EFFECT OF REJOINDERS IN PRODUCTION QUESTIONNAIRES

BILL JOHNSTON, GABRIELE KASPER, & STEVEN ROSS
University of Hawai'i

INTRODUCTION

The most widely used method of data collection in interlanguage pragmatics is some form of production questionnaire (PQ).[1] Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1993) noted that of the interlanguage pragmatics studies reviewed by Kasper and Dahl (1991), 54% (19 out of 35) were based on PQ data.

The popularity of PQs is easy to explain. Because they enable researchers to collect large amounts of data quickly and to collect comparable data from members of different speech communities, they are a valuable tool for cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics research. While eliciting language users' own production of linguistic action rather than their preferences for preselected response alternatives, PQs constrain subjects' pragmatic options to the speech act under study. Their reliability appears to be good, though the absence of formal reliability tests is problematic. The unit of analysis is usually identical with the response provided. Compared to conversational data, PQ responses are easier to code (although 'easier' does not mean 'easy' or uncontroversial: cf. Meier (1994) on the coding of apologies). Since PQs usually require written responses, there is no need for transcription (but cf. Rintell & Mitchell, 1989, for oral PQ responses). PQ studies

[1] The instrument under discussion is usually referred to as a discourse completion task (DCT). 'Discourse completion' suggests some stretch of discourse including one or more empty slots which respondents are asked to fill in (e.g., Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989, or the 'dialogue completion' items in Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford, 1993). However, some versions of the instrument elicit responses without providing any discourse context (e.g., Olshtain & Weinbach, 1993, or the 'discourse completion' items in Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford, 1993). In order to capture any variety of questionnaire designed to elicit speech act production data, we therefore prefer the generic term 'production questionnaire.'

University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL, Vol. 13, No. 1, Fall 1994, pp. 121-143.

are thus eminently feasible, and for this reason are very popular with graduate students.

Compared to the many interlanguage pragmatics studies based on PQ data, there are few which examine the extent to which PQ responses are actually valid representations of naturally occurring speech. It does not take much comparative research to ascertain that, as far as discoursal aspects of linguistic action are concerned (conversational management, sequencing of linguistic action in developing exchanges, collaborative activity, turn-taking, backchanneling), the construct validity of PQs is necessarily very low: such discourse-level phenomena do not show up in one-turn responses. However, the strategies and linguistic forms used in speech act performance--the conventions of means and form of linguistic action under given contextual conditions--are believed to be adequately represented in PQ responses. Is this indeed the case?

Given the widespread use of PQs, validation studies are urgently needed. In this paper, we shall first review the comparative studies available to date, and then report on a recent study.

PRODUCTION QUESTIONNAIRES

The first study to compare PQ with naturalistic data was by Beebe and Cummings (in press), originally presented in 1985. The authors compared refusals elicited through a single item PQ with refusals performed in telephone conversations in response to the same request. Interlocutors in these interchanges were NS of American English. The telephone conversations were semi-authentic rather than authentic since the caller was one of the authors, whereas the party called was unaware of the ultimate purpose of the call. Beebe and Cummings found that the PQ responses did NOT represent natural speech with respect to 'actual wording, range of formulas and strategies, and length of responses or number of turns necessary to fill a function. Nor do they adequately represent the depth of emotion and general psycho-social dynamics of naturally occurring speech' (p. 1). However, the PQ data modelled

the 'canonical shape of refusals', shed light on the social and psychological factors that are likely to affect speech act performance, and helped establish an initial classification of semantic formulas. This initial classification was confirmed by the naturalistic data. Beebe and Cummings note that they did not find a single semantic formula in the naturalistic data that had not been identified in PQ data, though not necessarily in their own data (which was quite limited: 11 subjects responding to a single PQ item).

The potential of PQs to establish the 'speech act set' of a given type of linguistic action was indirectly confirmed by the request studies carried out in the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989). The main requestive strategies--directness levels, internal and external modification--had been established on the basis of authentic speech (e.g., Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Blum-Kulka, Gerson, & Danet, 1982) and open-ended role plays (House & Kasper, 1981). All of these strategies, and only these, showed up in the PQ data.

The only other study which offers a comparison of PQ with authentic data is Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig (1992). Theirs differs from Beebe and Cummings' study in that they included NNS as informants, and represented unequal power enounters. The study examines the rejections by NS and NNS graduate students of their academic advisers' suggestions for the students' course schedules. The PQs produced a narrower range of semantic formulas, and fewer status-preserving strategies than the authentic data. As in Beebe and Cummings's (in press) study, the extended negotiations typical of the authentic advising sessions were absent from the PQ responses. On the bright side, the PQ proved an adequate instrument to test hypotheses derived from the authentic interactions but untestable in the same data set because it was too small. The PQ data confirmed Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig's (1992) hypothesis that the NNS were more likely to use unacceptable content to reject advice than the NS.

Rather than assessing the validity of PQs against a norm constituted by (semi-) authentic interaction, the remaining methodological studies compare PQs with other types of questionnaire data, or examine different types of PQ. Rose (1994) suspected

the PQ (DCT) of being culturally biased in that it favors more direct responses over the more indirect mode preferred by Japanese interlocutors in conversational encounters. Comparing request responses elicited through PQ to Multiple Choice Questionnaires including three levels of directness and an opt-out possibility, he found that both Japanese and American NS preferred more indirect and opting out strategies in the Multiple Choice than in the PQ. In the PQ, the Japanese were more direct than the Americans. Rose concluded that the Multiple Choice data was more consistent with the preference for Japanese indirectness established in the literature than the PQ, especially in contexts where the hearer is the status-higher interlocutor.

Rose (1994) contrasted production and assessment tasks in the crosscultural study of linguistic action. A different cross-modality study was conducted by Rintell and Mitchell (1989), who examined oral vs. written responses to PQs eliciting requests and apologies. They found little difference between the two modalities, though the NNS respondents were more affected by modality than the NS. Rintell and Mitchell's findings suggest that the more resource demanding oral version of the PQ does not seem to be advantageous in crosscultural and interlanguage pragmatics research.

Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1993) contrasted two versions of PQ. The 'open questionnaire' consisted of a situational prompt but no interlocutor initiation or rejoinder. The 'dialogue completion task' included verbatim suggestions from the interlocutor in the role of the subject's academic adviser, quoted from the authentic advising sessions reported on in Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig (1992). Task effects were evident in NS and NNS responses, but more so in the NNS. The dialogue completion task produced more talk, increased the 'naturalness' of subjects' rejections (compared to the authentic responses from the earlier study), and produced fewer direct rejections. While the presence of an advisor's suggestion thus had a clear impact on subjects' responses, the specific form of the suggestion (whether it was more or less directive) did not. Importantly, the dialogue completion task enabled the NNS (more than the NS) to improve the quality of their responses. It seems that the interlocutor initiation, to which subjects provided a second pair part, helped the NNS along, whereas the NS were less dependent on interlocutor prompts. For

interlanguage pragmatics research, then, dialogue completion appears to be the preferred format when the speech act under study is a responding act.

A related difference in PQ format was examined by Rose (1992). While Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1993) focused on the impact of an interlocutor's initiation on respondents' second pair parts, Rose looked into the effect of an interlocutor's second pair part on the production of initiating acts. Questionnaire items eliciting requests differed according to presence or absence of interlocutor rejoinder. The provided rejoinders were preferred seconds, i.e., complying with the requests. Rose found that on a variety of measures of request realization, respondents--NS of American English --did NOT respond differentially to the two PQ formats.

However, in light of the task effects established in most of the studies, it seems important to probe somewhat more deeply into the issue of rejoinder effect in PQs. For one thing, if rejoinders don't matter, results from studies which differ on this design feature are more directly comparable. For another, if rejoinders do not affect responses, PQ designers will not have to bother about including rejoinders in the first place. In order to examine the issue more closely, we conducted another rejoinder study, which expanded Rose's (1992) investigation in several ways.

In addition to absence of rejoinder and preferred second, there is the option of a dispreferred second, i.e., a rejecting, refusing, or otherwise 'negative' rejoinder. Since response expectancies have been shown to influence speakers' linguistic action (Levinson, 1983; Pomerantz, 1984; Bilmes, 1993), it is conceivable that a dispreferred rejoinder will shape the initiating act in some way. Furthermore, it seems important to establish whether the response stability established for requests holds up across different types of speech act. And finally, since previous studies have shown NS and NNS to be differentially affected by different stimulus conditions, potential NS-NNS variation dependent on rejoinder type needs to be explored.

THIS STUDY

The study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. Do responses to PQ items differ according to presence and type of rejoinder?
2. Are different speech acts differentially sensitive to presence and type of rejoinder?
3. Do native and nonnative speakers respond differently to presence and type of rejoinder?

METHOD

Respondents in the study were undergraduate or graduate students at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. There were 36 NS of American English (21 female, 15 male) and 33 NS of Chinese (18 female, 15 male). Each respondent was given a production questionnaire to be completed in English. The items on the questionnaire included situations aimed at eliciting three different speech acts: complaints, requests, and apologies. There were six complaint situations, ten request situations, and six apology situations. There were more request contexts because the original set of six items for each speech act was expanded to incorporate all of Rose's (1992) six situations.

Ten items for each speech act had previously been tested in a pilot study. We selected only those items that reliably elicited the speech act they were aimed at producing. In the case of complaints, for instance, certain items were found not to produce complaints because it was possible for the respondent to avoid confrontation by suggesting how the situation might be repaired. It thus proved necessary to ensure that all the complaint situations involved an 'offense' of some magnitude and, importantly, one that it was too late to rectify.

Context-external factors such as social distance and status differentials were not of

interest to us and therefore controlled: all relationships in the situations involved familiar but not intimate, status-equal interlocutors such as colleagues, fellow students, neighbors, etc. Four items from Rose (1992) were an exception to this, and were not included in the analysis for the present study.

For each of the three speech acts, three types of item were prepared: items with no seconds provided, items with a preferred second, and items with a dispreferred second. Each item type was included in two versions for each speech act. In the questionnaire, items were presented in randomized order. Examples of the three kinds of item are given below.

(1) Complaint, no rejoinder. You were in a hurry to leave on a trip, and you asked your roommate to mail an express letter for you. When you get back a few days later, the letter is still lying on the table.

You: [Space is provided here for response.]

(2) Request, preferred rejoinder. You are giving a dinner party for twelve people, but you don't have a bowl big enough for the salad. You go round to your neighbor to see if she has one.

You: [Space is provided here for response.]

Your neighbor: Yes, I'll just get it for you.

(3) Apology, dispreferred rejoinder. At an office party, you had a bit too much to drink and were rude to one of your colleagues. The next day you call her up to check that she wasn't offended.

You: [Space is provided here for response.]

Your colleague: Well, it's a long time since I was insulted like that. You should be ashamed of yourself.

The questionnaire items analyzed for this study specified the following contexts:

Complaints

1. A colleague is repeatedly late for a meeting. (Late)
2. Friends of S's roommate were smoking in S's smoke-free apartment. (Smoking)
3. A friend of S is playing ball on the beach and kicking sand all over S's

food. (Picnic)

4. A book which a friend had borrowed from S is severely damaged. (Book)
5. S's roommate did not mail S's express letter. (Letter)
6. S's neighbors' loud party prevented S from sleeping. (Loud Party)

Requests

7. Asking a friend who is a good cook to prepare the food for a party. (Cook)
8. Borrowing a salad bowl from a neighbor. (Salad Bowl)
9. Borrowing money for lunch from a colleague. (Lunch)
10. Asking a friend to look after S's apartment while S is out of town. (Apartment)
11. Borrowing lecture notes from another student. (Notes)
12. Asking a neighbor for a lift home. (Lift)

Apologies

13. S accidentally breaks a small ornament in a friend's apartment. (Ornament)
14. S was prevented from joining a colleague's farewell party. (Farewell Party)
15. S bumps into another student while rushing to class. (Collision)
16. S forgets to buy concert tickets for S and a friend. (Tickets)
17. S was rude to a colleague at a party. (Rude)
18. S bumped into a colleague's car while parking. (Car)

Analysis

Data were coded according to published coding schemes for the three speech acts. For complaints, we adapted Olshtain and Weinbach (1993), for requests, Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989), and for apologies, Bergman and Kasper (1993). The relevant coding scheme will be detailed prior to the results for each speech act below. Coding categories will be illustrated by examples from the three data sets. Crosstabulations within the NS and NNS groups were performed in order to examine

the impact of rejoinder type on the choice of speech act realization strategies, and to compare the speech act realization strategies preferred by each group in relation to rejoinder type.[1]

RESULTS

Complaints

Coding categories

ALERTER: any attention getting device preceding the complaint.

Address term	dude(tte), Bud, friend
Attention getter	hey, excuse me, guess what

BELOW REPROACH: utterance which does not in itself have complaining force, i.e., no reference is made to the offensive act or to any negative consequences of the act for the speaker (S).

You guys must be having fun

Are you alright?

DISAPPROVAL: utterance expressing S's disapproval of or annoyance with the offensive act.

Emphasizing cost of act	cigarette smoke bothers me
to others	we can't afford this
Demanding justification	where the cigarette smoke come from
	what's up
Expressing annoyance	nice work [sarcastic]
	my letter man!!!
Preempting excuse	I don't care if they're your friends

[2] Some of the crosstabulations violate the chi-square assumption of independence. Since there are multple analyses, only the lowest probabilities are likely to reflect genuine (that is, non-spurious) differences.

REPROACH: S holds H accountable for committing the offensive act, emphasizing preconditions or consequences.

Prior obligation	I told you to mail the letter
not honored by H	we had set certain rules about smoking
Bad consequences	we lost a deal because of your tardiness
Accusation	you ruined my food
[you did p/ p is bad]	

FUTURE ACTION: non-confrontational statement expressing how the offense can be remedied or avoided in the future, often as suggestion or request.

please tell your friends not to smoke

I think you should replace it

trying to be on time is not only a good habit but also a responsibility

you want to show people that you are reliable and gain people's reputation

THREAT: statement of negative consequences for H, often confrontational.

shape up or you're out next time

I'll remember this!

if you are late again, our company will be closed

Table 1

Cooccurrence of Rejoinder Type and Complaint Strategy

	NS			NNS	
Strategy	Summary	Probab.	Strategy	Summary	Prob.
Alerter			Alerter	most frequent w/ neg. rejoin	.007
Below Reproach	most frequent w/ no rejoin	0.49	Below Reproach		
Disapproval			Disapproval		
Reproach			Reproach		
Future action			Future action		
Threat	most frequent w/ pos. rejoin	.018	Threat		
Modifi-cation			Modifi-cation	most frequent w/ no rejoin	.028

Both NS and NNS made their choice of complaint strategies contingent on rejoinder type in only two out of seven strategies. However, the affected strategies were different in the NS and NNS groups. The NS opted most frequently for the mildest complaint strategy, Below Reproach, when no rejoinder was provided (1), and chose the most forceful complaint (threatening the perpetrator) when a preferred

second was supplied, e.g., the interlocutor apologized (2).

(1) I'm sorry, but we don't allow smoking indoors. Would you mind going outside? [NS; Smoking]

(2) Next time please take better care of my stuff or I'm not going to let you borrow it. [NS; Book]

Perhaps the NS felt that in the absence of any interlocutor response, it is wisest to tread softly. On the other hand, the offered apology may suggest to the offended person that her complaint is justified, and hence elicit a particularly strong expression of displeasure. The NNS prefaced their complaints by Alerters most frequently when the rejoinder was a dispreferred second, i.e., the complaint was rejected (3). They also aggravated (4) and mitigated (5) their complaints most when no rejoinder was provided.

(3) Hay! You guys! don't play food, man! go and play your ball. [NNS; Picnic]

(4) See what you've done to me! You destroyed my whole life! [NNS; Letter]

(5) *If you don't mind,* I'll open the windows. Next time when you have a party *could* you remember to keep the windows open? [NNS; Smoking]

It thus seems that uncertainty about interlocutor uptake increased the NNSs' effort to modify the force of complaint in either direction--by increasing or decreasing threat to H's face. Rejection of their complaint, i.e., H's countering S's face-threatening act with a face-threatening move of her own, resulted in more aggravation on S's part: as in (3), the Alerters were mostly attention getters such as 'hey' or other exclamations.

Rejoinder type thus appears to have a differential effect on some of the strategies used by the NS/NNS groups in the speech act of complaint. Since two of the differentially affected strategies--Below Reproach in the NS group and Alerter in the NNS group--were used most frequently when no rejoinder was provided, this difference begs the question how absence of interlocutor response is interpreted. While it may be seen as representing unmarked discoursal sequencing (S's contribution to the discourse precedes H's, i.e., at the time of S's utterance production H's rejoinder cannot have occurred), an alternative interpretive option would be to regard the blank as representing silence on the part of H. If the American

and Chinese respondents indeed perceived the absence of a rejoinder as silence, differing cultural interpretations of silence (Jaworski, 1993) could come into play in the completion of the questionnaire. Clearly, further research into the interpretation and significance of the absence of rejoinders in PQs is needed.

Requests

Coding categories

ALERTER: as in complaints.

MULTIPLE HEADS: more than one 'head act', or request proper.

please keep quiet or take it outside

I've missed the bus and the next one is due in an hour

PERSPECTIVE: Agency as specified in the head act.

Hearer dominance	*you* need to be quieter
Speaker dominance	can *I* borrow a big salad bowl
Collaborative	could *we* begin now
Impersonal	can *one* ask for a little quiet

DIRECTNESS LEVEL: degree to which requestive force is apparent from the utterance (locution).

Mood derivable requestive force is determined by grammatical mood, e.g., imperative.

Please quiet down

Performative requestive force is designated by a performative verb (pure or hedged).

can I *ask* you to turn it down a bit

Locution Derivable sentence meaning indexes utterance meaning, e.g., by specifying H's obligation or H's doing the requested act.

you'*ve got to* help me

you're helping me with this?

Scope Stating utterance expresses S's preference for the requested act to come about.

I'd like to borrow your notes

Suggestory Formula requestive force is indicated by routinized convention.

let's/how about/why don't you turn down the noise

Preparatory utterance contains reference to a preparatory condition, e.g., of H's ability or willingness to do the requested act, or its feasibility.

can you turn it down a bit

will you be a bit quieter please

is it possible for me to get an extension

Hint requestive force is contextually implied rather than indicated by conventions of form.

I've missed the bus (as a request for a lift)

I didn't go to class yesterday (as a request for borrowing lecture notes)

INTERNAL MODIFICATION: as 'Modification' in complaints

EXTERNAL MODIFICATION: supportive moves preceding or following the head act, e.g.,

Grounder	I forgot my wallet at home
Imposition minimizer	I'll return it as soon as possible
Sweetener	you're such a great cook

Table 2

Cooccurrence of Rejoinder Type and Request Strategy

	NS			NNS	
Strategy	Summary	Prob.	Strategy	Summary	Probab.
Alerter			Alerter		
Multihead			Multihead		
Per-spective	neg. rejoin: H-oriented pos. rejoin: S-oriented	<.001			
Directness level			Directness level		
Internal modific-ation	most frequent w. neg. rejoin	.005	Internal modificatio n	most frequent w. neg. rejoin	.037
External modific-ation	most frequent w. neg.rejoin	<.05	External modificatio n	most frequent w. zero rejoin	<.01

In request realization, two of the optional modificatory dimensions were affected by rejoinder type in the NS and NNS groups. Both groups mitigated requestive force by means of internal modifiers most frequently when the interlocutor indicated noncompliance (6 & 7).

(6) *I was wondering if* you *could* cook for my party [NS; Cook]

(7) *I wondered if you would mind* keep an eye on my apartment [NNS; Apartment]

Noncompliance thus appears to trigger greater politeness investment than compliance or no indication of interlocutor uptake. In the case of the NS, this patterns also extended to external modification: the NS were most likely to use supportive moves such as grounders (8) or sweeteners (9) when their requests were denied.

(8) *I'm going away for a few weeks*, and I was wondering if you could watch my appartment [NS; Apartment]

(9) *I just love your teriyaki spareribs! All of my friends think it's great!* I'm having a party next weekend and I was wondering if you could cook for my party [NS; Cook]

The NNS, however, displayed quite the opposite pattern in their choice of external modification. When their requests were rejected, they preferred *not* to support them by external modification. Negative rejoinders thus had different effects on the NNS's choices from the two dimensions of request modification. In fact, it is consistent with previous findings that the same request contexts may affect options for internal and external modification differentially (Faerch & Kasper, 1989). Why NS and NNS displayed such different patterns of external modification must remain a matter of speculation at this stage. Perhaps for the NS, a rejection increased the need for more persuasive strategies because the interlocutor's rejoinder is perceived as an initial response in a longer imaginary exchange. The NNS conceivably took a more literalist perspective, viewing the exchange as terminated by the second pair part. In that scenario, investing persuasive activity in an issue which had already been unfavorably resolved would have been a waste of energy and consequently avoided by the NNS.

Another difference between NS and NNS responses appears in the obligatory category Perspective, which specifies agency in the proposition (see above). While the NNS choice of request perspective was unaffected by rejoinder type, the NS opted for hearer-orientation when their request was refused (10) and for speaker-orientation when the rejoinder expressed compliance (11).

(10) Would *you* like to do the meal for my party? [NS; Cook]

(11) Can *I* borrow your salad bowl? [NS; Salad Bowl]

To the extent that these response preferences reflect strategic options in authentic discourse, it would seem that expected compliance favors permission requests (can/could I), whereas expected refusal elicits requests for hearer's action. In terms of threat to face, it may be less face-damaging for S to receive a refusal by H to engage in the proposed action (because in threatening S's positive face H insists on her own negative face, i.e., freedom from imposition) than to have S's own course of action interfered with through an interdiction by H, which amounts to considerable damage

to S's negative face. Quite possibly the NNS were insensitive to the subtle pragmalinguistic nuances carried by different request perspectives.

There was no rejoinder effect on NS and NNS choices of directness level, the other obligatory dimension of request realization. Of seven possible directness levels (see above), by far the most frequently chosen was Preparatory, selected in 88% of the request responses by the NS and in 84% by the NNS. This finding agrees with Rose (1992) and earlier studies on requesting in American English (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 1987; Rintell & Mitchell, 1989) and Mandarin (Zhang, 1995), which demonstrated that preparatory questions are the preferred request strategy between familiar non-intimate speakers of these languages.

Apology

Coding categories

ALERTER: As in complaints and requests.

ILLOCUTIONARY FORCE INDICATING DEVICE (IFID): Conventionalized expression indicating apologetic force.

I'm sorry

I apologize

TAKING ON RESPONSIBILITY: S admits the offense, e.g., by

Stating the offensive fact	I broke your ornament
Assuming responsibility	It was my fault
Expressing lack of intent	I didn't mean to hurt you
Expressing self-blame	I wish I was more careful

DOWNGRADING RESPONSIBILITY OR SEVERITY OF OFFENSE: Any attempt by S to minimize the offense or S's accountability for it, e.g., offering justifications or excuses.

(I'm sorry that I did not come last night) It was because my mother-in-law was sick and I have to take care of her

[Bumping into someone] (I'm sorry but) I'm late for class

I guess I had too much to drink

OFFER OF REPAIR: S offers to remedy the damage by some compensatory action.

I'll pay for the damage

I'll get you a new one

VERBAL REDRESS: Attempt by S to appease H, e.g.,

Expressing Concern for H Are you ok?

Did I hurt you?

I hope you're not angry

Promising Forebearance I guarantee this won't happen again

MODIFICATION: as in complaints.

Table 3

Cooccurrence of Rejoinder Type and Apology Strategy

	NS			NNS	
Strategy	Summary	Prob.	Strategy	Summary	Prob.
Alerter	most frequent w/ pos. rejoin	.037	Alerter		
IFID	most frequent w/ pos. rejoin	<.001	IFID	most frequent w/ pos. rejoin	<.001
Take Respons.	most frequent w/ neg. rejoin	<.001	Take Respons.	most frequent w/ neg. rejoin	<.001
Downgrade Resp.	most frequent w/ neg. rejoin	<.001	Downgrade Resp.	most frequent w/ neg. rejoin	<.001
Repair	most frequent w/ no rejoin	<.001	Repair	most frequent w/ no rejoin	<.001
Verbal Redress			Verbal Redress	most frequent w/ pos. rejoin	.005
Modifi-cation			Modifi-cation		

Of the three speech acts under study, apologies were most strongly affected by

rejoinder type. NS and NNS displayed sensitivity to rejoinder type in their choices of five out of seven apology strategies, and made their choice of the same four strategies contingent on the same type of rejoinder. There is thus remarkable similarity in the effect of rejoinder type on NS and NNS apology performance. More specifically, IFIDs such as 'I'm sorry' cooccurred with apology acceptance (12), while offenders assumed responsibility (13) and downgraded the offense or their involvement in it (14) when they met dispreferred uptake. Repair was offered most often when no rejoinder was provided (15).

(12) Oh, *sorry,* I am going to be late, is there any damage? [NNS; Collision]

(13) I just got up and realized that *I was kinda rude to you last night.* [NS; Rude]

(14) I am sorry I didn't go yesterday. *I had some family business suddenly come up.* But I really wanted to attend your party. [NNS; Farewell Party]

(15) I'm so sorry. How much does it cost? *I'd like to pay for it.* [NNS; Ornament]

These response patterns suggest that when S's positive face is supported, as in apology acceptance, respondents are more forthcoming with an explicit apology, because the accepting uptake compensates the threat to S's positive face inherent in the explicit apology. The sequential positioning of 'explicit apology--acceptance' thus re-establishes the social balance which was disrupted by the offense. On the other hand, a confrontational form of uptake, which threatens S's positive face, induces two opposing response patterns: respondents explicitly assume responsibility for the offensive act (and thereby, just as in offering an apologetic formula, damage their own positive face), but they also downsize the severity of the offense or their involvement in it (and thereby attempt to contain the damage to their positive face). Repair was offered mostly in the absence of a rejoinder, suggesting that the ambiguity created by the lack of uptake triggers more compensatory activity.

In both groups of respondents, yet another strategy was frequently chosen in response to preferred seconds--Alerters by the NS (16), Verbal Redress by the NNS (17).

(16) *Whoa!* Sorry about that! [NS; Collision]

(17) I'm sorry. *Are you okay?* [NNS; Collision]

Both strategies directly address the hearer, but in a brief and cognitively undemanding manner in the case of Alerters such as terms of address or attention getters, and in more elaborate expressions of concern for the other person in the case of Verbal Redress. That the NS opt for the shorter and simpler strategy than the NNS may seem surprising at first glance but is in fact consistent with previous studies, which demonstrated learners' tendency to 'waffle' in apology responses to production questionnaires (e.g., Edmondson & House, 1991; Bergman & Kasper, 1993).

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The crosstabulations of the rejoinder types by strategies provided by the NS and NNS respondents suggest that presence and type of rejoinder affect responses to PQ items differentially. The influence of rejoinder types on responses varied according to speech act category: Complaints were least sensitive to type of rejoinder, apologies were most strongly affected, requests held an intermediate position. Furthermore, respondents' choice of realization strategies for each of the three speech acts was influenced to some extent by type of rejoinder. NS and NNS were almost equally sensitive to rejoinder type in the realization of the three speech acts, although there was some variation in the specific strategies selected by NS and NNS depending on rejoinder type. These findings suggest that results from studies using different PQ formats may not be comparable, but are likely to reflect respondents' sensitivity to presence and type of uptake represented in questionnaire items.

Our study thus gives reason to reconsider some design principles for production questionnaires. Whereas for an individual PQ study, using only one type of rejoinder may be advantageous because it helps avoid undesirable stimulus variation, such lack of stimulus variation directly precludes generalizability across PQ studies using different rejoinder types. In order to improve the generalizability of results from PQ research, future questionnaire designs need to present items with different rejoinder

types in a counterbalanced sequence that will facilitate internal consistency checks. If the rejoinder type fixed in questionnaire items to some degree influences respondents' strategy choice, a distinction has to be observed between traits (speech act realization strategies) and methods (questionnaire items including different types of scripted rejoinders) used to access those traits. Since PQs are likely to remain a widely used method of data collection in crosscultural and interlanguage pragmatics, it will be important to improve the quality of such studies by heeding the trait-method distinction as a design principle in the construction of speech act production questionnaires.

REFERENCES

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Hartford, B. (1993). Refining the DCT: Comparing open questionnaires and dialogue completion tasks. *Pragmatics and Language Learning, 4,* 143-165.

Beebe, L. M., & Cummings, M. C. (In press). Natural speech act data vs. written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. In J. Neu & S.M. Gass (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. (Original version 1985).

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

Bilmes, J. (1993). Ethnomethodology, culture, and implicature. *Pragmatics, 3,* 387-409.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics, 11,* 131-146.

Blum-Kulka, S., Danet, B., & Gerson, R. (1985). The language of requesting in Israeli society. In J. Forgas (Ed.), *Language and social situation* (pp. 113-141). New York: Springer.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Edmondson, W. J., & House, J. (1991). Do learners talk too much? The waffle phenomenon in interlanguage pragmatics. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research* (pp. 273-286). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

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

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

Hartford, B. & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1992). Experimental and observational data in the study of interlanguage pragmatics. *Pragmatics and Language Learning, 3,* 33-65.

House, J. & Kasper, G. (1981). Politeness markers in English and German. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine* (pp. 157-185). The Hague: Mouton.

Jaworski, A. (1993). *The power of silence.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Press.

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

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meier, A.J. (1994). Apologies: What do we know? What should we teach? Paper presented at the TESOL Convention Baltimore, MD, March.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turns shapes. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olshtain, E., & Weinbach, L. (1993). Interlanguage features of the speech act of complaining. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 108-122). New York: Oxford University Press.

Rintell, E., & Mitchell, C. J. (1989). Studying requests and apologies: An inquiry into method. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), Cross-cultural pragmatics (pp. 248-272). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Rose, K. R. (1992). Speech acts and questionnaires: The effect of hearer response. *Journal of Pragmatics, 17,* 49-62.

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

Zhang, Y. (1995). Strategies in Chinese requesting. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Chinese as native and target language* (pp. 23-68). Technical Report # 5, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Honolulu HI: University of Hawai'i Press.