on co-occurrence of formal address forms and the informal verbal forms in buying-selling interactions. The author asserted that people from Buenos Aires showed a tendency toward using a more informal system. Piatti (2003) examined both NNSs and NSs of Argentinean Spanish via questionnaire, where they were asked to react to an offer and to a request and to refuse an invitation. The author found out that native speakers employed mitigation strategies to maintain relationships, whereas nonnatives use those strategies where there is social distance. Therefore, the author suggested activities for engaging pragmatic strategies in the teaching of Spanish for NNSs.

García (2007) studied Argentinean invitations and pointed out that Argentinean informants preferred showing solidarity to indicating deference. Also, she stated that they preferred to enhance their own and their interlocutor's positive face, "sending a strong message that they liked and approved of the interlocutor and wanted to be liked by him or her" (p. 299). The same author (2008) conducted a study on solidarity politeness in Argentinean Spanish and Venezuelan Spanish. Interestingly, the results indicated that Argentinians highly preferred to employ solidarity politeness strategies (SPS). Almost 80% of the request head acts were impositives including mood derivable and locution derivable (*Sí, venite más o menos a las 8 de la noche.* 'Yes, come more or less at 8 p.m.'; *—y así te invito así no (te tengo que) llamar así.* '—and then I invite you so (I don't have to) call and so.'; *...quiero que vengas* '…I want you to come.') (p. 267), whereas the preference for deference politeness strategies (DPS), such as strong hints (El sábado cumplo años. 'My birthday is on Saturday.'; *... pero bueno voy a hacer así en casa una fiesta,* '…but well I am going to have a party in my house') (p. 280) was only 21% (p. 294). She inferred that there might be pragmatic failure between Argentinean and Venezuelan members: Venezuelan speakers could feel coerced when Argentineans try to establish solidarity, on the other hand, Argentineans may think that Venezuelan speakers lack a strong desire for inviting them or lack feeling of intimacy with them.

Yates (2015) investigated pragmatic variation in public service encounters at kiosks in Buenos Aires, Argentina. The data was collected via natural recordings between customers and vendors at stores, which lasted 13 hours. The data showed that the Argentineans preferred using openings and closings, direct request strategies, including elliptical and direct requests. Additionally, the author mentioned pervasiveness of informal-you (*vos*), which "demonstrates the sociocultural expectation of the informality of service encounters" (p. 153). Nicknames were employed in order to show familiarity, such as *capo*, *maestro*, *negro*, *amigo*, and *querido*.

Overall, Spaniards seems to have less self-territory compared to American speakers, therefore, they may not feel uncomfortable when being asked to help others, including where there is social distance. Argentineans appear to prefer solidarity over deference during interaction, especially inviting, and to favor informality and familiarity not only between friends or co-workers, but also between vendors and customers in service encounters.

2.2.3. Other countries

García (1993) researched Peruvian Spanish and found that Peruvians demonstrated a greater preference for expressing deference and respect toward their interlocutor reflecting the desire not to threaten the negative face of the hearer. Also, female speakers tended to be more deferential; nevertheless, this result has not shown significant difference compared to male speakers (p. 147-148). The same author (2008) mentioned that Venezuelan speakers preferred to respect interlocutor's freedom to accept or refuse invitations, in other words, not to threaten hearer's negative face. In relation to Mexican requests, Félix-Brasdefer (2005) indicated that the 'query preparatory' was most preferred by Mexican university students among conventionally indirect strategies in situation with more social distance and higher social power. Nonetheless, between closer interlocutors, directness was more frequently used (p. 76).

The present section described cross-cultural research regarding speech act realization and especially, regarding Spanish variation. The following section introduces important

concepts in second language acquisition focusing on the pragmatic perspective.

2.3. Important concepts in second language acquisition (SLA)

The present research concentrates on how L2 learners develop pragmatic competence in Spanish, therefore, a few important concepts regarding SLA are explained in order to analyze the data of the investigation: L1 transfer, interlanguage and L2 pragmatic competence.

2.3.1. L1 transfer

Hassall (2013), who investigated pragmatic development of L2 speakers of Indonesian, emphasized the importance of language identities and language socialization and mentioned "L1 transfer" (p. 2). Kasper (1992) contended that the term 'transfer' does not have an agreed-upon meaning, among other experts, but according to Faerch and Kasper (1987, p. 112), 'transfer' is a "psycholinguistic procedure by means of which L2 learners activate their L1 knowledge in developing or in using their 'interlanguage'". It plays an important role while L2 speakers acquire L2 pragmatic norms, since it can help develop pragmatic competence (Kasper, 1992; Blum-Kulka, 1982).

2.3.2. Interlanguage

'Interlanguage' is closely related to 'transfer' in pragmatics. L2 learners struggle to produce the same utterances as they hear native speakers making, but they sometimes fail to make the native-like utterances. In this way, Selinker (1972) hypothesized "the existence of a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a target language (TL) form". He called this linguistic system 'interlanguage' (p. 214). Bialystok and Sharwood Smith (1985) also defined interlanguage as "mental representation of systematic, organized information about the target language, and the procedures for effectively and efficiently retrieving that knowledge in appropriate situation" (p. 106). According to Koike (1989), "'interlanguage' is the term given to an interim series of stages of language learning between L1 and L2 grammars through which all L2 learners must

pass on their way to attaining fluency in the TL" (p. 280). Thus, interlanguage pragmatics concentrates on the acquisition and application of pragmatic norms in L2: how L2 learners comprehend and produce speech acts, and how their pragmatic competence progresses with time (Kecskés, 2014).

2.3.3. L2 pragmatic competence

Taguchi (2009) defined pragmatic competence as "the ability to use language appropriately in a social context" which involves both innate and learned capacities and develops naturally through a socialization process (p.1). Dippold (2008) specified the definition of pragmatic competence by dividing it into two components: it is understood as knowledge of forms and strategies to convey particular illocutions (i.e. pragmalinguistic competence) and as knowledge of the use of these forms and strategies in an appropriate context (i.e. sociopragmatic competence). Also, Harlow (1990) stated that sociopragmatic competence is the ability to ''vary speech-act strategies according to the situational or social variables in the act of communication'' (p. 1). Therefore, in order to be pragmatically competent, learners must incorporate their sociopragmatic knowledge with pragmalinguistic forms and strategies and produce socially and linguistically appropriate utterances.

Liu (2004) stated that pragmalinguistic failure is related to a linguistic deficiency "caused by differences in the linguistic encoding of pragmatic force", while sociopragmatic failure centers in insufficiency of sociocultural knowledge and "cross-culturally different perceptions of what constitutes appropriate linguistic behavior" (p. 16). The previous research has demonstrated that the pragmatic knowledge of NNS and that of NSs may be somewhat different since NNS have distinct systems of using it. Therefore, foreign language learners should learn pragmalinguistic as well as sociopragmatic aspects of the target language use in classroom in order to enhance pragmatic competence and lessen cases of pragmatic failure (Mirzaei, A., Roohani, A., Esmaeili, M., 2012).

2.4. Impact of study abroad on pragmatic competence

A number of studies have researched the study abroad (SA) context and its impact on language socialization and with a view that SA could enhance student's pragmatic competence. The biggest question that has been raised is if there is any significant pragmatic development between students who have studied abroad, and control groups of students who have not experienced SA. Additionally, it is an open question whether the length of the study abroad program significantly affects learners' pragmatic development. The current section is dedicated to exploring research on the impact of study abroad on L2 pragmatic development and is divided into two subsections according to length of the program: long-term study abroad and short-term study abroad.

2.4.1. Long-term study abroad

Several authors have agreed that SA programs enhanced students' pragmatic competence despite the fact that significant development may not have been evident (Alcón-Soler & Hernández, 2017; Code & Anderson, 2001; Owen, 2001). Code and Anderson (2001) investigated Japanese high school students doing homestay in New Zealand or Canada for 10 months and found out that students who attended a SA program were better able to notice native norms for requesting behavior. Cohen and Shively (2007) examined acquisition of requests and apologies of Spanish and French learners and also researched the impact of the SA program and the intervention during the program. They concluded that as a whole, students demonstrated the pragmatic development during the SA and also suggested that students' strategies of mitigating requests were developed by intervention. However, the authors did not find any significant impact of the intervention of the SA program. A more recent study by Alcón-Soler and Hernández (2017) studied 122 international students who were in their first semester, focusing on development in learners' recognition and production of pragmatic routines via vocabulary tests and written DCTs. The results indicated that students showed

higher gains in recognition than in production of pragmatic routines during a semester. The author also mentioned that learners' proficiency was not significantly related to pragmatic gains.

On the contrary, other researchers argue that no significant differences between the SA group and the control group existed, showing that the SA group did not necessarily achieve greater language gains than the control group (Dewey, 2004; Díaz-Campos, 2004; Rodríguez, 2001). Barron (2003) investigated 33 Irish learners of German who studied abroad for 1 year in Germany utilizing a DCT to compare the learners' speech act realization and that of native German speakers. Even though pragmatic knowledge of the speech acts improved over time, their pragmatic knowledge was not as high as native speakers' norms. Also, the author mentioned that some pragmatic elements were not acquired until very late in their program. This finding may corroborate Schauer's research (2004) on pragmatic development of German learners of English. The author contended that the length of the stay in the program affected the pragmatic competence of the learners, since acquisitional series was related to the length of stay in the investigation. Therefore, it implies that short-term study abroad may not be sufficient for L2 pragmatic development.

Several articles focus on the impact of the study abroad and explicit instruction. Shively (2011) conducted a longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters through naturalistic audio recordings. The participants in the study were seven United States students who studied abroad for one semester in Toledo, Spain. The results showed that students acquired some of the pragmatic norms of service encounters in the target community, such as openings and requests: the verbs in request strategies shifted from speaker-oriented verbs (*...¿puedo tener café con leche?*, '…can I have coffee with milk?') to hearer- oriented verbs (*…ponme un tinto de verano por favor*, '…give me a summer red [wine] please') (p.1827). The usage of indirect and syntactically complex verb forms (*quisiera comprar una pila para ese reloj*, 'I would like to buy a battery for that watch') was reduced; rather, use of direct and

syntactically less complex structures increased (*me pones un- paquete de*:: 'you give me a- packet of ::') (p.1828). The author asserted that explicit instructions had an impact on a few students' requesting behavior in service encounters. Alcón-Soler (2015) found an immediate effect on students' production of e-mail request mitigators, which did not last until the end of the program and concluded that instruction and length of stay may interact together. Their participants included 60 Spanish students who had decided to study in the United Kingdom for one academic year. 30 participants were instructed on e-mail requests, whereas the others were not. The results showed that the experimental group demonstrated ability to mitigate their request in e-mails, but this change was not mirrored in the control group. Particularly, the author pointed out that it was the explicit instructions that contributed learners' pragmatic development, not length of stay in this investigation. Lastly, Halenko and Jones (2017) conducted research on the impact of the pre-departure explicit instruction and the study abroad environment with 34 students during a 6-month period. The results revealed that explicit instruction promoted immediate pragmatic development and the students sustained it to some extent. Also, the findings demonstrated that the experimental group with explicit pre-departure instructions utilized more internal and external modification. The authors suggested that it may be beneficial to create cross-cultural connections in the classroom before departure. Moreover, it can be effective to repeat pragmatic instruction in the target environment to promote long term memory.

2.4.2. Short term study abroad

There has been increasing attention on the pragmatic development of L2 Spanish learners during short-term study abroad and varied findings have been provided (Félix-Brasdefer & Haser-Barker, 2015; Hernández, 2016; Czerwionka & Cuza, 2017; Hernández & Boero, 2018).

Félix-Brasdefer and Haser-Barker (2015) examined learners' pragmatic ability to

produce appropriate compliments in four situations using oral DCTs. The participants in the study consisted of three groups: learners in SA studying for eight weeks in Guanajuato, Mexico; learners in At Home (AH) contexts; and native speakers of Spanish and English. They compared the pretest and posttest within both the SA and AH groups and the results indicated that learners in the SA context produced more native-like compliments in posttest, using "*Qué* ADJ/ADV NP (What ADJ/ADV NP) strategy, e.g. *¡Qué lindo vestido!* (What a lovely dress!)" (p. 80). The NS Spanish group preferred this type of compliments among seven possible strategies. In contrast, no significant differences were found for the AH group for this strategy. Moreover, the erroneous usage of the adverb *bien* (well) was found in the AH group, producing it as an adjective (*Tu casa es bien*, 'Your house is well'), whereas this was much less frequent in the SA group in the pretest and posttest. Another evidence of change as a result of the SA experience was found in the production of a higher frequency of the adjective *padre* (cool), which is a preeminent adjective in Mexican Spanish. This adjective was not found among students in the AH group, which showed limitations of the AH context. The author confirmed that there was positive pragmatic development of the SA group toward NS Spanish norms in this investigation.

Hernández (2016) examined the pragmatic development of the requesting behavior of twenty students who spoke English as their L1. They participated in a four-week SA in Madrid, Spain. The instrument of this investigation was comprised of a written DCT with a total of five situations. Two native speakers participated in the evaluation of the responses on the request production questionnaire. The results showed that the students achieved some progress in their request performance during the SA, since the groups' posttest average is higher than their pretest average for each situation. However, the author found that while students improved some aspects of their production, other aspects remained unaffected. For example, the SA group kept using query preparatory (i.e. ¿*Puede hablar más despacio por favor*? (Can you speak

slower please?) in all five situations in pretest and posttest while native speakers never used this strategy at all. Moreover, the preference for speaker-oriented requests (e.g. *¿Puedo tener una extensión en el trabajo*? (Can I have an extension on the paper?) was maintained in four out of five situations in their pretest and posttest whereas hearer-oriented requests would have been more native-like (e.g. *¿Me daría una extensión en el trabajo*? (Could you give me an extension on the paper?). No differences were found between the SA group and native speakers in their use of politeness marker *por favor* (please). Based on the results, the author concluded that marginal progress in their requesting behavior had been achieved and contended that it is necessary to adopt a "three-part pragmatic intervention" (p. 210), which consist of pre-departure intervention, intervention during SA program and post-intervention after SA.

Czerwionka and Cuza (2017) investigated pragmatic acquisition of requests of English-speaking learners of Spanish during short-term study abroad. The learners participated in a short-term immersion program for six weeks in Madrid, Spain. They examined the acquisition of requests in three controlled situational contexts: "food and drink, general merchandise, and familial" (p. 391). Seventeen English-speaking learners of Spanish and fifteen Spaniards participated in the investigation and they completed a computerized oral DCT. Spanish learners did this task within three days of the beginning and end of the immersion program. The data indicated that a considerable increase in hearer-oriented requests was found overall, showing pragmatic development for learners. At the beginning of the program, the preference for speaker-oriented requests was noted: *Queremos café*, 'We want coffee'; *Necesito una cebolla*, 'I need an onion', etc.) (p. 408). However, these types of strategies were decreased during the immersion program. Typical hearer-oriented requests by learners were imperatives (*Ponme un café*, 'Give me a coffee') than other types of requests and maintained a less frequent use of hearer-oriented interrogatives (*¿Nos puedes poner un café por favor?* 'Can you bring us a coffee please?'), which did not follow native speaker tendency in the study. With respect to

situational contexts, the authors confirmed that learners' requesting behavior was more native-like in relation to requesting food and drink than other situations. They concluded that pragmatic improvement regarding request acquisition can happen during short-term SA without any pragmatic intervention, supporting the idea of Bardovi-Harlig (1999) who found that "shorter lengths of stay might help learners become more targetlike, particularly with respect to highly salient conversational functions" (p. 685).

Heranández and Boero (2018) explored the impact of explicit pedagogical intervention on students' pragmatic development of request performance during short-term SA. Their participants included: fifteen English-speaking undergraduate students who participated in a four-week SA program in Valladolid, Spain; fifteen native Spanish speakers from Spain; and two Spaniards in order to rate the SA group's responses. The learners received explicit instruction about requests before the SA program and completed a written DCT 4 weeks prior to the SA program and again at the end of the program. The scores of two native speakers represented how they believed that they would react to the SA group's responses in each situation. The results revealed that the SA group was rated higher on the posttest than the pretest for five situations. More specifically, the learners increased their use of verbal downgrading, such as using the conditional or past imperfect to mitigate the imposition of the request (*¿Me daría una extensión en mi trabajo?*, 'Could you give me an extension on my paper?') while their used of query preparatory decreased. Both raters confirmed that the use of verbal downgrading was a factor in their higher performance ratings. With respect to some external modifications, such as grounders, which offer the reason for the request (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p.17) (e.g. *Es que he hablado con mis compañeros y a veces no entendemos que nos dice*. 'It's just that I have spoken with my classmates and sometimes we cannot understand what you are saying to us.') and appreciation (e.g. *¡Muchísimas gracias! Se lo agradezco.* 'Thank you very much! I appreciate it.'), the SA group produced more native-like request behavior on both

the pretest and the posttest. Regarding request perspective, a greater use of hearer-oriented forms (*¿Podrías hablar más despacio*? 'Could you speak slower?') was found on the posttest and affirmed the pragmatic development of the SA group. These findings led to the conclusion that the explicit intervention was successful in spite of the short length of the SA program.

This chapter has been dedicated to reviewing previous studies regarding making requests in the Spanish of L2 speakers during short-term SA. To sum up, making a request may seem simple, but it requires a high degree of pragmatic competence. Making a request is one of the directive speech acts (Searle, 1976), and it necessitates the investigation of indirect speech acts and politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Fraser, 1990). Previous research has found that the concept of being polite is not universal; therefore, Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) investigated cross-cultural pragmatics regarding requests and apologies in different languages. They also examined different speech act realizations of L2 speakers and observed the difference between native speakers and L2 speakers. Accordingly, their research suggested that it is necessary that learners develop pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence in order to produce native-like speech acts. Recently, a number of studies have focused on the impact of the SA on pragmatic competence and found a common result: students develop pragmatic competence, but only to a certain extent during SA. Chapter 3 presents the research questions and the methodology used for the current paper.

Chapter 3.
Methodology

3.1. Research questions and hypotheses

The goal of the current paper is to examine the Spanish L2 learners' pragmatic development in their strategies of requesting behaviors during a short-term SA in Argentina and in Spain via qualitative analysis. The present paper adopts Martinsen's (2008) definition of short-term SA programs, that is, those programs which last "two months or less" (p. 504). The investigation examines three specific research questions:

1) How did the SA learners' production of requests change after the short-term SA in Argentina and in Spain?
2) Do learners in SA groups have differences in their request strategies compared to students who have not participated in a SA program?
3) To what extent do learners in the SA groups become more native-like in their request strategies after a short-term SA compared to native speakers?

Regarding hypotheses for the research questions, it is expected that the students who participated in the SA program would change their speaker-oriented strategies to hearer-oriented strategies over the period abroad, considering exposure to native speakers' norms in their daily life. Also, for the students who study abroad in Spain, more direct request behavior can be expected considering Czerwionka and Cuza's research (2017), which showed a learner shift towards directness at least in Spanish food and drink request contexts. Relating to internal mitigation uses, it is expected that the SA groups would use more politeness markers such as, *por favor* 'please' and more lexical downgraders, such as a use of the diminutive *-ito*, in various vignettes on their posttest. For the learners in the SA program in Argentina, it is probable that they would produce query preparatory strategies based on Blum-Kulka et. al's (1989) research

findings regarding Argentinian Spanish requests. Moreover, they could acquire the pronominal *vos* (the informal singular second-person pronoun) form, considering that this pronominal form is universally used in Argentina. With respect to the differences between the control group of the NNSs and the SA groups, it is probable that the students in the SA groups produce more native-like request behaviors, such as hearer-oriented strategies with more appropriate usage of the internal mitigators.

3.2. Participants

The current investigation includes three groups of participants: an experimental group of U.S. students who participated in the SA programs in Argentina and in Spain; a control group of NSs of Spanish; and lastly, a control group of U.S. students studying Spanish as L2 who have never studied abroad. The total number of the students in the experimental group is 15, which consists of 5 students in the SA program in Argentina and 10 students in the SA program in Spain. All participants in the experimental groups were undergraduate students and they either majored or minored in Spanish. One participant in the Spain program and one participant in the Argentina program had already participated in other SA programs. The proficiency level of Spanish was not restricted for the SA program in Argentina, resulting in a diversity of levels in the group, whereas the proficiency level of Spanish was restricted to mostly intermediate level for the SA program in Spain.

Table 3.1. Information of the participants in SA programs in Argentina and Spain

Name	Age	Highest level of classes	Country of the SA program
Student 1	21	Advanced	Argentina
Student 2	20	Intermediate-high	Argentina
Student 3	21	Graduate	Argentina
Student 4	19	Intermediate	Argentina
Student 5	20	Intermediate-high	Argentina
Student 6	20	Intermediate	Spain
Student 7	19	Intermediate	Spain

(table cont'd.)

Name	Age	Highest level of classes	Country of the SA program
Student 8	21	Advanced	Spain
Student 9	20	Intermediate	Spain
Student 10	20	Intermediate	Spain
Student 11	20	Advanced	Spain
Student 12	19	Intermediate	Spain
Student 13	21	Intermediate-high	Spain
Student 14	20	Intermediate	Spain
Student 15	19	Intermediate-high	Spain

The control group of NSs of Spanish comprises seven native speakers of Spanish: five Mexicans and two Hondurans. Four of the five Mexicans have lived in Yucatan, Mexico throughout their lifetime, and two Hondurans and one Mexican are currently living in Louisiana, United States. For all seven, their native language is Spanish and they have been in the United States for less than 4 years.

Table 3.2. Information of the native speakers of Spanish

Name	Age	Nationality
Participant 1	45	Mexico
Participant 2	26	Mexico
Participant 3	63	Mexico
Participant 4	32	Mexico
Participant 5	22	Mexico
Participant 6	25	Honduras
Participant 7	20	Honduras

Another control group is comprised of twelve U.S. undergraduate students, none of whom had ever studied abroad[2]. Their proficiency level of Spanish is restricted to the advanced level and they either majored or minored in Spanish.

Table 3.3. Information of the control group of U.S. students

Name	Age	Highest level of classes
Participant 1	22	advanced
Participant 2	22	advanced

(table cont'd.)

[2] There was an outlier who worked for 10 weeks in Honduras, but had never studied abroad in the control group.

Name	Age	Highest level of classes
Participant 3	22	advanced
Participant 4	22	advanced
Participant 5	22	advanced
Participant 6	21	advanced
Participant 7	22	advanced
Participant 8	20	advanced
Participant 9	19	advanced
Participant 10	20	advanced
Participant 11	20	advanced
Participant 12	20	advanced

3.3. The study abroad program

The current paper explores two short-term Spanish SA programs in Argentina and in Spain, respectively. The SA in Granada, Spain was a five-week program and the SA in Córdoba, Argentina was a four-week program during the summer of 2018. The students in both countries lived with host families, and a majority of students had roommates, who were U.S. students. They took intermediate level classes and participated in extracurricular activities, such as exploring the downtown, eating in local restaurants, and traveling. The SA groups' approximate average hours of speaking Spanish per day is uncertain since the present investigation does not include interviews of the students, but it is certain that the students spoke Spanish while interacting with native speakers during the programs, as both programs focused on linguistic proficiency.

3.4. Data collection

Written discourse completion tasks (DCT) with rejoinders were used for the current paper. Two native speakers and one heritage speaker of Spanish confirmed the appropriateness of the questions and rejoinders in the pretest and the posttest. The heritage speaker revised the usage of English and Spanish in the pretest and the posttest, for the purpose of triangulation. The pretest was exclusively given to the experimental group of learners who participated in the SA programs prior to their departure to Argentina and Spain. The researcher conducted the face-to-face pretest and specific instructions were given in English before the questionnaire in

Spanish was presented. The learners had to complete the pretest within 10 minutes; the time restriction was so that the students would focus on their most natural reaction to the situation.

While the format, the instructions and the time limit of the pretest and posttest were consistent, the vignettes of the two tests were slightly different. The posttest for the group of the SA in Spain was completed with the help of the instructor of the program five weeks after they returned, and the posttest for the group of the SA in Argentina was carried out by the researcher four weeks after they returned.

NSs were required to do the same questionnaire on the posttest for the researcher to compare the SA groups' results with theirs. The data of NSs were collected in two different places: Yucatán (Mexico) and Louisiana. One of the researcher's colleagues was able to gather the data while she was traveling in Mexico during the summer. The instructions were given to the participants by the researcher's colleague and they completed the questionnaire in her presence. Besides the Mexican speakers' data, two Hondurans and one Mexican who are living in Louisiana also completed the questionnaire, thanks to another colleague of the researcher. The colleague also gave explicit instructions to the participants and they completed the questionnaire in her presence.

Lastly, the control group of U.S. students, who had not participated in SA programs, completed the same questionnaire on the posttest so as to be compared with the SA groups' results. The level of the students in the control group was advanced and this group was used to investigate if there are differences between the students who studied abroad and those who had not. The researcher was allowed to conduct the questionnaire at the end of the class by each professor and the learners who never studied abroad completed their survey in the researcher's presence.

3.4.1. Request production questionnaire

The instrument was comprised of written DCTs with a total of five request vignettes.

For each vignette, students were asked to produce an appropriate request. The five vignettes on the pretest and the posttest are described in Table 3.4 and 3.5, respectively.

Table 3.4. Description of the vignettes on the DCT (pretest) (modified from King, 2007)

Vignette	Relative Social Status of Hearer	Social Distance	Degree of Imposition
Borrowing a book: A student asks a professor to lend a book to complete a class paper.	High	Mid	Mid/High
Moving a car: A police officer asks an elderly man to move his car because he parked in a prohibited fire zone.	Equal/High	High	Low
Borrowing $50: A student asks his/her roommate to lend $50 to buy a ticket for his/her favorite singer's concert.	Equal	Low	High
Driving to the hospital: A parent of a three-year-old son asks his/her neighbor to drive him/her to the hospital because the son is sick and his/her car is not available.	Equal	Mid	Mid/High
Patient's information: A doctor asks his/her intern to find a patient's file and bring it immediately because the internet is down temporarily.	Low	Low	Mid

Table 3.5. Description of the vignettes on the DCT (posttest and questionnaire for the control groups) (modified from King, 2007)

Vignette	Relative Social Status of Hearer	Social Distance	Degree of Imposition
Time schedule: A worker asks a manager to change the time schedule because he/she needs to take his/her mother to the hospital urgently.	High	Mid	High
Taking care of a dog: A person asks his/her sister to take care of his/her dog during traveling.	Equal	Low	Mid
Opening a class: A student asks his/her professor to open a required class for his/her graduation.	High	Mid	High
Grocery store: A chef asks his/her assistant to go to the grocery because of lack of time	Low	Low	Low
Borrowing money: A person asks an elderly man to borrow some money at the bus stop to take a bus because he/she doesn't have a wallet or cell phone.	High	High	Mid

3.4.2. Data analysis

The researcher coded and quantified the use of strategies in the request vignettes using the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project Coding Manual (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989).

Table 3.6. Coding categories (adapted from Blum-Kulka et al. 1989)

Coding category	Examples by the researcher
Request: Head act strategies	
Mood derivable	*Limpia tu cuarto.* Clean your room.
Performative	*Te estoy pidiendo que limpies tu cuarto.* I'm asking you to clean your room.
Hedged performative	*Me gustaría pedirte que limpiaras tu cuarto.* I would like to ask you to clean your room.
Obligation statement	*Tienes/Tendrás que limpiar tu cuarto.* You will have to clean your room.
Want statement	*Quiero que limpies tu cuarto.* I want you to clean your room.
Suggestory formulae	*¿Qué te parece limpiar tu cuarto?* How about cleaning your room?
Query preparatory (with verbal downgrading)	*¿Puedes/Podrías limpiar tu cuarto?* Can/Could you clean your room?
Strong hint	*Tu cuarto está hecho un desastre.* Your room is a mess.
Mild hint	*Tienes tantas cosas en tu cuarto.* You have a lot of things in your room.
Request: Internal mitigation	
Politeness marker *por favor* (please)	*Limpia tu cuarto, por favor.* Clean your room, please.
Lexical downgrader	*¿Puedes limpiar tu cuarto un poquito?* Can you clean your room a little bit?
Request: Perspective	
Speaker-oriented	*Quiero que limpies tu cuarto.* I want you to clean your room.
Hearer-oriented	*¿Puedes/Podrías limpiar tu cuarto?* Can/Could you clean your room?
Inclusive	*¿Podemos limpiar tu cuarto ahora?* Can we clean your room now?
Impersonal	*Es necesario limpiar tu cuarto.* It's necessary to clean your room.

(table cont'd.)

Coding category	Examples by the researcher
Address form	
Name or Title	*Profesor, ¿podría abrir esta clase para mí?* Professor, could you open this class for me?
Tú (informal singular second-person pronoun)	*¿podrías abrir esta clase para mí?* Could you (informal you) open this class for me?
Vos (informal singular second-person pronoun)	*¿Podés abrir esta clase para mí?* Can you (informal you) open this class for me?
Usted (formal singular second-person pronoun)	*¿Podría Ud. abrir esta clase para mí?* Can you (formal you) open this class for me?

The current paper followed Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) taxonomy and modified it to analyze the data. The modified coding categories are presented in the following chapter. Requests were coded for six head act strategies, two internal mitigation uses and three request perspective verbs. The address forms were coded for four forms: proper name or a title, *tú*, *vos* and *usted*. Each group's responses are analyzed based on these coding categories and a number of findings are discussed in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4.
Results and Discussion

In the first section of this chapter, results of the SA groups on the pretest are presented and the results of the SA groups, NNSs, and NSs on the posttests are presented in the second section. In both sections, four categories are described: head act strategies, internal mitigations, request perspective orientation, and address forms. Table 4.1 shows the coding categories for requests with examples from the students in the SA groups and in the control group of NNSs.

Table 4.1. Coding categories for requests with examples from students in the SA groups and in the control group of NNSs[3]

Coding category	Example from the students in SA groups and the NNSs group
Request: Head act strategies	
Mood derivable	*Busca la información de _____, por favor. Es urgente.* (Student pretest: Patient's information) Find _____'s information, please. It's urgent.
Obligation statement	*Señor, necesita mover su carro ahora*. (Student pretest: Moving a car) Sir, you have to move your car now.
Want statement	*Te necesito voy a supermercado para comprar mantequilla, leché y pan*. (Student posttest: Grocery store) I want you to go to supermarket to buy butter, milk and bread.
Query preparatory	*¿Puedes prestarme dinero por el concierto?* (Student pretest: Borrowing $50) Can you lend me money for the concert?
Query preparatory with verbal down grading	*Mi hijo está enfermo y no tengo un coche. ¿Podría traer nosotros?* (Student pretest: Driving to the hospital) My son is sick and I don't have a car. Could you take us?
Hint	*No es legal a estar aquí con su carro*. (Student pretest: Moving a car) It is not legal to be here with your (formal) car.
Other	*¿Era traiga $50, por favor?* (Student pretest: Borrowing $50) Was it to bring $50, please?
Request: Internal mitigation	

(table cont'd.)

[3] The researcher is reporting the students' data without correcting any grammatical or spelling errors. The students' responses are included exactly as they appear on the DCT responses.

Coding category	Example from the students in SA groups and the NNSs group
Politeness marker *por favor* (please)	*¡Hola! Necesito tomar esta clase para graduar. Pero, la clase no está abierta. ¿Puede abrir la clase para mí? Por favor.* (Student posttest: Opening a class) Hello, I need to take this class to graduate. But the class is not open. Can you open the class? Please.
Lexical downgrader	*¿Pueda darme dinerito?* (Student posttest: Borrowing money) Can you give a little bit of money?
Request: Perspective	
Speaker-oriented	*¿Puedo tener 50 dolares por favor?* (Student pretest: Borrowing $50) Can I have 50$, please?
Hearer-oriented	*¿Podrías ir al mercado?* (Student posttest: Grocery store) Could you go to the market?
Inclusive	*Tengo una lista, necesitamos todos estos ingredientes.* (NNS student posttest: Grocery store) I have a list, we need all these ingredients.
Impersonal	*¿Es posible que tenga dinero para el concierto?* (Student pretest: Borrowing $50) Is it possible that I have money for the concert?
Other	*¿Hola profesor, te pongo en esta clase por favor?* (Student posttest: Opening a class) Hello professor, Do/Can I put you in this class, please?
Address form	
Name or Title	*Hola, Señor, ¿puedo usar su libro para hacer mi ensayo?* (Student pretest: Borrowing a book) Hello Sir, can I use your book to do my essay?
Tú (informal singular second-person pronoun)	*Busca la información para el/la hombre/mujer más rápido, por favor. (*Student pretest: A patient's information) Find the information for the man/the woman faster, please.
Vos (informal singular second-person pronoun)	*¡Andá al supermercado para comprar la comida que yo necesito para cocinar esta noche!* (Student posttest: Grocery store) Go (command in *vos* form) to the supermarket to buy the food that I need in order to cook this night!
Usted (formal singular second-person pronoun)	*Perdon, yo necesito ud. a mover su carro por favor.* (Student pretest: Moving a car) Excuse me, I need you to move your car, please.
No address form	*¿Puedo cambiar el rato del trabajo para hoy?* (NNS student posttest: Time schedule) Can I change the work time for today?

As described in Table 4.1, requests were coded for six head act strategies, for two internal mitigation uses, and for four request perspectives. Lastly, the address forms were coded for five items. Some tokens were classified as 'other', since they cannot be parsed. For example, the token *¿Hola profesor, te pongo en esta clase por favor?* (Hello professor, Do/Can I put you

in this class, please?) cannot be analyzed and was classified as 'other' in the perspective category.

Each group's responses are presented based on these coding categories. In the following section, each category on the pretest is presented in the tables and the results of the SA groups are discussed.

4.1. Pretest

4.1.1. Head act strategies

The distribution of the head act strategies of the SA groups on the pretest is presented in Table 4.2.[4]

Table 4.2. Request strategy use of the SA groups on the pretest (raw frequencies, N=15)

Head Act	Borrowing a book	Moving a car	Borrowing $50	Driving to the hospital	Patient's information
Mood derivable	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	13 (86%)
Obligation statement	0 (0%)	5 (34%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Want statement	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Query preparatory	9 (60%)	2 (13%)	10 (67%)	11 (73%)	2 (13%)
Query preparatory with verbal down grading	2 (13%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)
Hint	4 (27%)	4 (27%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

There were four points worthy of mention in their use of request strategies on their pretest. Firstly, L2 learners highly preferred query preparatory than any other forms. Query preparatory is one of the "conventionally indirect strategies" (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p.18) and previous research has presented that it is one of the most-preferred strategies among English speakers. The fact that most L2 learners utilized this strategy before their SA seems

[4] The researcher is merging the Spain and Argentina SA participants into a single group for the purpose of analyzing the results in the present investigation.

plausible. However, on the Moving a car vignette (Equal/High, High, Low), a third of the students used obligation statement strategy, which is categorized as a "direct strategy" (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p.18). Even though they were making a request to an elderly man with whom they were not acquainted, more than half of the students preferred to use direct strategies (mood derivable, obligation statement, and want statement). Based on the contexts of the vignette, students could freely use direct strategy, as the hearer parked in an illegal zone and the speaker was a police officer who can make the elderly man move his car legally. Also, almost 90% of the students used mood derivable strategy in the Patient's information vignette (Low/Low/Mid). Considering these results, students were conscious of their profession (a police officer and a doctor) and its social position, which could have been one of the most influential factors when making a request.

Secondly, they did not use performatives, hedged performatives or suggestory formulae at all on their pretest. Taking into consideration the grammatical structure of this category of strategies, students may have not used them since the structure is too complicated for them. They may not have wanted to use them since they did not want to risk making any grammatical errors. Also, it is possible that Spanish classes may have not provided the students enough preparation about performatives, hedged performatives or suggestory formulae strategies for the students to feel comfortable using them.

Thirdly, they did not use want statements or query preparatories with verbal downgrading. These two strategies often require the use of different moods in Spanish. For example, the want statement strategy often requires the subjunctive mood in Spanish and query preparatories with verbal downgrading strategy often requires the conditional mood. As mentioned in the previous point, L2 learners may not have felt confident sufficiently to use those strategies without encountering any problems. They rather decided to use strategies with simpler structures, i.e., query preparatory.

Lastly, several students used hint strategies in the Borrowing a book vignette (High, Mid, Mid/High), the Moving a car vignette (Equal/High, High, Low), and the Borrowing $50 vignette (Equal, Low, High). The hint strategy is classified as a "nonconventionally indirect strategy" and it is not one of the most-preferred strategies due to its heavy reliance on the context (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 18). One example such as *Necesito un libro completer un papel.* 'I need a book (to) complete a paper.' is not necessarily a request, rather a strong hint. Other students also produced *¿Tienes…?* (Do you have…?) strategies, which seem less coercive as requests. Students may have chosen this strategy in order not to impose upon the hearer in the vignettes. Also, there was one token in the SA groups that could not be parsed and that had to be classified as 'other' due to the ungrammaticality of the token: *¿Era traiga $50, por favor?* 'Was it to bring $50, please?'

4.1.2. Internal mitigation

The distribution of the internal mitigation use of the SA groups on the pretest is presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3. Internal mitigation use of the SA groups on the pretest (raw frequencies, N=15)

Internal mitigation	Borrowing a book	Moving a car	Borrowing $50	Driving to the hospital	Patient's information
Politeness marker *por favor* (please)	5 (33%)	5 (33%)	5 (33%)	4 (26%)	6 (40%)
Lexical downgrader	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

There were two appreciable findings in L2 learners' internal mitigation use on their pretest. Firstly, a politeness marker *por favor* was found in response to every vignette, whereas only one token was found in the usage of the lexical downgrader in all situations (specifically, a use of the diminutive *-ito*). It is probable that the learners could have acquired the expression *por favor* in their classes and were able to produce it without any significant problems. However, the lexical downgrader use requires more pragmatic ability to understand the context

since it cannot be used as a fixed expression like *por favor*. For this reason, students may not have produced the lexical downgrader as frequently as the expression *por favor*.

Another interesting result is that the politeness marker was most frequently used on the Patient's information vignette (Low, Low, Mid). As mentioned previously, 90% of the students used the mood derivable option in this situation, which could have entailed the politeness marker. L2 learners may have produced the expression *por favor* to lessen the imposition of the request since they used the most direct strategy.

4.1.3. Request perspective

The distribution of the request perspective use of the SA groups on the pretest is presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4. Request perspective use of the SA groups on the pretest (raw frequencies, N=15)

Request perspective	Borrowing a book	Moving a car	Borrowing $50	Driving to the hospital	Patient's information
Speaker-oriented	10 (66%)	3 (20%)	7 (46%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)
Hearer-oriented	5 (33%)	11 (73%)	8 (54%)	11 (73%)	15 (100%)
Inclusive	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Impersonal	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Other	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

There were some contradictory findings regarding L2 learners' request perspective use on the pretest. Interestingly, the students overused speaker-oriented requests in only one vignette on the pretest, which was an unexpected result. In the Borrowing a book vignette (High, Mid, Mid/High), the high frequency of speaker-oriented requests was most striking, with two thirds of the students choosing speaker-oriented requests. Likewise, in the Borrowing $50 vignette (Equal/Low/High), almost half of the students used speaker-oriented requests. From a lexical perspective, students might not have known the word *prestar* (to lend) so they may have preferred speaker-oriented requests. From a different perspective, L2 learners may have used speaker-oriented requests considering the relative social status of the hearer and the degree of imposition of the requests. For example, in the Borrowing a book vignette (High, Mid,

Mid/High), they might not have wanted to pressure the hearer by using hearer-oriented requests since they were making a request to a professor. Likewise, in the Borrowing $50 vignette (Equal/Low/High), it is quite tough for a student to lend $50 to his or her roommate and the learners used speaker-oriented requests not to make the roommate feel obligated.

In the same context, all students used hearer-oriented requests in the Patient's information vignette (Low, Low, Mid). The students may not have minded using hearer-oriented requests since they were asking one of their interns to find information while taking the role of a supervisor. Likewise, in the Moving a car vignette, the learners were asking an elderly man who parked in an illegal parking zone to move his car while taking the role of a police officer; therefore, the learners may have decided to use hearer-oriented requests because a police officer has the authority to make a request toward hearers.

Nevertheless, a similar pattern was not found in the Driving to the hospital vignette (Equal, Mid, Mid/High). This vignette showed a high degree (or at least mid-level degree) of imposition and their social distance is not low. However, the majority of the students used hearer-oriented requests. On the one hand, it is possible that this request was considered to be quite acceptable for the hearer by the students. On the other hand, the learners may have realized that the possible speaker-oriented requests in this vignette, for example, *¿Puedo usar tu/su carro?* 'Can I use your car?' could sound somewhat rude or coercive.

4.1.4. Address forms

The distribution of the address forms of the SA groups on the pretest is presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5. Address forms of the SA groups on the pretest (raw frequencies, N=15)

Address form	Borrowing a book	Moving a car	Borrowing $50	Driving to the hospital	Patient's information
Name or Title	6 (40%)	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	9 (60%)	0 (0%)

(table cont'd.)

Address form	Borrowing a book	Moving a car	Borrowing $50	Driving to the hospital	Patient's information
Tú (informal singular second-person pronoun)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	7 (46%)	3 (20%)	11 (73%)
Vos (informal singular second-person pronoun)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Usted (formal singular second-person pronoun)	5 (33%)	3 (20%)	1 (6%)	3 (20%)	4 (26%)
No address form	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (26%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

These results regarding address forms showed four notable findings. Firstly, the students preferred the name or title most in the three vignettes: The Borrowing a book (High, Mid, Mid/High), the Moving a car (Equal/High, High, Low) and the Driving to the hospital vignettes (Equal, Mid, Mid/High). In the Moving a car vignette (Equal/High, High, Low), the description stipulated that the hearer was an elderly man, who can appropriately be addressed as either *Señor* (Sir) or *usted* (formal 'you') in Spanish. Likewise, the description in the Driving to the hospital vignette (Equal, Mid, Mid/High) explicitly indicated that the hearer's name was Mrs. García, who can be addressed as *Señora García* (Mrs. García) in Spanish. In the Borrowing a book vignette (High, Mid, Mid/High), the hearer was a professor, who can be addressed as *Profesor* (Professor). All three of the prompts explicitly presented hearer's name or title, which possibly led the students to use the name or a title in their responses.

Secondly, the pronominal form *tú* was preferred most in the Borrowing $50 (Equal, Low, High) and in the Patient's information vignette (Low, Low, Mid). The respondents did not use the address pronoun *tú* in any examples, but the verb associated with the pronominal form was conjugated in the *tú* form. Considering the results, the respondents were able to employ different address forms based on the relative social status of the hearer. The students used the pronominal form *tú* when they spoke to their roommate (equal status) in the Borrowing $50 vignette (Equal, Low, High) and to their intern (lower status) in the Patient's information

vignette (Low, Low, Mid).

Thirdly, the formal second-person form *usted* was attested in every vignette, including the Borrowing $50 vignette (Equal, Low, High). However, only one student used the address form *usted* in their responses, whereas other students used the verbs associated with the pronominal form *usted* or possessive adjective associated with the form *usted*, which is *su* (your).

Lastly, it was not possible to identify the address forms in some responses since the respondents did not specify them in the data: *¿Puedo tener 50 dolares por favor?* (Can I have 50 dollars, please?); *¿Puedo tener un libro por mi tarea?* (Can I have a book for my homework?) Also, there were five examples of unexpected usage of verb conjugations with the associated address form. For example, one student answered: *Pardo Señor, pero puedes movar su coche* (Excuse me Sir, but can you (informal) move your (formal) car?) This result was not expected, but quite interesting, since textbooks instruct students that verbs associated with the address form *Señor* are usually conjugated in the formal second-person singular form.

4.1.5. Summary of results of the pretest

The results of the pretest indicate that students have not fully acquired native-like request behaviors before attending SA programs. Even though students did use hearer-oriented requests in most of the vignettes, it did not necessarily prove that students had already acquired the native norms of request behaviors. It is possible that their request behaviors may have been more influenced by the grammatical structures of the requests or their limited vocabulary. It is also probable that the students were influenced by the rejoinders of the vignettes when making requests. For example, the positive rejoinder (*Claro que sí. Vamos al hospital en mi choche ahora.* 'Of course. Let's go to the hospital in my car now.') may have led the learners to use hearer-oriented requests or mood derivable strategy in the Driving to the hospital vignette (Equal, Mid, Mid/High), since the respondents may have thought that they could use more

direct strategies toward hearers based on the positive rejoinder on the vignette.

The following section presents each group's response on the posttest. Each category is presented in the tables and the results of each group are discussed.

4.2. Posttests

4.2.1. Head act strategies

The distribution of the head act strategies of the SA groups and two control groups on the posttest is presented in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6. Comparison of request strategy use between SA groups and the control groups on the posttest (raw frequencies; SA groups N=15, NNSs N=12, NSs N=7)

Head Act		Time schedule	Taking care of a dog	Opening a class	Grocery store	Borrowing money
Mood derivable	SA groups	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)
	NNSs	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Obligation statement	SA groups	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
	NNSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Want statement	SA groups	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
	NNSs	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	2 (16%)	0 (0%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)
Query preparatory	SA groups	9 (60%)	12 (80%)	13 (86%)	8 (53%)	12 (80%)
	NNSs	6 (50%)	7 (58%)	11 (91%)	6 (50%)	7 (58%)
	NSs	2 (29%)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)
Query preparatory with verbal down grading	SA groups	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)
	NNSs	1 (8%)	3 (25%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	2 (16%)
	NSs	5 (71%)	3 (43%)	5 (71%)	5 (71%)	6 (86%)
Hint	SA groups	5 (34%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)
	NNSs	5 (42%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (16%)	2 (16%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other	SA groups	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	NNSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)

Table 4.6 presents several intriguing results with respect to head act strategies of the SA groups, the NNSs group, and the NSs group. Firstly, query preparatory with verbal down grading strategies were preferred most by NSs in all vignettes. Interestingly, although the nationality of the NSs group was not identical (Mexican and Honduran), they showed a similar

pattern of making requests in all vignettes. NSs did not use any "nonconventionally indirect strategies" at all on the posttest and only one token of mood derivable strategy was found in the posttest. It was in response to the Taking care of a dog vignette (Equal, Low, Mid) and the example of mood derivable was articulated as: *Haces el favor de hacerlo* (Do me the favor of doing it), which can be interpreted as a mitigated command. Mostly, NS respondents used query preparatory and query preparatory with verbal downgrading in all situations, which are classified as "conventionally indirect strategies".

Unfortunately, there was one token in the Borrowing money vignette (High, High, Mid), which can't be parsed or analyzed in the current research, since the participant did not provide the appropriate answer for the analysis: *Lo saludaría ya cuando entremos en muchas aplica Así sucesivamente le pido para el pasaje.* (I would greet him when we already get on…like this successively, I will ask him (the money for) the ticket.) This answer shows that the participant did not answer what exactly he or she would like to say in this situation; rather, he or she wrote the participant's description of how he or she would act and say in given situation. Due to this reason, this answer is classified as 'other' in other categories as well.

The most preferred head act strategy among the SA groups was query preparatory. Although the results showed a slight increase in the usage of query preparatory with verbal downgrading strategy (pretest=5 tokens, posttest=6 tokens), it was not notable. They showed high frequency of the query preparatory in every vignette compared to the NSs. Particularly, the respondents in the SA groups seemed to use query preparatory strategies far more frequently than the NSs in the Borrowing money vignette (High, High, Mid). In that vignette, the speaker was required to ask an elderly man who was stranger to lend him or her money since s/he forgot their wallet and cell phone. No NSs used query preparatory strategy in this vignette (0%), while twelve out of fifteen students in SA groups chose that strategy (80%). Moreover, the SA groups used the hint strategies more frequently than the NSs in the Time

schedule vignette (High, Mid, High). Five students used hint strategies like *Tengo una emergencia. ¡Necesito tomar mi madre al hospital!* (I have an emergency. I have to take my mother to the hospital!); *Perdón, necesito ir por una emergencía* (Excuse me, I have to go due to an emergency.) This showed that a third of the students preferred to explain their situation, rather than making a request to change their schedule.

There was one token in the SA groups that could not be parsed and that had to be classified as 'other' due to the ungrammaticality of the token. The token was described as *¿Hola profesor, te pongo en esta clase por favor?* 'Hello professor, Do/Can I put you in this class, please?'.

The NNSs' request behaviors were quite similar to those of the SA groups. The most preferred head act strategy among the NNSs was query preparatory. Neither group used query preparatory with verbal downgrading (SA groups=6 tokens, NNSs group=8 tokens) in any vignette as frequently as NSs. They showed high frequency of mood derivable, want statement and hint strategies in some vignettes on the posttest. Both groups used hint strategies more frequently compared to NSs in the Time Schedule vignette (High, Mid, High). For example, the hint strategy like *Tengo una emergencia familial y no puedo trabajar, lo siento.* 'I have a family emergency and I can't work. I'm sorry.' was frequent among NNSs group in this vignette like SA groups. Also, both groups showed high frequency "direct strategies", such as mood derivable, obligation statement, and want statement strategies, compared to NSs in the Grocery store vignette (Low, Low, Low). There are two possible reasons for this finding: On the one hand, both the SA and NNSs groups might have wanted to use these strategies because they could not comfortably produce the structure of other strategies. For example, they might not have acquired the conditional or subjunctive moods even though all learners taking the survey had at least been exposed to these forms, since all Spanish language textbooks at the intermediate level review these moods. On the other hand, considering the vignette, both

groups might have believed that it is appropriate for chefs to order their assistants to go to the grocery store for them via commands.

One interesting token was found in the NNSs group in the Opening a class vignette (High, Mid, High): *Querría saber si usted pueda abrirlo?* 'I wanted to know if you can open it?' The student used query preparatory strategy with "the durative aspect marker (I want/wanted to know…)", past tense (wanted) as verbal downgrading and subjunctive mood for the head act as mitigating strategies (Blum-Kulka et. al, 1989, p. 282). This student never studied abroad, but worked in Honduras during 10 weeks, where he could have acquired a variety of mitigation strategies.

An interesting pattern was found in both SA groups and NNSs group in the posttest. Several students produced requests like *¿Es posible para mi a salir?* 'Is it possible for me to go out?' or *Es posible que usted vaya a ofrecer y/o enseñar esa clase en el próximo semestre* 'Is it possible for you (formal) to offer and/or teach that class in next semester?'. The researcher classified these requests as query preparatory since they are "utterances containing reference to preparatory condition, such as ability or willingness" (Blum-Kulka et. al, 1989, p. 350). However, the students' requests are not conventionalized in Spanish. This pattern is possibly due to their L1, which is called "L1 transfer" (Faerch & Kasper, 1987, p. 112). In other words, these students transferred their same English request strategies to Spanish, creating a nonconventionalized query preparatory usage in their requests.

4.2.2. Internal mitigation

The distribution of the internal mitigation use of the SA groups and two control groups on the posttest is presented in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7. Comparison of internal mitigation use between SA groups and the control groups on the posttest (raw frequencies; SA groups N=15, NNSs N=12, NSs N=7)

Internal mitigation		Time schedule	Taking care of a dog	Opening a class	Grocery store	Borrowing money
Politeness marker *por favor* (please)	SA groups	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	4 (26%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)
	NNSs	1 (8%)	2 (16%)	0 (0%)	3 (25%)	3 (25%)
	NSs	1 (14%)	3 (42%)	2 (28%)	2 (28%)	3 (42%)
Lexical downgrader	SA groups	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (26%)
	NNSs	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 4.7 showed that no lexical downgrader was used by NSs in any vignette, while the usage of the politeness marker *por favor* was distributed in every vignette. A slight decrease in the usage of the politeness marker *por favor* was observed in the SA groups compared to their pretest. There was a slight increase in the usage of lexical downgraders among the SA group between the pretest and the posttest (pretest=0 token, posttest=5 tokens), which suggest that the students may have acquired the mitigation strategy during their SA program.

The NNSs group presented a similar pattern as the NSs group with respect to their politeness marker usage on the posttest. Regarding lexical downgraders, there were only 2 tokens in the NNSs group, which was the difference between the SA groups and the NNSs group. Interestingly, the NNSs group did not use any politeness marker in the Opening the class vignette (High, Mid, High), where both SA groups and NSs group preferred to use it (SA groups= 26%, NSs group= 28%).

4.2.3. Request perspective

The comparison of request perspective use of the SA groups and two control groups on the posttest is presented in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8. Comparison of request perspective use between the SA groups and the control groups on the posttest (raw frequencies; SA groups N=15, NNSs N=12, NSs N=7)

Request perspective		Time schedule	Taking care of a dog	Opening a class	Grocery store	Borrowing money
Speaker-oriented	SA groups	10 (66%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)	9 (60%)
	NNSs	7 (58%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	2 (16%)	2 (16%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)

(table cont'd.)

Request perspective		Time schedule	Taking care of a dog	Opening a class	Grocery store	Borrowing money
Hearer-oriented	SA groups	4 (26%)	14 (93%)	10 (66%)	14 (93%)	6 (40%)
	NNSs	4 (33%)	11 (91%)	10 (83%)	9 (75%)	10 (83%)
	NSs	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	5 (71%)	6 (86%)	7 (100%)
Inclusive	SA groups	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	NNSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Impersonal	SA groups	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	NNSs	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	2 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (28%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other	SA groups	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	NNSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)

Table 4.8 showed an absolute preference of the hearer-oriented perspective by NNSs in four out of five vignettes. Only in the Opening a class vignette (High, Mid, High), two participants used the impersonal perspective.

While the results of the pretest showed that the SA group generally used hearer-oriented perspective requests, this group preferred speaker-oriented perspective in two vignettes after their SA. The most striking figure was found in the Borrowing money vignette (High, High, Mid). Nine out of fifteen students (60%) preferred speaker-oriented strategy, whereas only two out of twelve students in the NNSs group and no NSs chose this perspective (NNSs= 16%, NSs= 0%). Two tokens were categorized as 'other' due to the ungrammaticality of the token.

Unlike the SA groups, the NNSs group preferred the hearer-oriented perspective in four out of five vignettes. Only in the Time schedule vignette (High, Mid, High), the preference of the speaker-oriented perspective was found (58%). Interestingly, one token of the inclusive perspective was found in the NNSs group in the Grocery store vignette (Low, Low, Low). One participant used the hint strategy in the request, which was *Tengo una lista, necesitamos todos estos ingredients* 'I have a list, we need all these ingredients.' This student included the hearer in the request and stated that both the speaker and the hearer need the ingredients.

There were three tokens of impersonal perspective in the SA groups and three tokens in the NNSs group in the Time schedule (High, Mid, High) and the Opening a class vignettes (High, Mid, High). This result presented the overuse of this perspective in both SA groups and the NNSs group compared to NSs group. Considering the vignettes, some L2 learners may have used impersonal perspective strategy due to high degree of imposition of requests and/or due to the higher social status of the hearer.

As mentioned in the previous section, the pattern *¿Es posible para mi…?* 'Is it possible for me…'or *¿Hay posibilidad que puedes abrir la clase?* 'Is there possibility that you can open the class?' offered an intriguing point to discuss with respect to the request perspective. In the Opening a class vignette (High, Mid, High), NSs also used this pattern, yet in a slightly different way from L2 learners in the SA groups and the NNSs group. The examples like *¿Sería posible que se ofrezca la clase que necesito para graduarme este este semestre*? and *¿Habría posibilidad de abrir esa materia este semestre?* presented that the NSs used this pattern with only impersonal perspective without including any hearer or speaker. However, L2 learners included the speaker or the hearer while producing these requests in their posttest. This difference of the structure may indicate that L2 learners in the SA groups could not acquire native-like norms in making requests before or after SA.

4.2.4. Address forms

The comparison of address forms of the SA groups and two control groups on the posttest is presented in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9. Comparison of address forms between the SA groups and the control groups on the posttest (raw frequencies; SA groups N=15, NNSs N=12, NSs N=7)

Address forms		Time schedule	Taking care of a dog	Opening a class	Grocery store	Borrowing money
Name or Title	SA groups	3 (20%)	6 (40%)	8 (53%)	1 (6%)	6 (40%)
	NNSs	1 (8%)	2 (16%)	5 (42%)	0 (0%)	5 (42%)
	NSs	3 (42%)	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	1 (14%)	3 (42%)

(table cont'd.)

Address forms		Time schedule	Taking care of a dog	Opening a class	Grocery store	Borrowing money
Tú (informal singular second-person pronoun)	SA groups	1 (6%)	8 (53%)	3 (20%)	12 (80%)	2 (13%)
	NNSs	2 (16%)	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	11 (91%)	3 (25%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	6 (85%)	0 (0%)	6 (85%)	0 (0%)
Vos (informal singular second-person pronoun)	SA groups	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
	NNSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Usted (formal singular second-person pronoun)	SA groups	2 (13%)	1 (6%)	4 (26%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)
	NNSs	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)	3 (25%)
	NSs	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	2 (28%)	0 (0%)	4 (57%)
No address form	SA groups	9 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	4 (26%)
	NNSs	8 (66%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)
	NSs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)

Table 4.9 presents several points with regard to address forms use on the posttest. In the Time schedule vignette (High, Mid, High), two NSs created imaginary names *Luis* and *Jose* and one speaker used title *jefe* 'boss'. The address form *usted* was also found in one response, while other native speakers did not use the address form *usted*, but the verb associated with the pronominal form was conjugated in *usted* form.

Unlike the NSs group, it was not possible to identify the address forms in the majority of the responses in both SA groups and the NNSs group (SA groups= 9 tokens, NNSs=8 tokens) in this vignette. The usage of the pronominal form *tú* was more frequent than the NSs and the usage of the name or a title and *usted* was less frequent in this vignette among SA groups and NNSs group compared to NSs. No usage of the address form *vos* was found for this vignette.

However, one student in the SA groups used the address form *Señor,* but conjugated the verb in the pronominal form *vos*. This response presents two interesting points: Firstly, this student acquired the *vos* form during the SA program, since no *vos* forms were found on the pretest. Secondly, the fact that the student associated the title *Señor* with verbs conjugated in *vos* is intriguing, as textbooks instruct that the address form *Señor* is usually used to refer to someone formally. The same student continued to conjugate verbs in *vos* form regardless of the address forms in the Taking care of a dog (Equal, Low, Mid) and the Opening a class vignettes

(High, Mid, High).

In the Taking care of a dog vignette (Equal, Low, Mid), six out of seven NSs preferred the pronominal form *tú*, but they did not use address form *tú* in any examples. One participant used kinship term *hermana* 'sister' in this vignette. A similar behavior was shown in the SA groups and NNSs group, while 40% of the SA groups preferred the kindship term *hermana*. This can suggest that the L2 learners in SA groups might have used or be heard the address form (*hermana*) frequently during the SA or it can be simply high frequency of the address form *hermana* among SA groups. Also, there was one token of the pronominal form *usted* in SA groups and one token in NNSs group in this vignette. Considering that the speaker was asking his or her sister, it seems a bit too formal to use the pronominal form *usted* in this vignette.

In the Opening a class vignette (High, Mid, High), the majority of the NSs used titles such as *maestro* 'teacher', *profe*, or *profesor* 'professor'. One token was categorized as no address form since the speaker did not specify it in the response. Also, one participant associated the verb with the pronominal form *usted* but in the plural form: *¿Me podrían ayudar abriendo la clase para este semestre?* 'Could you (plural) help me opening the class for this semester?'

Eight out of fifteen students in the SA groups preferred to use a title *profesor* or a title and the name, such as *Profesor Davis* in this vignette. The high frequency of the pronominal *tú* in both SA groups and the NNSs group was observed in this vignette (SA groups=20%, NNSs group=25%). There were four examples in the SA groups and there was one example in the NNSs group where the L2 learners used title *profesor* or *profe* to address the hearer, yet the conjugated verb or the possessive adjective was associated with the pronominal *tú* form. This suggests that the relationship between professors and students in United States and in Spanish speaking countries might be different.

In the Grocery store vignette (Low, Low, Low), six out seven NSs preferred the pronominal form *tú*, while one participant used an imaginary name *Mario*. In the results of the SA groups, two interesting tokens were found. The same student who conjugated the verb in *vos* form in other vignettes, used the title *chico* 'boy' in this vignette, yet conjugated the verb in the third singular form. A more intriguing result was found in another student's response: *¡Andá al supermercado para comprar la comida que yo necesito para cocinar esta noche!* 'Go (command in *vos* form) to the supermarket to buy the food that I need to cook tonight!' This result also confirms the hypothesis that the students who have studied in Argentina can acquire the address form *vos*. Other students in the SA groups and NNSs group mostly preferred the pronominal form *tú* in this vignette. Also, there was one token in the SA groups that could not be parsed and that had to be classified as 'other' since the student did not address the specific person, but yet included an indefinite pronoun: *Necesito alugien a ir al supermercado y comprar ingredientes para mí. ¿Alguien puede ir?* 'I need someone to go to the supermarket and buy ingredients for me. Can someone go?'

Lastly, in the Borrowing money vignette (High, High, Mid), NSs used either title or the pronominal form *usted*. Nonetheless, the overuse of *tú* (SA groups=13%, NNSs group=25%, NSs group= 0%) and the underuse of the pronominal form *usted* (SA groups=20%, NNSs group=25%, NSs group=57%) was observed in this vignette among SA groups and NNSs group. There were four examples where the address form could not be identified in the SA groups. Again, there was one example of incorrect usage of verb conjugations with the associated address form in the SA groups and one in the NNSs group. One example was: *Perdon Señor, pero no tengo dinero o movil. ¿Podrías darme un poquito dinero para montar el autobus?* 'Excuse me Sir, but I don't have money or mobile phone. Could you (informal) give me a little bit of money in order to take the bus?' This example can show that the student may not have conjugated correctly since the verb associated with the address form *Señor* is usually

conjugated in the third person singular form.

4.3. Others

This section describes other factors and categories that have not been discussed in the previous sections. Firstly, a brief analysis of the proficiency level will be discussed. As mentioned in Chapter 3, there were different levels of students in the SA groups (from intermediate to graduate level). However, no noticeable difference between students with different levels on making request behaviors was found in the students' answers on the posttest. For instance, there was one student, whose level was intermediate after the SA, who made requests using the query preparatory strategy with verbal downgrading and hearer-oriented strategies in two vignettes, Taking care of a dog (Equal, Low, Mid) and Grocery store (Low, Low, Low) vignettes: *¿Podrías* to take care of *de mi perro por dos días?* 'Could you take care of my dog for two days?'; *Necesito esas cosas para las comidas, pero no puedo hoy. ¿Podrías ir al mercado?* 'I need those things for the food, but I can't go today. Could you go to the supermarket?' On the contrary, there was one student, whose level was graduate, who used query preparatory with speaker-oriented perspective in the Borrowing money vignette (High, High, Mid): *Perdon, puedo usar dinero por el autobus* (Excuse me, can I use money for the bus) on the posttest. Also, the proficiency level of the students in the NNSs group was advanced, which is higher than that of the majority of the students in the SA groups (except for one graduate student). Nonetheless, the current investigation did not observe noticeable difference between the NNSs group and the SA groups, except for the fact that the NNSs group produced hearer-oriented strategies more frequently than the SA groups did.

Secondly, a brief discussion of the external modifications will be presented. Supportive moves refer to the strategies that either precede or follow a request head act and serve to mitigate the impact of the request. Blum-Kulka et. al (1989) mentioned five categories in this strategy: "checks on availability", "precommitment", "grounders, which provide reason for the

request", "promises", or "threats" (p. 17). The SA groups students showed a similar pattern in using grounders with the NSs group; both groups preferred to provide reasons for the requests. Nonetheless, some L2 learners used grounders as requests by themselves, whereas native speakers always made requests on the posttest. With respect to "promises" there were two students in the SA groups and one native speaker using this strategy in Borrowing money vignette, which they all promised to give the money back to the hearer. Regarding to "checks on availability", there was one example in the SA groups in the Taking care of a dog vignette: *Hermana, te necesito a mirar mi perro por dos días… ¿Puedes?* Sister, I need you to look at (take care of) my dog for two days… Can you?' Also, one speaker in the NSs group used "precommitement" strategy in the Grocery store vignette: *Oye, ¿puedes hacerme un favor? Necesito que vayas al supermercado y compres XXX es que no me va a dar tiempo de ir.* 'Hey, can you do me a favor? I need you to go to the supermarket and buy XXX because I won't have time to go.' Interestingly, both participants used these supportive moves with the want statement strategy.

Chapter 5.
Conclusion

The current paper examined if L2 speakers of Spanish acquired native-like norms of making requests behaviors during short-term SA program in Argentina and in Spain via qualitative analysis. Chapter 2 summarized the literature on L2 pragmatics: speech act theory, politeness theory, and Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization, socicopragmatics, and pragmalinguistics. The research on Spanish pragmatic variation was described and important concepts in second language acquisition were mentioned as well. The last section in Chapter 2 presented studies on the impact of SA programs on pragmatic competence. Chapter 3 explained the methodology of the current investigation and Chapter 4 discussed the results of the pretest and the posttest of each group. Chapter 5 is dedicated to the conclusion and the answers for the research questions are discussed in the following section.

5.1. Research questions and answers

5.1.1. How did the SA learners' production of requests change after the short-term SA in Argentina and in Spain?

With respect to head act strategies, SA groups showed a preference of the query preparatory strategy in two vignettes, but they showed high frequency of "direct strategies" (Blum-Kulka et. al, 1989, p. 18) and low frequency of the query preparatory with verbal downgrading on their pretest. On their posttest, the learners preferred to use query preparatories in every vignette. Also, a decrease in "direct strategies" (pretest=24 tokens, posttest=7 tokens) and a slight increase in the usage of the query preparatory with verbal downgrading was observed (pretest=5 tokens, posttest=6 tokens).

Concerning internal mitigation use, the learners used a politeness marker *por favor* in every vignette, but there was only one token in lexical downgrader on their pretest. On their posttest, a decrease in the politeness maker *por favor* (pretest=25 tokens, posttest=15 tokens)

and an increase of a lexical downgrader was observed (posttest=5 tokens).

Relating to the request perspective orientation, the learners in the SA groups preferred to use the hearer-oriented perspective in four vignettes (73%, 54%, 73%, and 100%; in total, 50 tokens) and the preference of the speaker-oriented perspective was shown in only one vignette (66%; in total, 23 tokens) on their pretest. There were two tokens in the usage of the impersonal perspective and no tokens were found in the usage of the inclusive perspective. Interestingly, the preference of request perspective orientation shifted from hearer-oriented to speaker-oriented perspective on the posttest. They preferred to use speaker-oriented perspective in two out of five vignettes (66%, 60%; in total, 23 tokens). They tended to utilize speaker-oriented perspective when making requests to the hearer with a higher social distance. A slight decrease was found in the hearer-oriented perspective (posttest= 48 tokens). Three tokens were collected in the usage of the impersonal perspective and no token was found in the usage of the inclusive perspective.

Regarding the address forms, students used the title to call their professor, Mrs. García, and an elderly man and they used the pronominal form *tú* most frequenly to address their roommate and their intern on their pretest. The pronominal form *usted* was used in various vignettes, including to call their roommate and the intern. There were seven tokens which were classified as 'no address form'. On their posttest, the usage of the title or name increased when addressing a professor, but decreased when addressing the elderly man. The learners used the kinship term or the pronominal form *tú* to call their sister. They continued to prefer to use the pronominal form *tú* to address their assistant and also two tokens of the pronominal form *tú* were found to address an elderly man with whom they were not acquainted on the posttest. Also, a small decrease of the usage of the *usted* form was found (pretest= 16 tokens, posttest=10 tokens). Unlike the pretest, no *usted* form was found when calling their assistant, but the pronominal form *vos* was collected in the same vignette. There were three conjugated verbs in

the *vos* form on the posttest. There were 14 tokens which were classified as 'no address form', and 9 tokens were collected in the first vignette (High, Mid, High).

5.1.2. Do learners in SA groups have differences in their request strategies compared to students who have not participated in a SA program?

The results of head act strategies on the posttest show that there was no notable difference between the SA groups and the NNSs group. Both groups shared the similar pattern of preferring the query preparatory in every vignette, showing low frequency of the query preparatory with verbal downgrading, and high frequency of the hint strategy in some vignettes. The tokens of the "direct strategies" were similar (SA groups=7 tokens, NNSs group= 6 tokens). Both groups did not use any query preparatories with verbal downgrading in the Opening a class vignette (High, Mid, High). The NNSs groups used this strategy (7 tokens) a slightly more frequently than the SA groups (6 tokens), which is not a striking figure.

Regarding the internal mitigation use, the SA groups used more politeness markers than the control group of NNSs in three out of five vignettes: Time schedule (High, Mid, High), Taking care of a dog (Equal, Low, Mid), and Opening a class vignettes (High, Mid, High) (SA groups= 15 tokens in total; NNSs group=6 tokens in total). Moreover, the learners in the SA groups preferred using the lexical downgraders (5 tokens) than the NNSs groups (2 tokens) did.

With respect to request perspective orientation, the NNSs group preferred the hearer-oriented perspective in four out of five vignettes (91%, 83%, 75%, 83%). This group used the hearer-oriented perspective more frequently than the SA groups in three out of five vignettes. Both groups preferred to use the speaker-oriented perspective when asking a boss to change their time schedule in the first vignette (High, Mid, High). The biggest difference was found in the last vignette (High, High, Mid) where the speaker asked the elderly man to possibly lend the speaker some money. The NNSs group preferred the hearer-oriented perspective with 83%, whereas 40% of the learners in the SA groups chose the same perspective. Also, one token was

found in the usage of the inclusive perspective in the NNSs. Lastly, both groups showed a similar pattern in the impersonal perspective in the Time schedule (High, Mid, High) (SA groups=1 token, NNSs group=1 token) in Opening a class vignettes (High, Mid, High) (SA groups=2 tokens, NNSs group=2 tokens).

The data concerning the address forms showed that both groups showed a similar pattern in every vignette. Both groups preferred not to mention any hearer in the first vignette (High, Mid, High) (SA groups=9 tokens, NNSs group=8 tokens). The pronominal form *tú* was used most frequently to address the sister by both groups (SA groups=53%, NNSs group=75%), while the SA groups also preferred to use kinship term (40%, 6 tokens). Also, this pronominal form was used most frequently to address their assistant in the restaurant (SA groups= 12 tokens, 80%; NNSs group=11 tokens, 91%). In the Borrowing money vignette (High, High, Mid), both groups preferred the title (SA groups=6 tokens, 40%; NNSs group=5 tokens, 42%), the pronominal form *usted* (SA groups=3 tokens, 20%; NNSs group=3 tokens, 25%) to address the hearer, while more students in the SA groups did not specify any hearer (4 tokens, 26%). However, one token of the pronominal *vos* form and three verbs associated with the *vos* form were collected in SA groups on the posttest.

5.1.3. To what extent do learners in the SA groups become more native-like in their request strategies after the short-term SA compared to native speakers?

With respect to the head act strategies, the SA groups became more native-like, since they showed high frequency of "conventionally indirect strategies" and used "direct strategies" (Blum-Kulka et. al, 1989, p. 18) less frequently on the posttest compared to their pretest. (Direct strategy tokens on the pretest and on the posttest= 24 tokens vs. 6 tokens; conventionally indirect strategies in pretest and in posttest= 39 tokens vs. 60 tokens, respectively). Based on the native speakers' data, it was obvious that they preferred the query preparatories with verbal downgrading. The students were not able to produce that strategy in every vignette, but a slight increase was observed on the posttest.

Regarding internal mitigation use, the SA groups acquired the similar strategies in using the politeness marker *por favor*. A slight decrease was shown on the posttest compared to the pretest, which was similar to the NSs group. Nonetheless, the NSs group did not prefer to use any lexical downgraders in any vignette, whereas the SA groups used lexical downgraders more frequently in the Borrowing money vignette (High, High, Mid). It is assumed that the NSs may not have felt the necessity of lexical downgraders since they already used verbal downgrading with their strategies. However, the SA groups did not use verbal downgrading in their strategies as frequently as the NSs; therefore, they may have used lexical downgraders more frequently compared to NSs.

Concerning the request perspective orientation, the SA groups preferred to use speaker-oriented strategies in the Borrowing a book vignette (High, Mid, Mid/High) (66%; in total, 23 tokens) on the pretest, whereas in two vignettes on the posttest: Time schedule (High, Mid, High) and Borrowing money vignettes (High, High, Mid) (66%, 60%; in total, 22 tokens). The difference between the total number of the speaker-oriented strategies between the pretest and the posttest is not notable. They tended to use speaker-oriented strategies when making requests with higher impositions to the hearer with a higher social status, and higher social distance. A slight decrease was found in the hearer-oriented perspective (pretest= 50 tokens, posttest= 48 tokens). Unlike the SA groups, the NSs group showed a great preference for the hearer-oriented perspective in every vignette. The data shows that L2 learners may not have acquired native norms with regard to request perspective orientation. The NSs group showed an absolute preference for hearer-oriented strategies and previous research also confirms that native speakers of Spanish prefer to use requests with a hearer-oriented perspective (Blum-Kulka, 1989; Shively, 2011; Hernández, 2016; Czerwionka and Cuza, 2017; Hernández and Boero, 2018).

Lastly, relating to address forms, the difference between the SA groups and the NSs

group was shown in the Taking care of a dog vignette: The SA groups used kinship term a lot more frequently than the NS group (SA groups= 6 tokens, NS group=1 tokens). Another difference was found in associating a professor with the pronominal form *tú*: No speakers in the NSs group used the pronominal form *tú* in this vignette, whereas three students in the SA groups used it. A similar pattern was found in the Borrowing money vignette, where the SA groups used the pronominal form *tú* (2 tokens), while no one in the NSs group used it to ask an elderly man to lend the speaker money in the street.

5.2. Conclusion

No previous studies exist on the acquiring native-like norms of making requests of L2 learners during short-term SA in two different countries; accordingly, making the current paper a unique contribution to the SA research. The investigation showed that it is certain that students in the SA groups improved some aspects of their request-making behavior, while other aspects remained unchanged. There were five notable findings from the results of the present investigation. Firstly, L2 learners acquired native-like requesting behaviors during SA programs to a certain extent. Investigation of the request strategies before and after SA demonstrated that students became more native-like in their increased use of "conventionally indirect strategies". Secondly, gains in internal mitigation use were also observed from pre to posttest. They used politeness markers less frequently, which was quite similar to the NSs group. Thirdly, two students acquired the address form *vos*, which is the most common form in the country they visited, Argentina. Fourthly, however, with respect to request perspective, students still preferred speaker-oriented strategies when making requests to the hearer with higher social distance and higher social status on the posttest. Lastly, the differences between the SA groups and the NNSs group were found in their request perspective orientation and internal mitigation use. Whereas the NNSs group preferred to use hearer-oriented strategies, the SA groups still preferred speaker-oriented strategies in some vignettes on their posttest. However, the NNSs

group did not use the politeness marker and the lexical downgraders as frequently as the SA groups. The finding in the current research suggests several intriguing discussion points based on the previous research.

Previous research by Hernández and Boero (2018) found that students became more target-like in their head act strategies: in the pretest, the student preferred query preparatory strategies without any verbal mitigators (*¿Puedo tener una extensión?*) [Can I have an extension?], but after the SA, the query preapratory strategy with verbal downgrading increased (*¿Me daría una extensión en mi trabajo?* 'Could you give me an extension on my paper?') (p.403). The current research confirmed that the students became more native-like to a certain extent, but a notable increase of the query preparatory strategy with verbal downgrading was not observed. Moreover, the present study corroborates Hernández (2016)'s results that showed low frequency of the hedged performatives of the SA group in the pre and posttest.

Also, the present investigation merged two different groups (Argentina and Spain) into one group. However, some interesting results between the Argentina and Spain groups were found. Firstly, two out of five students in Argentina group started to use the pronominal form *vos* in their responses on the posttest, whereas no students in the Spain group used it. Secondly, the students in the Spain group did not prefer "direct strategies" after the SA program in Spain. Previous articles have shown that direct request forms and less tentative requests are more acceptable in Spain than in Latin America (Placencia, 1994; Márquez Reiter, 2002; Márquez Reiter et al., 2005; López Sánchez, 2010). The research by Czerwionka and Cuza (2017) found a great increase of the use of imperative requests by learners following a SA program in Spain (p. 405). However, this pattern was not found in the current paper among L2 learners in the SA group in Spain. The students used "direct strategies" more frequently in their pretest and a noticeable decrease of the usage of these strategies was found on their posttest. This indicates that the SA group who studied in Spain may not have noticed or acquired Spaniards' norms of

making requests.

With respect to lexical downgraders, Hernández (2016) found fewer lexical downgraders in the learners' results than in the native speakers' results. However, the current paper contradicts the Hernandez's data, which showed that the NSs group did not prefer to use any lexical downgraders, while the SA groups did use them more frequently. Concerning the usage of the politeness marker, according to Hernández (2016) and Shively and Cohen (2008), a similar pattern of the learners between the SA group and the NSs group was found in the use of the politeness marker *por favor*. Both groups did not frequently use the politeness marker and the number of the tokens of the use was similar. The present paper also confirmed the same pattern on their posttest, showing a small decrease of the politeness marker in the SA groups' responses, compared to their pretest (pretest= 25 tokens, posttest= 15 tokens). The number and the percentage of the usage of the politeness marker of the SA groups was similar to that of the NSs group.

Hernández and Boero (2018) and Czerwionka and Cuza (2017) discovered the students' shift from speaker-oriented requests to hearer-oriented requests, while Hernández (2016) and Shively and Cohen (2008) confirmed that students still continued to prefer speaker-oriented strategies. The current study corroborates Hernández (2016)'s findings and Shively and Cohen (2008)'s research that students still maintained their preference of speaker-oriented strategies in some situations in their posttest.

5.3. Limitations and future research

Several limitations were noted in the present research. Firstly, there is a limitation in the instrument used in the study, DCT. Ideally, research should investigate natural data from speakers, such as oral recordings during natural interactions. The DCT cannot show what the speakers 'actually' say, but rather describes the speakers' hypothetical judgement regarding what they 'would say' in the scenario. In the current paper, one token of the NSs group was

excluded due to this reason. However, DCT is still a useful and practical method for researchers to obtain the large sample of the speech act realization and to compare the different speech act realization of the native and nonnative speakers (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 14). Moreover, DCTs can be useful for future studies since they can be duplicated by other researchers.

The researcher also acknowledged that the DCTs utilized in the current paper had limitations: It did not cover every possible situation of making requests that could have included various kinds of strategies. For example, there was no ideal vignette to produce inclusive perspective requests on the pre and the posttest. In the same context, there was no possible vignette where the suggestory formulae strategies could have been used on the pre and the posttest. Also, the levels of the relative social status of hearer, the social distance, and the degree of imposition on pretest and the posttest were not completely comparable, which caused difficulty in comparing the responses on the pretest and the posttest. Additionally, the levels of the DCTs are heavily based on culture. The researcher did not carry out pilot testing to consider cultural ramifications; however, the DCT was modified from King (2007), who did carry out pilot testing and considered cultural appropriateness of the items.

In addition, the number of student participants was small. The results may have been different if the current study had investigated more students. Also, different proficiency levels of the students were also one of the limitations that was presented in the investigation, so each student's vocabulary and grammatical competence could be different; therefore, each students' answers could be different due to their proficiency level.

Lastly, the current research did not include any native speakers from Spain or from Argentina in the posttest, which would have provided insightful results regarding if the SA groups had acquired social norms of making a request in target countries.

The current investigation shows that the students can develop pragmatic competence to a certain extent during a short-term SA program. Previous research (Hernández, 2016;

Halenko and Jones, 2017; Alcón-Soler, 2014; Hernández and Boero, 2018) and the current investigation suggest that the students need a pragmatic intervention on the part of their instructors before and/or during the SA program. It is possible that students do not notice differing request strategies and use them without any pragmatic intervention although they are interacting with native speakers during SA. It would be beneficial to investigate the impact of the explicit pragmatic intervention on the pragmatic competence of L2 learners during short-term SA.

The present study focused on making requests and "conventionally indirect strategies", such as query preparatories, which are the most preferable strategies cross-culturally (Blum-Kulka et al.,1989); therefore, the results of the present investigation were somewhat predictable. However, it would be quite useful and intriguing if future research investigated cross-culturally different speech acts, such as compliments, refusals, etc.

Lastly, it would be beneficial to include students' interviews regarding their interactions with native speakers during SA. Also, integrating quantitative and qualitative analysis and examining the students' social factors, such as gender, age, socioeconomic backgrounds, and their language ability will be of use to the SLA pragmatic field. These future studies will produce critical insights into L2 pragmatic development during short-term SA and will better provide L2 students with a fruitful SA experience.

Appendix A. Pretest

Instructions:
You will be asked to read brief descriptions of several different situations and imagine that you are one of the two participants involved in each. For each prompt, please write **in Spanish** what you would say to the person with whom you are speaking. It is important that you imagine yourself in the situation and write down exactly what you would say to the other person if you were faced with this situation in real life.

Situation 1
You are a university student and you urgently need a book to complete a class paper on time and you would like to ask your professor to lend you the book.

You:_____

Professor: Claro, pero quiero que me lo traigas de regreso lo más pronto posible. Otro estudiante lo va a necesitar también.

Situation 2
You are a police officer and there is an old man who has parked in a prohibited fire zone area in front of a grocery store entrance. You are going to tell him to move his car.

You:_____

Man: ¿Ah, sí? Perdón, no lo sabía. Voy a mover mi carro ahorita.

Situation 3
You find out that your favorite singer has just come into town and will be giving a concert in two weeks. But you realize that you don't have enough money to buy the ticket. You want to ask your roommate to lend you $50 to buy the ticket.

You:_____

Roommate: Lo siento pero no tengo el dinero.

Situation 4
You are a parent of a three-year old son. Your son gets sick and he has to go to the emergency room, but your spouse is using your car right now. You want to ask your neighbor Mrs. García to drive you to the hospital.

You:_____

Mrs. García: Claro que sí. Vamos al hospital en mi coche ahora.

Situation 5
You are a doctor in a hospital. You need a patient's file urgently and the internet is down temporarily. You are going to ask one of your new interns to find the information you're looking for and bring it to you.

You:_____

Intern: Okay. Voy a buscar la información lo más rápido posible.

Please complete the following with information about yourself:

Age: _____

Sex: Male Female

Are you a Spanish major or minor? Yes No

Place of birth (city and country): _____

Is Spanish the primary language spoken in your home? Yes No

Have you ever lived in a Spanish-speaking country? Yes No

If so, please indicate where you resided, and your length of residence:

_____ _____
(city and country of residence) (length of residence)

What is the highest level of Spanish class that you have taken? _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

Appendix B. Posttest

Instructions:
You will be asked to read brief descriptions of several different situations and imagine that you are one of the two participants involved in each. For each prompt, please write **in Spanish** what you would say to the person with whom you are speaking. It is important that you imagine yourself in the situation and write down exactly what you would say to the other person if you were faced with this situation in real life.

Situation 1
You are working at a clothing store part-time and you were supposed to work today in the afternoon. But you urgently need to take your mother to the hospital and you want to ask your manager to change your time schedule for your shift.

You:_____

Manager: Ay, lo siento mucho. No te preocupes. Yo busco a alguien más que te reemplace.

Situation 2
You are going to travel with your friends, but you have a dog. Your sister also has a dog, so you are going to ask her if she can take care of your dog for two days.

You:_____

Your sister: Perdón, pero no puedo. Voy a trabajar toda la semana.

Situation 3
You are a university student and find out that you must take a specific class to graduate this semester. But you find out that the class is currently not offered by the program and you would like to ask one of your professors you trust to possibly open that class.

You:_____

Professor: No sé si se puede hacer eso, pero le preguntaré al jefe del programa.

Situation 4
You are a chef in a restaurant. You need to go to the grocery store, but you don't have time to do so. You are going to ask one of your assistants to go instead and buy the ingredients for you.

You:_____

Assistant: Está bien, ahorita voy al supermercado.

Situation 5
You are currently waiting for the city bus, when it finally arrives. You suddenly notice that you don't have your wallet or your cell phone, but this is the only time you can catch the bus to your destination in the afternoon. You decide you would like to ask the elderly man in front of you to borrow some money for the bus.

You:_____

Old man: Claro que sí joven, aquí tiene.

Please complete the following with information about yourself:

Age: _____

Sex: Male Female

Are you a Spanish major or minor? Yes No

Place of birth (city and country): _____

Is Spanish the primary language spoken in your home? Yes No

Have you ever lived in a Spanish-speaking country? Yes No

If so, please indicate where you resided, and your length of residence:

_____ _____
(city and country of residence) (length of residence)

What is the highest level of Spanish class that you have taken? _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

References

Alba-Juez, Laura. 2007. Chapter 2: "On the impoliteness of some politeness strategies: A study and comparison of the use of some pragmatic markers of impoliteness in British English and American English, Peninsular Spanish and Argentine Spanish". In P. Garcés-Conejos, M Padilla Cruz, R. Gómez Morón and L. Fernández Amaya, eds. Studies in Intercultural, Cognitive and Social Pragmatics. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 37-56

Alcón-Soler, E. (2015). Pragmatic learning and study abroad: Effects of instruction and length of stay. *System*,*48*, 62–74.

Alcon-Soler, E., & Sanchez Hernandez, A. (2017). Learning Pragmatic Routines during Study Abroad: A Focus on Proficiency and Type of Routine/Aprendizaje de rutinas pragmaticas durante programas de estudios en el extranjero: nivel de inglés y tipo de rutina. *Atlantis, Revista De La Asociación Española De Estudios Anglo-Norteamericanos*, (2), 191.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. Language Learning 49(4). 685.

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamines.

Bialystok, E.& Sharwood Smith, M. (1985). Interlanguage is not a state of mind: An evaluation of the construct for second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 101–117.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning How to Say What You Mean in a Second Language: a Study of the Speech Act Performance of Learners of Hebrew as a Second Language, *Applied Linguistics*, 3, 29-59

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies. Norwood, NJ: Alblex Publishing Corporation.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York : Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Code, S., & Anderson, A. (2001). *Requests by young Japanese: A longitudinal study. The Language Teacher Online*, 25(8).

Cohen, A. D., & Shively, R. L. (2007). Acquisition of Requests and Apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of Study Abroad and Strategy-Building Intervention. *Modern Language Journal*, *91*(2), 189-212.

Curcó, C. (1998). ¿No me harías un favorcito? Reflexiones en torno a la expresión de la cortesía verbal en el español de México y el español peninsular. In H. Haverkate, G. Mulder, & C. F. Maldonado (Eds.), *La pragmática lingüística del español: Recientes desarrollos* (pp. 129–71).

Curcó, Carmen, De Fina, Ana, (2002). Modo imperativo, negación y diminutivos en la expresión de la cortesía en español: el contraste entre México y España [Imperative mood, negation, and diminutives in the expresión of politeness in Spanish: a contrast between Mexico and Spain]. In: Placencia, M.E., Bravo, D. (Eds.), Actos de Habla y Cortesía en Español [Speech Acts and Politeness in Spanish]. Lincom, Munich, pp. 107–140.

Cuza, A., & Czerwionka, L. (2017). A Pragmatic Analysis of L2 Spanish Requests: Acquisition in Three Situational Contexts during Short-Term Study Abroad. *Intercultural Pragmatics*,*14*(3), 391–419.

Dewey, D. P. (2004). A comparison of reading development by learners of Japanese in intensive domestic immersion and study abroad contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 301-327.

Dippold, D. (2008). Reframing one's experience: face, identity, and roles in L2 argumentative discourse. In M. Putz & J. A. Neff-van (Eds.). *Developing contrastive pragmatics. Interlanguage and crosscultural perspectives* (pp. 131-154). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1987). *Perspectives on Language Transfer*. Applied Linguistics, 8(2), 120-132.

Felix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2003). Declining an invitation: A cross-cultural study of pragmatic strategies in American English and Latin-American Spanish. *Multilingua, 22,* 225-255.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2005). Indirectness and Politeness in Mexican Requests. In D. Eddington (Ed.). *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 66-78). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. & Hasler-Barker, M. (2015). Complimenting in Spanish in a short-term study abroad context. *System* 48, 75-85

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14(2), 219-236

García, Carmen. (1993). Making a Request and Responding to it: A Case-Study of Peruvian Spanish Speakers (n.d). *Journal of Pragmatics*, *19*(2), 127-152.

García, Carmen. (2008). Different Realizations of Solidarity Politeness: Comparing Venezuelan and Argentinean Invitations. In *Variational Pragmatics: A Focus on Regional Varieties in Pluricentric Languages*, ed. Klaus P. Schneider and Anne Barron, 269–305. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Grice, P. (1975). 'Logic and conversation'. In: P. Cole and J. Morgan, eds., Syntax and semantics, Vol. 3: Speech acts. New York: Academic Press. pp. 41-59.

Halenko, N., & Jones, C. (2017). Explicit instruction of spoken requests: An examination of pre-departure instruction and the study abroad environment. *System*, *68*, 26–37.

Hardin, K. J. (2001) *Pragmatics of Persuasive Discourse in Spanish Television Advertising* (Texas: SIL International; University of Texas at Arlington).

Harlow, L., 1990. Do they mean what they say? Sociopragmatic competence and second

language learners. Modern Language Journal 74, 328–351.

Hassall, T. (2013). Pragmatic development during short-term study abroad: The case of address terms in Indonesian. Journal of Pragmatics, 55, 1-17.

Hernández, T. A. (2016). Acquisition of L2 Spanish requests in short-term study abroad. Study Abroad Research in Second Language Acquisition and International Education, 1, 186–216.

Hernández, T. A., & Boero, P. (2018). Explicit instruction for request strategy development during short-term study abroad. Journal of Spanish Language Teaching.

Hill, B., Ide, S., Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A., & Ogino, T. (1986). Universals of Linguistic Politeness: Quantitative Evidence from Japanese and American English. *Jprag*, *10*(3), 347-371. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(86)90006-8

Institute of International Education. (2018). "Detailed Duration of U.S. Study Abroad, 2006/07-2016/17" *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange.* Retrieved March 9, 2019 from http://www.ile.org/opendoors

Kasper, (1992). Pragmatic transfer Second Language Research,8, 203-231

Kasper, G. (1989). Variation in Interlanguage Speech Act Realisation. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in Second Language Acquisition, I: Discourse and Pragmatics; II: Psycholinguistic Issues* (p. 37). Clevedon, Eng.: Multiling. Matters.

Kecskés, I. (2014). *Intercultural pragmatics*. New York:Oxford University Press

King, J. (2007). Pragmatic transfer in learners of Spanish as L2. Presented at 17th International Conference on Pragmatics & Language Learning, Hawaii, 2007, University of Hawaii-Manoa.

Koike, D. A. (1989). Pragmatic Competence and Adult L2 Acquisition: Speech Acts and Interlanguage. *Modern Language Journal*, *73*(3), 279-89.

Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or, minding your p's and q's. Proceedings of the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. pp. 292-305.

Le Pair, R. (1996). Spanish Request Strategies: A Cross-Cultural Analysis from an Intercultural Perspective. *Language Sciences*,*18*(3-4), 651-670.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Liu, J. (2004). *Measuring interlanguage pragmatic knowledge of Chinese EFL learners.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University of Hong Kong, Department of English and Communication.

López Sánchez, A. (2010). Request Behavior and Communicative Styles in Peninsular Spanish and American English: A Comparison. *Rael: Revista Electronica De Linguística Aplicada*, (9), 21-42.

Márquez Reiter, R. (2002). A contrastive study of conventional indirectness in Spanish: Evidence from Peninsular and Uruguayan Spanish. Pragmatics, 12(2), 135-151.

Márquez Reiter, R., Rainey, I., & Fulcher, G. (2005). A Comparative Study of Certainty and Conventional Indirectness: Evidence from British English and Peninsular Spanish. *Applied Linguistics*, *26*(1), 1-31.

Márquez-Reiter, R., & Placencia, M. E. (2005). *Spanish pragmatics*. Basingstoke, Hampshire [England] ; New York : Palgrave Macmillan.

Martinsen, R. A. (2008). Short-term study abroad: predicting changes in oral skills. Foreign Language Annals, 43(3), 504-530.

Mey, Jacob. L. (2001) *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (Second Edition [1993]), Blackwell Publishers, Oxford & Malden, Mass.

Mirzaei, A., Roohani, A., & Esmaeili, M. (2012). Exploring Pragmalinguistic and Sociopragmatic Variability in Speech Act Production of L2 Learners and Native Speakers. Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 4(3), 79-102.

Owen, J. S. (2001). *Interlanguage pragmatics in Russian: A study of the effects of study abroad and proficiency levels on request strategies.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA.

Piatti, G. (2003). La cortesía: un contenido functional para los programas de español como lengua extranjera, en D. Bravo, 355-397

Placencia, M.E. (1994). 'Pragmatics across varieties of Spanish', Donaire, 2, 65-77

Placencia, M.E. (1998). 'Pragmatic variation: Ecuadorian Spanish vs Peninsular Spanish', Spanish Applied Linguistics, 2.1, 71-106

Puga Larraín, J. (1997). La atenuación en el castellano de Chile: Un enfoque pragmalingüístico (Hedges in the Spanish of Chile: A Pragmatic-Linguistic Approach). *Dissertation Abstracts International, Section C: Worldwide*, *58*(3).

Richards, J., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1985). *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Essex: Longman.

Rigatuso, Elizabeth Mercedes. (2000) "Señora (...) ¿no tenés más chico?": Un aspecto de la pragmática de las fórmulas de tratamiento en español bonaerense; *Revista Argentina de Lingüística*; Revista Argentina de Linguistica; 16. 293-344

Rodríguez, S. (2001). *The perception of requests in Spanish by instructed learners of Spanish in the second- and foreign-language contexts: A longitudinal study of acquisition patterns.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.

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

Schauer, F. A. (2004). May you speaker louder maybe? Interlanguage pragmatic development in requests. In S. H. Foster-Cohen, M. Sharwood Smith, A. Sorace, & M. Ota (Eds.) *EUROSLA Yearbook No. 4* (pp. 253-273). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Searle. J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay on the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect Speech Acts, in Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), Syntax and Semantics Volume 3: Speech Acts, Academic Press, 59-82.

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

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. IRAL 10(3). 209-231.

Shively, R. L. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: a longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. Journal of Pragmatics, 43, 1818e1835.

Taguchi, N. (2009). *Pragmatic competence*. New York, Berline: Mounton de Gruyter.

Trosberg, A. (2010). *Pragmatics across languages and cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Weber de Kulart, F. (1941). Fórmulas de cortesía en la lengua de Buenos Aires. *Filología*, 12, 137-192.

Yates, A. B. (2015). Pragmatic variation in service encounters in Buenos Aires, Argentina. IULC Working Papers, 15(1), 128-158.

Vita

Christine Hee Song, born in Ithaca, New York, majored in Spanish Translation and Interpretation and received her bachelor's degree from the Hankuk University of Foreign Studies in the Republic of Korea. She has a teaching certificate of Spanish in secondary education in the Republic of Korea and taught Spanish in Hankuk Academy of Foreign Studies. As her interest in teaching of Spanish grew, she decided to enter the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at Louisiana State University to pursue her master's degree. During her last two semesters, she gained experience by teaching elementary Spanish classes. Upon completion of her master's degree, she expects to start her teaching career.