

Pragmatic Competence: The Case of Advice in Second Language Acquisition

(SLA) Abroad

by

Evelyn Baca

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved April 2011 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Barbara Lafford, Co-chair
Carmen García Fernandez, Co-chair
Jabier Elorrieta

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2011

ABSTRACT

Using Spencer-Oatey's rapport management approach, the present study evaluates the interlanguage pragmatic development of 17 native English-speaking American learners over the course of a semester in Spain, specifically in terms of the strategies they used in their second language (L2) to manage rapport in an advice-giving, oral role-play situation at semester start and semester end. To allow for a more in-depth analysis of the effect that a semester abroad has on Spanish L2 advice-giving behaviors, the learners were grouped into two distinct proficiency levels. Group 1 (n=9) represents learners who entered the semester abroad with a beginning to intermediate-low proficiency level and group 2 (n=8) represents learners who entered the semester abroad with an intermediate-high proficiency level.

The results indicate that both learner groups had similar overarching behavioral expectations in this context. Specifically, both sets of learners expressed empathy, involvement, and respect for the interlocutor, while at the same time they used advice-giving strategies of varied illocutionary force to claim authority in addressing the interlocutor's dilemma. Both groups also balanced face sensitivities through strategies that both enhanced and challenged the interlocutor's identity face. However, it is argued that in this context claiming authority and challenging the interlocutor's identity face were permitted behaviors that emphasized the relational goals of the participants. Additionally, when developmental differences between the two proficiency levels were analyzed, the

results showed that learner proficiency had an impact on specific strategy choices.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to the memory of Alex T. Barrese and Landis Hanken.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all of the people in my life that made this thesis possible. First, I would like to thank the student participants— without your participation this study would not have been possible. Also, thank you to Laura Tardiff in the ASU Study Abroad Office and to the study abroad administrators and instructors in Alicante, Spain who greatly assisted me in collecting my data during the fall 2010 semester. Specifically, thank you to Armando and Cynthia Miguelez, Sergio Cenizo, and the Alicante USAC program staff— your kindness will not be forgotten.

Thank you to my advisors Dr. Carmen García and Dr. Barbara A. Lafford for encouraging and guiding me throughout this intense process. I am eternally grateful for the wisdom and expertise you lent me at every point along the way. I am also grateful for the valuable commentary of committee member Jabier Elorrieta and to all the Spanish Department graduate student advisors and graduate students who helped me at various points throughout this journey.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family and friends for their unconditional love, support, and encouragement. I am truly blessed to have such incredible people in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| LIST OF TABLES..... | vi |
| CHAPTER | |
| 1 INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Statement of the problem..... | 1 |
| Purpose of this study..... | 4 |
| 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE..... | 6 |
| Theoretical Framework..... | 6 |
| Speech Act Theory..... | 6 |
| Communicative Competence..... | 8 |
| Rapport Management..... | 9 |
| Literature Review..... | 13 |
| Advice defined..... | 13 |
| Advice in American English..... | 15 |
| Advice in Spanish..... | 18 |
| Advice in Spanish as a foreign language..... | 20 |
| L2 pragmatic competence in study-abroad..... | 24 |
| Justification for study..... | 28 |
| Research questions..... | 29 |
| 3 METHODOLOGY..... | 30 |
| Subjects..... | 30 |

| CHAPTER | Page |
|---------------------------------------|------|
| Group 1..... | 30 |
| Group 2..... | 32 |
| Instruments..... | 34 |
| The oral role-play situation..... | 34 |
| The post role-play questionnaire..... | 36 |
| Reflective Interviews..... | 36 |
| Procedures..... | 37 |
| Data analysis..... | 39 |
| 4 RESULTS & DISCUSSION..... | 41 |
| Strategies..... | 42 |
| Behavioral Expectations..... | 59 |
| Group 1..... | 64 |
| Group 2..... | 72 |
| Comparisons..... | 78 |
| Face Sensitivities..... | 80 |
| Group 1..... | 84 |
| Group 2..... | 89 |
| Comparisons..... | 95 |
| Interactional Wants..... | 97 |
| Summary of Results..... | 100 |
| Discussion of Results..... | 101 |

| CHAPTER | | Page |
|------------|-------------------------------|------|
| | Discussion..... | 102 |
| 5 | CONCLUSIONS..... | 114 |
| | Summary of Study..... | 114 |
| | Pedagogical implications..... | 115 |
| | Limitations..... | 116 |
| | Future research..... | 117 |
| REFERENCES | | |
| APPENDIX | | |
| A. | IRB Approval..... | 124 |
| B. | Instruments..... | 126 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|-------|--|------|
| 1. | 1.1, Behavioral Expectations: The Association Principle..... | 61 |
| 2. | 1.2, Behavioral Expectations: The Equity Principle..... | 63 |
| 3. | 2.1, Face Sensitivities: Strategies used in enhancing the interlocutor's identity face (IIF)..... | 82 |
| 4. | 2.2, Face Sensitivities: Strategies used in challenging the interlocutor's identity face (IIF)..... | 83 |

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The primary aim of this study is to describe the interlanguage pragmatic development of a group of beginner-low students and a group of intermediate-high students while studying abroad for a semester in Spain. Specifically, this study identifies the strategies used in an advice-giving interaction by these two groups of Spanish as a second language (L2) learners over the course of a semester in the target culture. In this chapter, a statement of the problem and the purpose of the study are presented.

Statement of the problem

The most recent Open Doors data (2010) put out by the Institute of International Education (IIE) indicates that during the 2008-2009 academic year over 250,000 American students sojourned abroad for academic credit; a number which has more than doubled in the last decade. The experiences sought out by these students while abroad are diverse, however many continue to pursue second language acquisition (SLA) as a goal. Additionally, Spanish continues to be the most studied foreign language and the second most spoken language in the U.S. (Modern Language Association, 2009). Therefore, it should not be surprising that the third most selected country (and the first among nations where Spanish is the dominant language) by American students when studying abroad is Spain. As a result, the importance of understanding the linguistic and cultural factors that shape L2 language development in a Spanish study abroad context could not be

underestimated for language learners, language educators and university study abroad administrators alike.

The common belief is that a semester abroad will result in measurable L2 linguistic gains due to the access that students presumably have to rich and varied native speaker input. In fact, many studies have demonstrated that immersion experiences in the target culture are immensely valuable to learners in the SLA process, especially in terms of increased oral proficiency (DeKeyser, 1991, Freed, 1990, Regan, 1995 Lafford, 2004). Up until recently much of the published research on SLA abroad has provided valuable insights on the acquisition of specific language skills such as grammar, fluency, and lexicon (Isabelli, 2000, Lafford & Ryan, 1995). However, recently there has been a social shift in SLA research that has sought to evaluate language learning in specific situations and cultural contexts (Block, 2003). One avenue, among others, that has been used to pursue this goal is the study of *interlanguage pragmatics*.

Selinker (1972) was among the first to define the developing interlanguage use of L2 learners as a stage in which learners are not fully proficient in the L2, yet begin to approximate target language linguistic behavior at the same time. As a result, learners begin to demonstrate idiosyncratic L2 performance that is influenced by many factors such as the cultural backgrounds of the learners, experiences in the L2, native language (L1) transfer, overgeneralizations in the L2, error fossilization and linguistic simplifications among other occurrences. Of particular interest to the current study is the effect that an extended stay in the target culture has on the interlanguage development of pragmatic strategies.

Pragmatics has been broadly defined by the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA) as “the way we express and interpret meaning in communication” in distinct social contexts (http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/sp_pragmatics/Introduction_to_pragmatics/what_are_SAs.html). However, the meaning and interpretation assigned to comparable contexts can vary greatly from one culture to the next (Wierzbika, 1991). Therefore, as Wolfram & Schilling-Estes (2006) point out:

Knowing a language involves more than knowing the meaning of the words and the phonological and grammatical structures of the language. In every language and dialect, there are a variety of ways to convey the same information or accomplish the same purpose, and the choice of *how* to say something may depend upon *who* is talking to *whom* and under *what* social circumstances (p.93).

Failure to attend to these contextual factors can result in intercultural misunderstandings caused by *pragmatic failure*. Thomas (1983) describes two forms of pragmatic failure: *pragmalinguistic* and *sociopragmatic*. Both relate to a lack of contextually appropriate language use, however sociopragmatic failure specifically “stems from cross-culturally different perceptions of what constitutes appropriate linguistic behavior” (p.99) which is fundamentally linked to a lack of awareness or willingness to respect social norms. On the other hand, pragmalinguistic failure pertains to the inappropriate assignment of illocutionary force (Thomas, 1983). Both types of pragmatic failure can occur between individuals who come from the same culture, however it is more likely to occur in

interactions between individuals from different cultural and language backgrounds. L2 learners are especially susceptible to pragmatic failure when the differences in linguistic form and cultural expectations in the L2 do not coincide with the students L1 or when their explicit knowledge of appropriateness in the L2 is limited.

Therefore, knowledge of what distinguishes the L2 interlanguage pragmatic behavior of learners from the pragmatics of native speaker groups is very important to learners and especially relevant in a study abroad context where the frequency and diversity of interactions with native speakers make the potential for pragmatic failure higher. In fact, several researchers have noted that despite grammatical correctness, many learners still exhibit linguistic behavior that is quite different from native speaker norms (García 1989; Kasper 1989; Olshtain, 1983). As a result, there has been a recent trend in the investigation of L2 *pragmatic competence* in both at home and study abroad contexts (Shively, 2008, Bataller, 2008, Mwinylene, 2005). However, the study of interlanguage pragmatic development is too broad for the scope of this paper. For this reason, the focus of the current study is limited to the L2 acquisition of one specific speech act (*advice*) by one specific speech community (*L2 learners of Spanish*) in a study abroad context.

Purpose of this study

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the interlanguage pragmatic development of 17 native English-speaking American students over the course of a semester abroad in Spain. Results from a pre and post oral role-play situation

are analyzed using Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach in order to evaluate the specific pragmatic strategies the learners use to give advice in a situation that exhibits no power differential and no social distance (i.e. between close friends). However, before the details of the methodology and results are presented, an overview of the theory relevant to the analysis of interlanguage pragmatic development is presented followed by a review of the current literature available on giving advice in English, Spanish, and second language contexts.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Theoretical Framework

Prior to presenting an analysis of the learners' interlanguage pragmatic behavior while giving advice in Spanish, it is important to outline the terminology and theory upon which the analysis is based. As defined above, interlanguage pragmatics refers to the way second language learners use their L2 to express and interpret meaning in specific social contexts. However, in doing so, students often encounter difficulties related to deficiencies in their sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic knowledge of the L2. In a study abroad context, students are thrust into L2 interactions in which the importance of considering various interactional factors such as age, gender, social class, and other cultural considerations are suddenly real and how students express and interpret meaning in these varied contexts can have a profound effect on the students' perceptions of themselves and the host culture. As a result, Bachman's (1990) Communicative Language Ability model will be used to determine how students manage the speech act of advice-giving under Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach. A review of the concepts that shape and define speech act theory, the Communicative Language Ability model, and the rapport management approach is presented below.

Speech-act theory.

As a result of the context specific nature of pragmatics, the speech act has often been used as the basic unit of analysis in pragmatic research. This concept

was first developed by Austin (1975) who pointed out that speakers not only say things, but also do things with their words. He went on to define the three acts that occur when communicating as the locutionary act (the actual words of an utterance), illocutionary act (the force or purpose assigned to an utterance), and perlocutionary act (the effect of an utterance on the hearer). Searle (1976) elaborated on speech act theory by defining the illocutionary act as “the basic unit of human linguist communication” and he then proceeded to categorize illocutionary acts according to the function they perform (p.1). These categories were an elaboration of Austin’s (1975) taxonomy, but went a step further by identifying the entire utterance as the speech act as opposed to merely identify performative verbs. Specifically, he identified five illocutionary acts: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives, each of which cover a broad range of possible language uses. However, due to the fact that advice, recommendations, and suggestions all fall under the directives category, a further explanation of directives is given here. Searle (1976) defined directives as “attempts... by the speaker to get the hearer to do something” (p.11). This includes utterances that “order, command, request, beg, plead, pray entreat, and also invite, permit and advise” (p.11). At the same time, speech act theory alone has been criticized for its narrow focus at the utterance level, therefore while it provides a useful point of departure in the analysis of pragmatic performance, it is also important to provide a framework from which to evaluate how these acts are carried out discursively, over several turns in specific interactional contexts. For this purpose, Spencer-Oatey’s (2005) rapport

management approach is used to analyze the L2 learner interactions in this study. However, before expounding upon the complexities of the rapport management approach, the role of pragmatic competence in SLA theory is discussed.

Communicative competence.

Bachman (1990) was the first theorist to include pragmatic knowledge as a main component in his Communicative Language Ability model. According to Bachman's (1990) model there are two main areas of language competence: *organizational competence* and *pragmatic competence*. Organizational competence refers to both the grammatical structures and the textual conventions of a language, whereas, pragmatic competence is divided into *illocutionary competence* and *sociolinguistic competence*. For the purposes of this study, only the pragmatic competence of the learners is evaluated. Illocutionary competence involves knowledge of the appropriate illocutionary force (i.e. conventions of form) assigned to a given utterance and sociolinguistic competence refers to the ability to use the language appropriately in different social contexts according to the social norms of the target language community; both areas of pragmatic competence are often intimately related. By identifying pragmatic competence as a key competency in SLA, Bachman's (1990) Communicative Language Ability model provides fuel to the current "social turn" in SLA, which focuses on the fact that speaking a second language cannot be separated from the dynamic social context of specific interactions (Block, 2003). However, the evaluation of L2 pragmatic competence in SLA abroad context is too broad for the scope of this paper, therefore the current study focuses on how learners manage rapport in an

advice-giving interaction under the framework of Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach.

Rapport management.

This study uses Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach to analyze learner interactions at both the beginning and end of the semester in terms of *behavioral expectations*, *face sensitivities*, and *interactional wants*. This approach was selected over Brown & Levinson's (1987) politeness model due to the fact that the components outlined above allow for a broader reaching analysis. First, because it goes beyond merely identifying utterances as respecting positive (i.e. the desire to be well accepted by others) and negative face (i.e. the desire of an individual to be unimpeded by others) and reflects the more dynamic factors affecting an individual's ability to effectively manage rapport in context specific situations. Furthermore, Brown & Levinson's (1987) politeness theory has been criticized as ethnocentric due to the fact that many of the assumptions on which their theory is based are not cross-culturally applicable. For example, the way they identified conventionally direct forms as more "polite" than other forms and the way they labeled specific speech acts as intrinsically face threatening and therefore in need of mitigation has been widely criticized (Wierzbicka, 1991; Hernández-Flores, 1999). As a result, the cross-cultural application of their theory is troublesome.

On the other hand, Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach allows for a richer analysis of the dynamic factors that influence rapport when rapport management is defined as the "the *management* (or *mismanagement*) of

relations between people” (p.96). She goes on to state that the harmony or disharmony established in managing relationships can result in different rapport orientations by the individuals involved. Specifically, she identifies four possible interactional orientations: a rapport-enhancement orientation, a rapport-maintenance orientation, a rapport-neglect orientation, and a rapport-challenging orientation. These four orientations demonstrate that managing rapport in human interactions is a dynamic process in which rapport has the potential to be enhanced, maintained and/or damaged. Furthermore, Spencer-Oatey’s (2005) model puts an emphasis on how the context of the interaction influences the “subjective judgments that people make about the social appropriateness of verbal and non-verbal behavior” (p.97). These subjective judgments are often determined by people’s belief systems, which are unquestionably influenced by the dominant culture and/or subcultures an individual identifies with and thus filters their language use through. Therefore, appropriate behavior is primarily based on what is contextually *prescribed*, *permitted*, or *proscribed* in a given situation. That is, behavior that is considered obligatory (prescribed), behavior that is forbidden (proscribed), and behavior that is not officially prescribed or proscribed (permitted) (Spencer-Oatey, 2005). However, permitted behavior may be socially desirable and expected in certain situations, while at the same time permitted behavior could include unnoticed or even undesirable behavior that is not officially prescribed or proscribed.

According to Spencer-Oatey (2005), what individuals base their social appropriateness judgments on is related to behavioral expectations, face

sensitivities, and interactional wants. She further contends that there are two principles that govern people's behavioral expectations: *the association principle* and *the equity principle*, each of which has three components. The equity principle maintains that people have a basic desire to be treated fairly by others and this includes the belief that people should not be unduly imposed upon, unfairly ordered about, or exploited (Spencer-Oatey, 2005, p.100). The three components of the equity principle reflect these fundamental human desires, which are labeled by Spencer-Oatey (2005) as: cost-benefit considerations (i.e. the idea that people should not be taken advantage of), fairness-reciprocity (i.e. the idea that costs and benefits should be reasonably fair and balanced), and autonomy-control (the idea that people should not be excessively controlled or imposed upon). On the other hand, the association principle upholds that people believe they are entitled to associate with others and are interdependent on one another (Spencer-Oatey, 2005). The three components that make up this principle are: involvement (i.e. the idea that people should show appropriate amounts of involvement with others), empathy (i.e. the idea that people should show appropriate amounts of concern, shared feelings, and interests with others), and respect (i.e. the idea that people should be appropriately respectful of others). How these principles play out in specific contexts would naturally vary from situation to situation and from (sub)culture to (sub)culture.

Face sensitivities, on the other hand, can be situation specific or pan-situational in Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach. Pan-situation face is called *respectability face* and refers to the public image an

individual or group has within a larger community. This type of face tends to hold constant over time (although can change under certain circumstances). On the other hand, *identity face*, is constantly being negotiated in interaction and coincides with Goffman's (1967) idea of face, which states that face is connected to "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself... during a particular contact...[and is] located in the flow of events in the encounter (p.7). Therefore, identity face sensitivities are vulnerable and can consequently be challenged or enhanced in specific interactions. As a result, a challenge or enhancement to identity face is directly related to people's diverse "self-aspects" which can be related to bodily features, possessions, performance/skills, social behaviors, and verbal behaviors (Spencer-Oatey, 2005, p.104). Furthermore, Spencer-Oatey (2005) points out that these self-aspects are connected to what Schwartz (1992) calls value constructs such as power, achievement, self-direction, hedonism, stimulation, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security. Consequently, it appears that faces sensitivities, like behavioral expectations, are both individually and culturally dictated.

The final component that Spencer-Oatey (2005) identifies as influencing rapport management is the interactional wants of specific situations. Interactional wants are therefore defined as the goals that individuals bring to interactions and are usually either transactional or relational. However, Spencer-Oatey (2005) also points out that an interaction can be simultaneously transactional and relational should the social context call for such conduct.

Therefore, Spencer-Oatey's (2005) comprehensive rapport management approach provides a productive framework for the analysis of speech act production, especially as it relates to both native-speaker pragmatics and L2 interlanguage pragmatic development. In Chapter 4, the strategies used by learners to give advice in Spanish will be classified according to the attention paid to the different components of behavioral expectations, identity face, and interactional wants. However, before this takes place a review of the literature available on the speech act of advice as it relates to the current study is presented.

Literature Review

In order to gain a better understanding of the different influences that may shape L2 oral production in an advice-giving scenario, it is important to evaluate previous research on advice-giving in both American English and Peninsular Spanish. Moreover, due to the fact that Spanish L2 advice-giving in a study abroad context has never been investigated (to the best of this researcher's knowledge), it is important to also review the findings of other researchers across languages and speech acts as these studies can provide valuable insight into the acquisition of pragmatics in a study-abroad setting despite differences in the L2 and speech act under investigation. Below the speech act of advice is defined, followed by a review of literature relevant to the acquisition of Spanish L2 advice-giving in a study abroad setting.

Advice defined.

Searle (1976) first classified the speech act of advice into his *directives* category that he defines as an attempt by the speaker to get the hearer to do

something. At the same time, many terms have been used to synonymously refer to *advice*. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, the terms advice, suggestion, and recommendation will be used interchangeably due to the fact that the difference between the three terms is subtle, if existent at all. In fact, Tusi (1994) used one term (*advisives*) to refer to suggestions, recommendations, and advice.

The CARLA website on Spanish speech acts states that offering advice usually involves the hearer expressing an opinion that can either “refer to emotional action or feelings (e.g. trying to make the other person cheer up) as well as physical action (e.g., taking a seat, having a cup of coffee)” (http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/sp_pragmatics/Advice_etc/adv_sugg.html). Martínez Flor (2005) developed a taxonomy for the categorization of different types of suggestions. In this taxonomy, Martínez Flor (2005) defines a suggestion as:

“An utterance that the speaker intends the hearer to perceive as a directive to do something that will be to the *hearer’s benefit*.

Therefore, the *speaker is doing the hearer a favor*, because it is not obvious to both the speaker and the hearer that the hearer will do the act without the suggestion being made” (p.179).

At the same time, DeCapua and Huber (1995) point out that there is a difference between solicited and unsolicited advice, and between advice that is given in public or expert settings versus private settings between friends. Therefore, the context, the relationship of the interlocutors, and the imposition of the advice can affect how the speaker decides to give advice and how the hearer interprets the

advice. The specific characteristics of the advice situation used in this study are explained in further detail in Chapter 3. However, before presenting the methodology and results of the current study, it is important to evaluate previous research on advice-giving in both the L1 and the L2 of the learners in order to better understanding of the linguistic traditions that could influence their L2 production. Below previous research on advice-giving in American English, Spanish, and second language acquisition is presented.

Advice in English.

It is well known that the language and culture of a community are intimately related. In the United States, Anglo-Saxon communities are well known for the emphasis they place on individualism. Wierzbika (1991) points out that the English speaking communities of the United States “place special emphasis on the rights and autonomy of every individual, which abhors interference in other peoples affairs, which respects everyone’s privacy, which approves of compromises and disapproves of dogmatism of any kind” (p.30). The limited amount of studies on advice-giving in American English support this assertion by demonstrating that giving advice is a complex speech act that can be perceived as intrusive. Brown and Levinson (1987) assert that giving advice is an intrinsically face threatening act (FTA) and as a result carrying out this speech act in English is usually accompanied by hedging and indirect speech. Furthermore, they point out that the level of threat depends on the culture, social distance, power, and imposition of the specific situation. However, no native-speaker data was presented to support their assertions.

Fitch (1994) did ethnographic observations of English speakers in Colorado, USA. Her study found that Americans from this region prefer to avoid direct advice-giving to the point that they often deny that they are giving advice all together by emphasizing that the course of action taken is the individuals' ultimate decision. The emphasis placed on the hearer as an individual capable of making their own decisions was further confirmed by the frequent use of the term 'empowerment' to refer to their preference for giving individuals the tools to make their own "right" decisions in life.

A few years later, Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) carried out an ethnographic study on what they called the complex and dynamic act of giving advice in English in the United States. Based on their notes and retrospective interviews, Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) identified three potential dilemmas that this community experiences in giving, receiving, and requesting advice. First, they noticed that for the advice giver there is a tension between being helpful and being intrusive, and being supportive and being honest. On the other hand, the advice recipient has to balance between showing gratitude and respect for the speaker and preserving the right to make an individual decision. In the terms of Brown and Levinson (1987), the data demonstrated a sort of balancing act in which the speakers wanted to avoid being intrusive to prevent threatening the hearers negative face (e.g. the freedom to be independent and unimpeded by others); yet, at the same time they did not want to be too honest with the hearer in order to avoid threatening the hearers positive face (e.g. the desire to be well liked by at least some others). In the end, they conclude that giving advice in American

English is a complex speech act that presents various linguistic challenges for both the speaker and the hearer.

DeCapua and Hubber (1995) used a questionnaire to determine who Americans seek advice from (if anyone) in a number of specific situations. They also qualitatively described some of the differences in types of advice and how these differences seemed to change the nature of the advice given depending on if it was an interaction between intimates or if it was a public “expert” where little to no intimacy had been previously established. They found that American English speakers tended to solicit advice from intimates and that the advice given between intimates often represented more than just the advice-givers authority or experience with a particular matter, but also their desire to maintain harmony and build solidarity and greater intimacy with the advice seeker. While no quantitative analysis of preferred advice-giving strategies was performed, they suggested that in solicited advice-giving situations between intimates American English speakers tend to not use direct forms to avoid coming off as bossy and in an effort to maintain equal status with the advice-seeker. As a result, they observed that American English speakers prefer to relate stories of similar situations or “use softeners, downgraders, mitigators, and hedges in their speech” (p.125). However, they concluded that advice-giving is not always face-threatening, although it has the potential to be especially if inappropriate and/or certain types of unsolicited advice are given. At the same time, they state that advice seems to be a pervasive, normal part of American linguistic interactions and for this reason the speech act of advice-giving warrants greater investigation.

More recently, Bordería-García (2006) administered a preference questionnaire to 37 English-speaking Americans from the Midwest and a closed oral role-play situation to 10 of those 37 native English speakers. Upon analyzing her results, she reported that this group of Americans had a distinctive pattern in their preference for non-conventionally indirect strategies of giving advice, followed by conventionally indirect strategies, and then direct strategies in both their oral and questionnaire data. Specifically, the study indicates that for this group of Americans, the most appropriate way to give advice in English was through hints to solutions or hints to the origin of the problem. At the same, the oral data also indicated that some non-conventionally indirect forms and direct forms were used (albeit in lower frequency).

Advice in Spanish.

Very few studies have been carried out on giving advice in Spanish. At the same time, those that do exist point out that in Spanish giving advice does not seem to threaten face. In fact, several studies have shown that in the Spanish-speaking world imposing is more important than maintaining independence or privacy. Specifically, Fitch (1994) ethnographically observed a high-involvement style of giving advice in Colombia. The advice preference, she points out, is to operate under the assumption that one must help those around them, whether or not they request it (advice) or not. Fitch (1994) also discusses the idea of *confianza*, which she states represents the level of intimacy between interlocutors. Her study indicates that the more *confianza* that exists between interlocutors, the more freedom an individual has to give solicited or unsolicited advice.

Hernández-Flores (1999) rejects Brown & Levinson's (1987) idea that advice is an intrinsically face threatening act. To the contrary, she proposes that in colloquial Spanish conversation, it does not matter if advice is solicited or not, advising is considered appropriate and well accepted. She points out that giving advice in Spain can create greater solidarity and trust because of the involvement and interest in the conversation that it illustrates. According to Hernández-Flores (1999) giving advice in Spain demonstrates the speaker's autonomy as an individual with unique and independent opinions. This could indicate that in Spain advice-giving overtly works on the speakers face and is less concerned the hearer's face than in the United States. However, while this study provides us with some important insight into advice-giving in Spain, it is important to note that only two very brief and natural conversations were evaluated, therefore, it is not possible to generalize her conclusions to the entire Spanish population.

In her dissertation, Bordería-García (2006) administered a perception questionnaire to 30 native Peninsular Spanish speakers and closed oral role-play situations to 10 of those 30 native speakers. On the perception questionnaire she found that there was not a statistically significant difference in the way the Spaniards perceived the appropriateness of non-conventionally indirect, conventionally indirect, and direct forms of advice. However, in the oral situations they demonstrated a strong preference for the use of direct advice. In fact, the advice production patterns of the Spaniards were the opposite of the American English speakers in that there was a preference first for direct advice, then conventionally indirect, and lastly non-conventionally indirect strategies.

Advice in Spanish as a foreign language.

The study of pragmatics in the field of Second Language Acquisition has recently seen an increase in the number of studies that investigate L2 learners' ability to develop and produce native like pragmatic behavior. These studies have taken place in both the foreign language classroom setting and the study abroad setting. However, very little research has focused exclusively on the speech act of advice-giving. The following section will review the currently available literature on the acquisition of advice in the classroom or Spanish as a foreign language setting, followed by a brief look at studies on the acquisition of L2 pragmatics in a study abroad setting.

Koike and Pearson (2005) investigated the effects of teaching the pragmatics of suggesting to third semester English speaking L2 learners of Spanish through either explicit or implicit pre-instruction, and explicit or implicit feedback in a classroom setting. Four experimental groups and one control group were formed to measure the effect of the different treatments. They found that the group that received the explicit instruction and explicit feedback performed best on the multiple choice recognition posttest, whereas the group that received implicit pre-instruction and implicit feedback performed better on the post open-ended written dialogue task. Therefore, it appears that different treatments aided in the learning of pragmatic knowledge in different ways, although, it is noted by the researchers that the posttest gains were not uniformly retained on the delayed posttest four weeks later. It should be noted here that this study did not outline the native-speaker norm the pragmatic instruction was based upon. Sample

dialogues and an advice-giving directness continuum were provided, both of which seem to indicate that greater mitigation (e.g. the conditional, subjunctive mood, interrogative forms) and politeness markers (e.g. *por favor*) were scored as more pragmatically competent ways of giving and/or mitigating a suggestion in Spanish. At the same time, more forceful suggestions (e.g. the imperative or obligation statements) forms were scored as less appropriate. The norm used in this study, therefore, seems to contradict the research outlined above on Peninsular Spanish advice.

That same year, Mwinyelle (2005) investigated the acquisition of advice in a classroom setting. Specifically, 40 intermediate students of Spanish at the University of Texas were grouped into two experimental groups and one control group in which the degree of explicit pragmatic instruction and exposure to an exemplar video were systematically manipulated. Furthermore, each group participated in a pre-test, post-test, and delayed post test that measured the effectiveness of the different treatments through the analysis of student to student oral role-play situations. Mwinyelle found that the group that viewed the exemplar video and received explicit pragmatic instruction produced the best results on the post-test. However, on the delayed post-test this group did not uniformly retain the results obtained on the post-test.

There were many limitations to Mwinyelle's (2005) study. First, he ended all of his oral role-play situations by explicitly instructing the participants to "advise" the advisee. This technique is flawed because it is not giving the speaker the opportunity to "do-nothing." As a result the oral role-play situations should

have been worded in such a way that the advisor (or speaker) was instructed to merely speak with the hearer about the situation at hand. The presence of the word *advise* or *give advice* in the native speaker and student situations left open the possibility that the researcher was cuing the use of certain structures or words (like *aconsejar* or *recomendar*). Additionally, Mwinylene (2005) stated that he was basing his native speaker norm on a variety of Mexican Spanish and he stated that he collected oral role-play data from 20 non-bilingual, native Mexican Spanish speakers in Mexico. However, this information was never quantitatively presented. The use of this data could have provided both the students and instructors of this study as well as future researchers with rich data on which to base the teaching of advice in Spanish. Moreover, detailed information on the exemplar video was not provided, therefore the linguistic background of the actors is unclear and no information was provided as to whether the individuals were scripted or performing one of the role-play situations. Further, this study used native speaker ‘appropriateness’ raters to evaluate the appropriateness of the students’ oral data, however the origin of the raters was not outlined nor was what exactly constituted appropriate behavior. However, like with Koike (2005) this study suggests that greater mitigation and indirectness were rated as more appropriate. However, it should be noted here that various studies have demonstrated that there is quite a bit of pragmatic variation in Spanish (Placencia & García, 2007; Márquez-Reiter, 2000; Ruzickova, 1998) and what native speakers rate as appropriate, and what they actually do orally often does not line

up perfectly (Bordería-García, 2006). Overall this study, provided insight on the potential effectiveness of teaching pragmatics in the classroom.

Bordería-García (2006) investigated beginner, intermediate, and advanced learners of Spanish in their abilities produce advice in a university setting. A closed role-play scenario was first administered to gather learner production data, followed by a Metapragmatic Judgment Task (MJT) in which the students judged the appropriateness of three different advice strategies: direct, conventionally indirect, and non-conventionally indirect. Bordería-García (2006) also manipulated the level of imposition to determine if the strategies or perceptions of the strategies changed depending on the particular advice situation. Learner results were then compared quantitatively and qualitatively to native English and Spanish speaker data collected via the same MJT and role-play scenarios. It was found that beginning L2 learners of Spanish use of direct strategies most closely mirrored native Spanish speaker (NSS) use of direct strategies, even though this beginning learner group had greater grammaticality difficulties. Intermediate learners appear to have effectively learned the conventionally indirect strategy of advising, but appear to overuse this strategy when compared to the NSS data. Advanced learners' advice-giving strategies most closely mirrored the native English speaker (NES) data. This may be due to the advanced learners' abilities to more effectively and efficiently transfer language from their L1 to their L2. However, Bordería-García (2006) is quick to point out that based on her qualitative analysis, the advanced learners used significantly more positive politeness strategies than NES and they produced the same quantity of advice as

NSS. Therefore, it seems possible that the advanced students have developed L2 pragmatic competence in their L2 politeness strategies, but that as they advance they diverge from the directness norm of linguistic form preferred by NSS. This increase in positive politeness markers also seems to indicate that the advanced learners understood the importance of using solidarity-building strategies in Spanish; while at the same time this group's language demonstrated that the conventions used to achieve this end were different than the NSS. There were not statistically significant differences between the four groups appropriateness perceptions on the MJT, however, pedagogically speaking Bordería-García (2006) points out that her study demonstrates the need to raise learner awareness of these speech act realization differences in order to avoid potential intercultural misunderstandings.

Bodería-García's (2006) study had several limitations. First, she only had 10 individuals from each group participate in the oral role-play situations. This small number makes it difficult to generalize her results to the student and native speaker populations they intend to represent. Furthermore, her research design only provided a one-time snapshot of learner performance, which makes it difficult to draw developmental conclusions

The acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence in study abroad.

It is often assumed that studying abroad provides learners with greater access to native speaker pragmatic norms. However, it is not clear how long it takes learners to notice target language pragmatic norms, although Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1985) suggested early on that pragmatic competence may develop

slower than other areas of linguistic competence. As a result, over the past decade, numerous researchers have begun to study the L2 development of speech-act specific pragmatic competence in a study abroad setting (Shively, 2008; Bataller, 2008; Barron, 2003; Hoffman-Hicks, 2000). Hoffman-Hicks (2000) investigated the interlanguage pragmatic development of a group of French L2 learners in their ability to produce pragmatically appropriate greetings, leave-takings, and compliments. The results indicated that the study abroad learners began producing more native-like, formulaic greetings and leave takings; however, their ability to produce native like complimenting behavior was less notable. In an attempt to account for this finding, it was suggested that learners had greater access to native like exemplars of greetings/leave-takings, than to appropriate complimenting behaviors. Barron (2003) and Bataller (2008) studied the L2 production of requests and found that L2 learners in a study abroad context approximated native speaker norms in certain ways, yet in other ways seemed to diverge from the L2 norm when left to their own devices. Both suggest that overgeneralizations and L1 transfer may play a role in interlanguage pragmatics. As a result of these mixed findings, Shively (2008) sought to introduce explicit pragmatic instruction into the L2 study abroad classroom. She found that the explicit instruction aided students' ability to notice and subsequently approximate more native like requesting behaviors. At the same time, Barron (2003) and Shively (2008) also described individual instances of resistance to native speaker norms due to personal values and cultural identity.

Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford's (1990, 1991, 1993, 1999) research on ESL pragmatics has suggested a number of interesting findings, namely suggesting that grammar and pragmatics develop independently and that even learners with high levels of grammatical knowledge may remain unaware of target language norms of pragmatic appropriateness in certain contexts. Moreover, Bardovi-Harlig & Dornyei (1998) found that native speakers and ESL learners often perceived pragmatic errors as more serious than grammatical errors. On the other hand, EFL learners rated grammatical errors as more serious; these findings seem to indicate that the second language context facilitates greater pragmatic awareness than the at home or foreign language context. At the same time, residency alone, especially for short amounts of time (as is often the case in study abroad) does not guarantee that students will notice pragmatic input, let alone convert that input into understanding (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996). As a result, many researchers have begun to advocate for the explicit instruction of pragmatics in both the at-home and study abroad or second language classroom contexts (Bardovi-Harlig & Dornyei, 1998; Cohen & Shively, 2007; Félix-Brasdefer, 2008a;)

Overall, it appears that the study abroad context has the potential to aid in the development of pragmatic competence, however the brief overview above indicates that the findings are not conclusive and that some speech acts have been more investigated than others. In fact, to the best of this researcher's knowledge, Matsumura (2001) is the only researcher who has investigated the L2 acquisition of advice in a study abroad context. Therefore, due its relevance to the current study, a more detailed summary of Matsumura's (2001) study is presented below.

With a quantitative focus, Matsumura (2001) studied the longitudinal development of the pragmatic competence necessary to offer advice in English. Specifically, she compared a group of Japanese students studying English for a year in Canada to a group of Japanese students studying English in Japan. Data were collected four times throughout the year by means of a multiple choice metapragmatic judgment task (MJT) in which social status was contextually manipulated. Matsumura found that the students all started off at relatively the same level of competence, i.e., they all started the year with a relatively native-like ability to offer advice to individuals of higher status, but were lacking in their pragmatic ability to offer advice to individuals of equal or lower status in the target language (English).

The results show that the study abroad group quickly began to pragmatically outperform the ‘at-home’ group in offering advice to individuals of equal and lower status. Matsumura (2001) concludes that exposure to native English speakers in a study abroad setting greatly aids in the acquisition of the speech act of advice-giving. However, the use of a multiple choice MJT instrument could be viewed as a limitation to this study, mainly because it is unclear as to whether the MJT truly reflected, natural native speaker production and it does not evaluate learner production patterns.

Justification of Study

The review of literature above, although somewhat limited, seems to demonstrate that there appears to be marked differences in Peninsular Spanish and American English advice-giving styles. As a result, it is not difficult to imagine

the intercultural misunderstandings that L2 learners abroad could encounter while studying abroad in Spain, especially in the context of developing interpersonal relationships. Specifically, it is possible that if the students are not made aware of the pragmatic differences that exist, they could interpret the Spanish advice-giving style as bossy, overly forceful, or even rude. On the other hand, if American students transfer more indirect forms of advice into their L2, it is possible that they could come off as disinterested to a Spaniard.

Similarly, the review of literature above demonstrates that advice has been less studied than other speech acts in both native speaker and learner language. The studies that have investigated the acquisition of Spanish L2 advice-giving have focused on the classroom setting (Koike & Pearson, 2005; Mwinyelle, 2005; Bordería-García, 2006). These classroom studies have provided some valuable insight on the effects of proficiency level and explicit instruction on L2 advice production. However, it is also possible that an American L2 classroom setting provides different advice input (and consequently different L2 production) than a Peninsular Spanish study abroad setting. In fact, to the best of this researchers' knowledge, no studies have investigated the acquisition of Spanish L2 advice-giving in a study abroad setting. Therefore, further research on this speech act is necessary, especially if advice interactions are as ubiquitous in everyday interactions as DeCapua and Huber (1995) suggest is the case in American English and as Fitch (1994) and Hernández-Flores (1999) suggest is the case in Colombian and Peninsular Spanish.

Moreover, the research above also clearly demonstrates that few studies have analyzed how a specific speech act (advice in this case) is used in the larger discursive context of rapport management (Spencer-Oatey, 2005). Therefore, this study aims to contribute to the growing number of studies that seek to describe the interlanguage pragmatic development of learners in a study abroad context. Specifically, in terms of the sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic strategies Spanish L2 learners use in an advice-giving situation with a native Peninsular Spanish speaker. In addition, it seeks to determine, how (if at all) their interlanguage in this specific context, develops over the course of a semester in the target culture. The findings could help researchers and instructors better understand the impact of a semester abroad on L2 interlanguage development and subsequently could provide a point of departure in determining where pedagogy could play a role in guiding learners understanding of pragmatic awareness in an advice situation. In order to address the above-mentioned intercultural issues and research gaps, the following research questions will be addressed in this study:

Research Questions

- 1.) What are the behavioral expectations, face sensitivities, and interactional wants of the two learner groups when giving advice in a Spanish study abroad context?
- 2.) How do the two learner groups' specific strategy choices vary (if at all) from semester start to semester end?

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter reports on the research design, participants, and data collection methods used in this study. It starts by presenting a detailed overview of the two participant groups and then a description of the instruments used to elicit learner language and gather other important data is described. Finally, an account of the data collection procedures is provided.

Subjects

The study abroad group originally consisted of 20 native English-speaking American L2 learners of Spanish participating in study programs in Alicante, Spain during the fall 2010 semester, however, two participants were eliminated because they had also participated in summer study abroad programs and one participant was eliminated because her program of study while in Alicante was very different from the other study abroad students. As a result, the final participant count was 17 students. These participants were split into two proficiency levels based on two factors: their entering placement exam scores at the University of Alicante (UA) and the last Spanish course they had taken at an accredited American university. As a result, 9 students were placed in group 1 and 8 students were placed into group 2. A more detailed explanation of each group is presented below.

Group 1.

Group 1 consisted of 9 study abroad students, 6 males and 3 females between the ages of 20 and 28 (median: 22). All the students were native

English-speaking Americans and none of them had ever studied abroad or were considered a heritage learner. The students in this group all came to Alicante from large public universities in the southwestern U.S. All nine students had different majors, which included only one Spanish major and two Spanish minors. The students were placed into this group based on their entrance placement exam scores at the University of Alicante (UA). Specifically, five students tested into the beginner courses and four tested into the intermediate low courses at UA. In terms of previous formal L2 instruction, one student was considered a complete beginner, however the remaining eight had not completed beyond fourth semester (i.e. lower-division) Spanish at Arizona State University (ASU). Overall, group #1 seemed to naturally come together based on their scores on the UA entrance exam and based on their previous formal classroom experiences at ASU.

While in Alicante, all 9 students were enrolled as full time undergraduate students at UA's Centro Superior de Idiomas (CSI). Each student took approximately 4 hours of Spanish class per day, Monday through Friday. Professors trained in Spanish as a second language taught the CSI courses and these classes generally consisted of three consecutive hours of contextualized grammar practice followed by a one-hour conversation course. Furthermore, students were permitted to take other courses at the university and/or through an affiliated study abroad organization in subject areas related to Spanish, their major, or personal interests. As a result, three students in group 1 were enrolled in a Spanish literature course, one student was enrolled in flamenco guitar lessons, and one student took a political science course in English at UA. Outside of the

classroom, students also engaged in for credit internships. One student worked at the Alicante Chamber of Commerce and a few of the female students received internship credit for working as English teaching assistants at local schools. Outside of the university/internship setting, eight of the nine students lived with a host mother or host family, however one student chose to live in a shared flat with three Spanish peers.

Group 2.

Group 2 consisted of 8 study abroad students, 7 females and 1 male between the ages of 20 and 30 (median: 22). All students were native English-speaking Americans and none had prior study abroad experience or were considered a heritage learner. This group included two Spanish majors, three Spanish-double majors, two Spanish minors, and one English/Secondary education major. The students in this group came from a larger variety of American universities than the students in group 1. Specifically, three of the students came to Alicante from a large public university in the Southwestern United States, two students came from a large public university in the Northeastern United States, and three students came from (three distinct) small, private liberal-arts institutions along the Eastern Coast of the United States. As with group 1, the students were placed into this group based on their UA entrance exam scores. In fact, all 8 students tested into the intermediate-high level courses at UA at the start of the semester. Additionally, all 8 students in group 2 had taken at least one semester of upper division Spanish at their home institutions in the U.S. prior to arrival in Spain. These pre-departure courses ranged from

Spanish literature to Spanish conversation and composition type courses. Overall, the similarities in group 2's entrance exam scores and their pre study abroad coursework allowed group 2 to naturally come together.

At the UA, all 8 students were enrolled as full time undergraduate students at the Centro Superior de Idiomas (CSI). Each student took approximately 4 hours of CSI Spanish class per day, Monday through Friday (however three of the students in this group did not have classes on Fridays). Professors trained in Spanish as a second language taught the CSI courses and these classes generally consisted of three consecutive hours of contextualized grammar practice followed by a one-hour conversation course. As with group 1, students were permitted to take other courses at the university and through their study abroad organization in subject areas related to Spanish, their major, or personal interests. The students in group 2 took much greater advantage of this option. Specifically, three students in group 1 were enrolled in a Spanish literature course, one student was enrolled in a Spanish history course and a European art history course (in Spanish), one student took a Spanish art and a cinema course, and two students took English literature courses at UA. Furthermore, two students were enrolled in a Spanish gastronomy course and a course on social realities in Spain through their study abroad organization. Outside of the classroom, six of the eight students also taught English (some as private paid instructors and others for course credit). As for housing accommodations, seven of the eight students lived with a host mother or host family, however one student (also the English major) chose to live in a shared flat with other American students.

Instruments

This study used an open oral role-play situation to elicit student speech. Additionally, post-role play questionnaires were administered immediately following the role-play interactions in order to gather the students' and the interlocutor's impressions of the interactions. Students were also given a background questionnaire at the start of the semester to determine their eligibility for the study. Reflective interviews were also conducted at the beginning and end of the semester in order to gather some qualitative data on student expectations, motivations, and experiences in the target culture at the beginning and end of the semester. A language contact questionnaire was also administered at semester start and end to determine the degree of contact individual learners had with the target language, however due to the time constraints of this project, the language contact questionnaire data will not be analyzed as a part of this study. The following section describes the instruments and rationale behind the instruments used in this study.

The oral role-play.

An open oral role-play situation was selected as the instrument for eliciting the students' L2 oral speech. Many researchers have opted to use written instruments (such as DCTs or questionnaires) to gather information on learner interlanguage pragmatics (Hoffman-Hicks, 2000; Matsumura, 2001; Barron, 2000); however, the main goal of the present study was to evaluate oral L2 production, therefore an open, oral role-play task was deemed a more appropriate tool for two primary reasons. First, because an open oral-role play situation

allows for the natural development of spontaneous conversation; and second, because the presence of a live, native speaker creates for a more authentic and realistic study abroad interaction. For this reason, many pragmatists have opted to use open role-play situations in their research (García, 1993, 2007; Félix-Brasdefer, 2005, 2007; Bordería-García, 2006; Bataller, 2008). Furthermore, role-play situations allow researchers to better control variables and provide a means of accessing linguistic behaviors that are often not as easily accessible via natural observation (e.g. the expression of sympathy, advice-giving between intimates, reprimanding, etc.).

Two advice situations were administered to the students. One situation reflected an encounter that could take place between friends (low social distance, power differential and imposition) and the second situation reflected a situation that could take place between a student and the parent of a friend (low social distance, some power differential (age), and low imposition). However, due to an unexpected turn in the second situation and the space limitations of this study, the second situation was not included as a part of the current advice-giving analysis. A translation of the situation used to elicit advice-giving between friends (situation one) is presented below:

Student: You are with a friend and he explains to you that one of your mutual friends seems to be showing romantic interest in him. You think that this might be true because you have also noticed some changes in this person's behavior. Your friend doesn't know what to do and so he talks to you about the situation.

Interlocutor: You have a friend that suddenly seems to be taking a romantic interest in you. In general, her interactions with you have been different lately. Specifically, the way she has been looking at you, calling/texting you continually, and how she always wants to hang out is different than in the past. You don't want her to get the wrong idea because you are not interested in having a relationship with her, but you want to maintain a friendship and so you don't know what to do. One day while with a mutual friend you discuss the situation.

Post role-play questionnaires.

A post role-play questionnaire was administered to both the interlocutor and the students immediately following each open role-play interaction. This instrument was used to gather student and interlocutor perceptions of the interaction. Specifically, the aim was to determine how, if at all, these impressions (often which were not explicitly stated during the interaction) had an effect on face sensitivities and rapport management. García (1993, 2008, 2010) routinely uses these questionnaires in her pragmatic studies to determine if the pragmatic norms of an interaction are interpreted as (in)appropriate by the interlocutors involved. An example of the questionnaire used is provided in Appendix B.

The reflective interviews.

In an effort to gain a more in-depth perspective on the overall study abroad experience, students were invited to participate in reflective interviews once at the beginning of the semester and once at the end of the semester. During

these interviews, questions about the students' expectations and experiences as a study abroad participant were asked. The questions used in these interviews are provided in Appendix B.

Procedures

The oral-role play data was gathered at two points in the semester, once at the beginning of the students stay abroad and once toward the end of the semester. Twelve of the participants were recruited through a contact I had made prior to my arrival in Alicante, as a result all twelve students gladly agreed to participate in the study. Specifically, I attend an event with these students at the beginning of the semester and gathered their background and contact information at that time. The remaining participants were recruited on the University of Alicante campus. Specifically, I approached several students outside the language building and I also visited two classrooms to recruit participants. During these visits, I gathered their contact information and later I set up a time to gather their detailed background information and conduct their entrance interviews (at the same time). Every student participated in two reflective interviews, one at the start of the semester and one at the end of the semester. The students were individually invited to coffee at various cafes around Alicante. The goal of these interviews was to get to know the students individually and to gather data on their expectations and motivations as it related to their language learning and the study abroad experience. These interviews were audio-recorded.

The oral role-play situations took place at my shared flat in Alicante. I invited the students over on three separate occasions within their first 2-3 weeks

of arrival. The students socialized in the living room, and were then invited one by one into the kitchen to perform the role-play situation with the interlocutor. However, I met with the interlocutor privately before the students arrived in order to explain his role to him and to ask him if he had any questions. Before engaging in the role-play conversations, the students read the oral role-play situation in Spanish and were asked if they had any questions. Once the students stated that they understood the procedures, the students and the interlocutor were instructed to interact naturally as if were in a real life situation. Then, the recorder was started. At that point, I left the room and the interlocutor managed the recording device and called me back into the kitchen once the conversations were completed. The recorder was then stopped and both the interlocutor and the student participants were asked to fill out the post-role play questionnaire, which addressed their perceptions and impressions of the interaction that had just taken place. These same procedures were repeated again during the last three weeks of the semester, however at the end of the semester the recordings took place over four different evenings.

Throughout the semester, the researcher also attended some events with the students and observed several of their classes in order to gain a more in-depth perspective of their study abroad experience. It is important to note here that there was a difference in the program design of handful of the students. Specifically, the majority (13) of the students were enrolled in classes with other international students from non-European countries. However, four of the students (one from group 1 and three from group 2) were enrolled in a sheltered

study abroad program. This program was also run by the Centro Superior de Idiomas, as a result, the coursework and proficiency levels corresponded with the mixed nationality courses of the other 13 students, however the participants in this program only attended classes with other Americans.

Data Analysis

The audio recordings were transcribed using Jefferson (1984) transcript conventions and then each conversation was coded using the CCSARP coding manual as a guide. Specifically, the advice-giving strategies were adapted from Bulm-Kulka et al.'s (1989) request categories. This decision was made because requests have been more widely studied as a speech act and also because advice is a type of directive as categorized by Searle (1976). However, due to the fact that the not all of the advice-giving strategies lined up perfectly with the requesting strategies outlined, Martínez Flor's (2005) taxonomy for the speech act of suggesting in foreign language teaching (FLT) was also consulted in addition to previous research (García 2009, 2010) that has used Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach to analyze speech act production. The above-mentioned sources were collectively referred to in an effort to better understand the current trends in speech-act classification and analysis.

After the conversations were transcribed and coded, the strategies were categorized according to the various principles and subcomponents of Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach. Specifically, the strategies were categorized as respecting or violating the association or equity principle in observance of the situational behavioral expectations. These same strategies were

then reclassified to analyze the face sensitivities of the situation (each strategy was classified as either face enhancing or face challenging). The results of the behavioral expectations and faces sensitivities' classifications were then quantitatively analyzed and displayed in corresponding tables. However, the interactional wants component of Spencer-Oatey's rapport management approach was analyzed purely qualitatively in light of the behavioral expectations and face sensitivities of the interaction, therefore, no quantitative table was used to analyze this aspect of the rapport management approach. Similarly, the post-role play questionnaires and interview data were used to qualitatively describe and support the findings as they related to both the students' and the interlocutor's dynamic perceptions of rapport in an advice situation between intimates. In the chapter that follows, the results of this data analysis are presented, followed by a discussion of the findings in light of previous research.

Chapter 4

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

When giving advice in Spanish both study abroad groups used a variety of strategies to address the situation and the interlocutor's request for advice. Therefore, it could be said that these strategies reflect the L2 behavioral expectations of native English-speaking American university students studying in Spain in this specific advice-giving context. Combined, the students used 33 different strategy types to varying degrees on the pre- and post- tests. This high amount of variation could preliminarily indicate that advice-giving does not attend to regularity like other more formulaic speech acts. In fact, published studies on more researched speech acts such as requests (García, 1993), inviting (García, 2007), and the expression of sympathy (García, 2009), among others, have recorded a range of twelve to fifteen strategies per speech act in native speaker data. However, due to the fact that this study is focusing on L2 learners of Spanish, native speaker data in both Spanish and English would need to be analyzed to determine whether this variation is a characteristic of learner speech, a characteristic of American English speakers advice-giving tendencies (resulting in a certain amount of L2 transfer), and/or a characteristic of Peninsular Spanish speakers advice-giving repertoire.

The 33 strategies used by students in this context are defined with examples below. Following the strategy definitions, the results are quantitatively categorized in tables according to Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach. The strategy choices of the students are then analyzed in terms of the

three key elements of this approach: behavioral expectations, face sensitivities, and interactional wants.

Strategies

The strategies used by the students during the advice-giving interactions are presented below with a brief explanation, followed by an example of their use in context. The strategy under discussion is bolded. Furthermore, the interlocutor's speech is labeled with the letter *I*, and the student speech is labeled with an *S* followed by a one or a two to indicate the student group the example pertains to.

1. Imperatives. Many students used imperatives to give direct forms advice to the interlocutor. This included direct imperatives (commands) and quasi imperatives (i.e. imperatives that were missing a verb, but clearly carried the illocutionary force of an imperative). Some imperatives were also externally mitigated. An example is given below.

Example:

I: está loca ((tongue clicking sound: t t t)) *tengo un problema*

S2: sí

I: Bueno bueno gracias

S2: pero **haz lo- piensas es mejor** ((laughter))

Translation:

I: she's crazy ((tongue clicking sound t t t))

S2: yeah

I: well, well thanks

S2: but **do what you think is best** ((laughter))

2. Obligation Statements. Many students urged the interlocutor to follow their advice by using obligation statements with the verb ‘deber’ (have to/must or ought to/should) or ‘tener que’ (have to). The verb ‘deber’ was also occasionally internally modified or externally mitigated, however internal modification and external mitigation were rare. An example is given below.

Example:

S1: ... **no tienes que decir mucho a ella uh**

I: tú crees?

Translation:

S1: ... you don't have to say much to her uh

I: you think?

3. Need Statements. Many students used need statements to give advice. An example is provided below.

Example:

I: eh hh no::: no sé cómo, no sé cómo. Por eso te pregunto. No sé cómo, qué hago?

S1: **Necesitas uh ser mu::y fuerte**

Translation:

I: eh hh no::: I don't know how to, I don't know how to. This is why I'm asking you. I don't know how, what do I do?

4. Suggestory Statements. Many students made suggestory statements to give advice. This type of suggestion primarily utilized the verb ‘poder’ (to be able to).

There were also a few examples of interrogative suggestions and ‘poder’ with internal modifications. An example is provided below.

Example:

I: pero ella nunca puede::, siem- siempre en mi casa o en su casa y todo siempre muy íntimo (ughh pooo)

S1: sí, ummm **puedes decir algo como umm (1.0) “quiero muchísimo terminar esta proyecto y::: quiero un- una nota buena y ella también.** Ehh supongo. Y::

Translation:

I: but she ca::n never, alw- always at my house or at her house and everything always very intimate (ughhh pooo)

S1: yes, ummm you can say something like umm (1.0) “I very much want to finish this project and I want a- a good grade and she also. Ehh I suppose. A::nd

5. Want Statements. A few instances of learners expressing their wants or desires on the interlocutor through want statements were observed. An example is provided below.

Example:

S1: pues **no quiero que la ignoras sólo que no um uh re:: (1.0) uh que no respuestas a sus um (0.2)du:::m**

I: que no sigue el juego, es lo que referes?

S1: sí sí

Translation:

S1: well, I don't want you to ignore her, just that you don't um uh
don't respond to her um (0.2)du:::m

I: that I don't play her game, is this what you are referring to?

S1: yes, yes

6. Opinion Statements. Many students gave their personal opinions to the interlocutor. The verbs 'pensar' (to think) and 'creer' (to believe) were often used to do so. However, there were other instances in which an opinion was given without the use of these exact verbs. An example is provided below.

Example:

S2: pero es- **pienso que es la única manera de resolverlo.**

(1.0)

I: tomo nota de lo que me has dicho. El problema que yo veo, es ella
es muy sensible, una chica muy sensible .

Translation:

S2: but it's- I think it's the only way to resolve this.

(1.0)

I: I'm taking note of what you have said. The problem that I see, is
she is very sensitive, a very sensitive girl.

7. Participant Shift. In a few cases, the students used 'if I were you' statements to give advice to the interlocutor. An example is provided below.

Example:

S2: pero (1.5) **si yo=**

I: um hm

(1.0)

S2: **era, si fuera**

I: *fuera*

S2: **fuera tú** ((laughs: hahahaha)) um voy a usar mi subjuntivo aquí. Si yo fuera tú

(1.5)

I: *If I were you es como en inglés*

S2: ehhhh **no sé- haría, haría el proyecto po:::r solo** ((giggles: Huhuhu)) y::: no me molesta con- con ella.

Translation:

S2: but (1.5) if I=

I: um hm

(1.0)

S2: was, if I were

I: *were*

S2: were you ((laughs: hahahaha)) I am going to use my subjunctive here. If I were you

(1.5)

I: *If I were you, it's like in English*

S2: uhhh, I don't know, I'd do, I'd do the project by myself and I wouldn't bother with her.

8. Impersonal Statements. Impersonal statements were used to give advice both at the beginning and end of the semester. An example is provided below.

Example:

S2: **y en todos los casos es más bueno si tu estás directamente- directo**

I: um hum

Translation:

S2: and in all cases it's better if you are directly- direct.

I: um hum

9. Announcing Plans. Some students announced future plans to help to help the interlocutor with his problem. An example is provided below.

Example:

S2: entonces **yo me::: me uh voy a salir con ella y vamos a- a uh-
buscar otros chicos para ella**

I: ((laughs: hahahahahaha))

Translation:

S2: So I'm, I'm going to go out with her and we are going to- to uh
look for other guys for her

I: ((laughs: hahahahahaha))

10. Assuming Responsibility. A few instances of a student assuming full responsibility for the interlocutor's problem occurred. An example is provided below.

Example:

S1: PORQUE YO- es posible, tú es mi amigo mejor- ok, vale?

I: entiendo

S1: **YO PUEDO hacer algo para ti.**

Translation:

S1: BECAUSE I- it's possible, you are my best friend, ok?

I: I understand

S1: I CAN do something for you.

11. Warning. A few instances of students warning the interlocutor were found in the student data. An example is provided below.

Example:

S2: **si tú no dices direc-tamente**

I: um hm

S2: **ella no- no va a entender nada**, entonces es la única manera

Translation:

S2: If you don't say something directly

I: um hm

S2: she's not- not going to understand anything, so it's the only way.

12. Requesting favor. One student requested a favor from the interlocutor. An example is provided below.

Example:

I: ... va a ser muy sencillo, os presento, voy con otra chica, os presento.

S1: pero, pero **el próximo vez que YO necesito un favor.**

Translation:

I: ... it's going to be very simple, I'll introduce you to each other, I'll go with another girl, I'll introduce you to each other.

S1: but, but the next time that I need a favor.

13. Hint. At the beginning of the semester, one student hinted at a solution to the interlocutor's problem. An example is provided below.

Example:

S1: **But you're- >you're you're< novia is not in el barrio=**

I: ((laughs: ha haaaa))

S1: **she's in the casa**

14. Making Offer. One student made an offer to the interlocutor. An example is provided below.

Example:

I: Y los juegos? Tengo un montón de juegos.

S1: **para los dos, yo puedo hacer qué quieres.**

Translation:

I: And the games? I have a ton of games.

S1: For both, I can do whatever you want.

15. Refusing to help. There were a few recorded instances of students refusing to help the interlocutor.

Example:

I: y qué puedo hacer entonces?

S1: qué puedes hacer? **Uhh es no my- no mi problema es tu problema con chica**

Translation:

I: What can I do then?

S1: What can you do? Uhh it's not my problem it's your problem with the girl.

16. Expressing Disagreement. The students expressed disagreement with the interlocutor both at the beginning and end of the semester. An example is provided below.

Example:

I: y no crees que va a ser un poco incómodo? Un poco como ((tshh))

S1: **no^**

I: pero las chicas a veces

Translation:

I: and you don't think it's going to be a little uncomfortable? A little like (tshh)

S1: **no^**

I: but girls sometimes

17. Expressing Doubt/Uncertainty. Some students were uncertain about the best way to resolve the interlocutor's situation. An example is provided below:

Example:

I: buena idea, buena idea.

S1: **no sé, no sé**

I: eres el primero que me hace este consejo, el primero, eh^

Translation:

I: good idea, good idea.

S1: I don't know, I don't know

I: you are the first to give me this advice, the first, eh^

18. Jokes. A few jokes were recorded in the student data. An example is provided below.

Example:

S1: ((laughs: hahaha))

I: joder ya.

S1: **eh eh lingua por favor ((laughs:haha))**

Translation:

S1: ((laughs: hahaha))

I: F*@!

S1: eh eh language please ((laughs))

19. Requesting Information. The students requested information from the interlocutor about his situation. An example is provided below.

Example:

I: claro, yo intento a presentarle a amigos

S1: **salgas con ella?**

Translation:

I: Of course, I try to introduce her to friends.

S1: You go out with her?

20. Requesting Confirmation. One student requested confirmation of a fact from the interlocutor. An example is provided below.

Example:

S1: pero uh [es en Alicante=

I: la chica?]Sí, sí, sí.

S1: =por cuatro meses.

I: sí.

S1: **sí**^

S: sí.

S1: **sí**^ ((laughs: hahah))

Translation:

S1: but uh she'[s in Alicante=

I: the girl? [yes, yes, yes.

S1: for four months.

I: yeah

S1: yeah^

I: yeah

S1: yeah^ ((laughs))

21. Statement of fact. The students stated facts, usually by repeating something that the interlocutor had said previously in the conversation. An example is provided below.

Example:

S2: **tú necesitas trabajar con ella.**

I: sí

Translation:

S2: you need to work with her.

I: yes

22. Signaling Comprehension. The students frequently signaled comprehension to indicate that they were listening and engaged in the conversation. This strategy was more frequently employed toward the beginning of the advice-giving period. An example is provided below.

Example:

I: porque ella no hace nada, yo la llamo =

S1: [sí

I: =]aie Jamie mira tenemos que, tenemos que hacer el proyecto
“ah sí sí ven, ven a mi casa”

Translation:

I: because she doesn't do anything, I call her =

S1: yeah

I: =]hey Jamie look we have to, we have to do the project, “oh yes,
yes,
come, come to my house”

23. Expressing Surprise. Some students expressed surprise at something the interlocutor was sharing. An example is provided below.

Example:

S2: ... has ha- hablado con ella sobre la situación, sí?

I: ((signals “no” with body language))

S2: **No!**

Translation:

S2: You have spoken with her about the situation, yeah?

I: ((signals “no” with body language))

S2: No!

24. Expressing Agreement. Many students expressed agreement with the interlocutor throughout the interactions. An example is provided below.

Example:

I: porque ella no me ha dicho claramente “^oh me gustas,” es simplemente- lo insinúa, insinúa. Entonces si yo le digo directamente “oye estás ligando conmigo- no me gusta” no- es un poco fuerte.

S2: **sí**

Translation:

I: because she hasn’t clearly said to me “^oh I like you,” it’s just she insinuates it, she insinuates. So if I say to her directly “hey, you are trying to hook up with me and I don’t like it” no- that’s a little strong.

S2: yeah

25. Expressing Concern. Some students expressed concern for the interlocutor. An example is provided below.

Example:

I: y como también hay una diferencia cultural- no sólo porque- entonces claro he pensado que como tú eres chica y además eres americana a lo mejor me podías ayudar?

S2: sí. >sí sí<. well, **no quiero que estés incómodo**

Translation

I: and since there is also a cultural difference- not only because- so of course I thought since you are a girl and also American maybe you could help me?

S2: yes >yes yes< well, I don't want you to be uncomfortable.

26. Well Wishing. Some students expressed a desire for the interlocutor's situation to improve. An example is provided below.

Example:

S2: Entonces después de nuestra conversación **espero que toda vaya bien**

I: pero tampoco quiero hacerle daño, no quiero herirla, entiendes?

Translation:

S2: So after our conversation I hope that everything goes well.

I: but I also don't want to hurt her, I don't want to hurt her, do you understand?

27. Offering Comfort/Support. Some students offered comfort and emotional support to the interlocutor. An example is provided below.

Example:

S2: y después puedes seguir como amigos, **sí y todo sería bien...**

I: tomo nota de lo que me has dicho.

Translation:

S2: And after you can continue as friends, yes and everything will be all right.

I: I'm taking note of what you have said to me.

28. Expressing Empathy. Some students expressed understanding and identified with the interlocutor's problem. An example is provided below.

Example:

I: Entonces no sé, tú que eres chica y entiendes como:- la situación mejor que los chicos porque los chicos son como "ehhhh no pasa nada", sabes?

S2: **sí entiendo es muy común** uh tuve uh la- el mismo problema en el pasado.

Translation:

I: So, I don't know, since you are a girl and you understand the situation better than a guy because guys are like "ohhhh no big deal," you know?

S2: yes, I understand it's very common uh I had the same problem in the past.

29. Expressing Pessimism. A few students were pessimistic about the interlocutor's situation. An example is provided below.

Example:

S2: no hay-**no hay algo que puedes hacer en esta situación**

Translation:

S2: there isn't- there isn't anything you can do in this situation

30. Expressing Sympathy. A few instances of the direct expression of sympathy were recorded in the student data. An example is provided below.

Example:

I: ¿tú nunca has estado en esta situación?

S1: no, **lo siento.**

I: ((heavy breath: huhh))

Translation:

I:]you have never been in this situation?

S1: no, I'm sorry

I: ((heavy breath: huhh))

31. Providing Information. The students frequently provided the interlocutor with personal information at both the beginning and end of the semester. An example is provided below.

Example:

I: y qué hicisteis?

S1: **huh pues uh probar a ignorar, no no ah puedo- actúo como no sé qué está haciendo=**

I: ((laughs: eh hee))

Translation:

I: And, what did you guys do?

S1: huh, well uh try to ignore, no no ah I can't- I act like I don't know what he's doing.

I: ((laughs: eh hee))

32. Grounders. The students explained and justified why the interlocutor should follow their advice. An example is provided below.

Example:

S2: debes eh hablar sobre la situación **porque es obvio que ella sí. le gustas** y aunque sería un poco um incómoda^ para decir ((laughs: ahaa))

I: ya =

Translation:

S2: you ought to talk about the situation **because it's obvious that she does. like you** and although it would be a little uncomfortable to say ((laughs: ahaa))

I: ya

33. Requesting Permission. One student requested permission to talk with the girl about the situation. An example is provided below.

Example:

S2: eh hh entonces voy a- voy a hablar con ella, **si si está bien?**

I: sí sí por supuesto, por supuesto

Translation:

S2: ehhh so I'm going to- I am going to talk with her, if if it's okay?

I: yes yes of course, of course.

Behavioral Expectations

The students' strategies were grouped into categories that either respected or violated the three components of the equity and association principles, according to Spencer-Oatey's (2005) definitions of these terms. Therefore, this study categorized *requesting information*, *requesting confirmation*, *statements of fact*, and *signaling comprehension* as strategies that respect the involvement component of the association principle because they communicate the idea that "people should show appropriate amounts of involvement with others" (Spencer-Oatey, 2005, p. 100). Moreover, these strategies demonstrated the students' desire to be a part of this area of the interlocutor's life. However, there was one strategy, *refusing to help*, that was categorized as violating the involvement component of the association principal for obvious reasons. Continuing along these lines, *expressing surprise*, *expressing agreement*, *expressing concern*, *well wishing*, *offering comfort/support*, *expressing empathy*, *expressing pessimism*, and *expressing sympathy* were all classified as respecting the empathy component of the association principle due to the fact that these strategies seem to articulate the concept that "people should share appropriate concerns, feelings, and interests with others" (Spencer-Oatey, 2005, p.100). On the other hand, *expressing disagreement*, *expressing doubt/uncertainty*, and *jokes*, were classified as violating the empathy component of the association principle as these strategies

do not overtly show concern or interest in the interlocutor's problem. The respect component of the association principle upholds the "belief that people should show appropriate amounts of respectfulness for others" (Spencer-Oatey, 2005, p.100). Students showed respect for the interlocutor by *providing personal information, using grounders, and requesting permission*.

Strategies that clearly challenged "the belief that people should not be unduly controlled or imposed upon" (Spencer-Oatey, 2005, p.100) were *the imperative, obligation statements, need statements, suggestory statements, want statements, opinion statements, participant shifts, impersonal statements, announcing plans, assuming responsibility, and warnings* because they challenged or violated the autonomy-control component of the association principle. However, *hints* were categorized as respecting the autonomy-control component of the equity principle because they indirectly suggest a solution without imposing on the interlocutor. *Making an offer*, was categorized as respecting the fairness-reciprocity component of the equity principle due to the fact that making an offer emphasizes interactional negotiation and therefore respects "the belief that costs and benefits should be "fair" and kept roughly in balance" (Spencer-Oatey, 2005, p.100). Tables 1.1 and 1.2 provide data on the student participants' advice-giving strategies as they relate to their behavioral expectations.

Table 1.1
Behavioral Expectations: The Association Principle (AP)

| | Group #1 | | | | Group #2 | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-----|--------------|-----|----------------|-----|--------------|-----|--|
| | Semester Start | | Semester End | | Semester Start | | Semester End | | |
| Respecting the AP (RAP) | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | |
| 1. Involvement component | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Requesting Info | 33 | 13% | 48 | 17% | 20 | 10% | 21 | 11% | |
| b. Requesting Confirmation | 2 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | |
| c. Statement of Fact | 2 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1% | 2 | 1% | |
| d. Signaling Comprehension | 31 | 12% | 14 | 5% | 15 | 7% | 4 | 2% | |
| Subtotal: | 68 | 27% | 62 | 22% | 37 | 18% | 27 | 14% | |
| 2. Empathy Component | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Expressing Surprise | 6 | 2% | 9 | 3% | 7 | 3% | 4 | 2% | |
| b. Expressing Agreement | 46 | 18% | 33 | 12% | 22 | 11% | 24 | 13% | |
| c. Expressing Concern | 5 | 2% | 1 | 0% | 3 | 1% | 3 | 2% | |
| d. Well Wishing | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | |
| e. Offering Comfort/Support | 1 | 0% | 4 | 1% | 6 | 3% | 2 | 1% | |
| f. Expressing Empathy | 4 | 2% | 11 | 4% | 10 | 5% | 11 | 6% | |
| g. Expressing Pessimism | 2 | 1% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1% | |
| h. Expressing Sympathy | 0 | 0% | 3 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | |
| Subtotal: | 64 | 25% | 63 | 23% | 49 | 24% | 46 | 24% | |

| 3 Respect Component | | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| a. | Providing Information | 14 | 5% | 25 | 9% | 14 | 7% | 5 | 3% |
| b. | Grounder | 5 | 2% | 8 | 3% | 13 | 6% | 23 | 12% |
| c. | Requesting Permission | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Subtotal: | | 19 | 7% | 33 | 12% | 28 | 14% | 28 | 15% |
| Total # Strategies | | | | | | | | | |
| RAP | | 151 | 59% | 158 | 56% | 114 | 56% | 101 | 53% |
| Violating the AP (VAP) | | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| 1. Involvement component | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | Refusing to Help | 2 | 1% | 4 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Subtotal: | | 2 | 1% | 4 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 2. Empathy Component | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | Expressing Disagreement | 7 | 3% | 2 | 1% | 2 | 1% | 1 | 1% |
| b. | Expressing Uncertainty | 11 | 4% | 11 | 4% | 5 | 2% | 15 | 8% |
| c. | Joke | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Subtotal: | | 18 | 7% | 15 | 5% | 7 | 3% | 16 | 8% |
| 3. Respect Component | | | | | | | | | |
| Subtotal: | | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total # Strategies | | | | | | | | | |
| VAP | | 20 | 8% | 19 | 7% | 7 | 3% | 16 | 8% |
| Total # of Strategies | | 256 | 100 | 280 | 100 | 203 | 100 | 192 | 100 |

Table 1.2
Behavioral Expectations: The Equity Principle (EP)

| | Group #1 | | | | Group #2 | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----|--------------|----|----------------|----|--------------|-----|
| | Semester Start | | Semester End | | Semester Start | | Semester End | |
| Respecting the EP (REP) | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| 1. Cost-Benefit | | | | | | | | |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 2. Fairness-Reciprocity | | | | | | | | |
| a. Making Offer | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 3. Autonomy-Control | | | | | | | | |
| a. Hint | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Subtotal: | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total # of strategies REP | 1 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Violating the EP (VEP) | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Cost-Benefit | | | | | | | | |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 2. Fairness-Reciprocity | | | | | | | | |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 3. Autonomy-Control | | | | | | | | |
| a. Imperative | 26 | 10% | 23 | 8% | 6 | 3% | 6 | 3% |
| b. Obligation Statement | 9 | 4% | 7 | 3% | 12 | 6% | 15 | 8% |
| c. Need Statement | 14 | 5% | 15 | 5% | 7 | 3% | 7 | 4% |
| d. Suggestory Statements | 6 | 2% | 14 | 5% | 14 | 7% | 24 | 13% |
| e. Want Statement | 1 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1% |
| f. Opinion Statement | 22 | 9% | 26 | 9% | 17 | 8% | 16 | 8% |
| g. Participant Shift | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1% |
| h. Impersonal Statement | 6 | 2% | 5 | 2% | 16 | 8% | 4 | 2% |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| i. Announcing Plans | 0 | 0% | 3 | 1% | 9 | 4% | 0 | 0% |
| j. Assuming Responsibility | 0 | 0% | 3 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| k. Requesting favor | 0 | 0% | 3 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| l. Warning | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 1% |
| Subtotal: | 84 | 33% | 102 | 36% | 82 | 40% | 75 | 39% |
| Total # of strategies VEP | 84 | 33% | 102 | 36% | 82 | 40% | 75 | 39% |
| Total # of Strategies | 256 | 100 | 280 | 100 | 203 | 100 | 192 | 100 |

The details of how these different strategies were used in context are presented below. Specifically, each group is analyzed separately in terms of their willingness or unwillingness to violate or respect the association and equity principles; subsequently, the advice-giving strategies of the two groups over time will be compared and contrasted.

Group 1.

Group 1 used a total of 256 strategies in their beginning of the semester recordings and a total of 280 strategies in their end of the semester recordings. In terms of behavioral expectations, at both the semester start (SS) and semester end (SE) this group preferred to respect the association principle (SS: 59% vs. SE: 56%) and violate the equity principle (SS: 33% vs. SE: 36%). Therefore, it appears that the students viewed the lack of social distance and the request for help from the interlocutor as valid reasons to impose their views, while at the same time showing support for the interlocutor through various association strategies. Group 1 also showed a certain amount of willingness to violate the association principle at both SS (8%) and SE (7%). On the other hand only two

strategies, one at the start of the semester start and one at the end of the semester, respected the equity principle. However, these two strategies totaled less than .5% of the total strategies at SS and SE.

The above percentages demonstrate that the big-picture behavioral expectations of group 1 in this situational context did not vary greatly from semester start to semester end. Therefore, it appears that group 1's tendency to respect the association principle and violate the equity principle is a characteristic of this group's overall advice-giving style. In fact, the strategies in these two categories accounted for 92% of all the strategies used by the students at the beginning and end of the semester. This lack of overall change could indicate several things. First, that respecting the association principle and violating the equity principle could be viewed as prescribed behavior in this context since the interlocutor was seeking the expertise and input of the participants.

Consequently, the authority or control that the students exerted over the interlocutor in this context is expected and socially called for behavior. In fact, the students and the interlocutor's post-role play questionnaires revealed that nothing inappropriate had occurred when the students violated the autonomy-control of the interlocutor by giving various forms of advice. In fact, the opposite was true in most cases. The interlocutor felt encouraged when the students shared their opinions and experiences with the interlocutor because this showed empathy and involvement with his "problem." Along those lines, it could also be argued that opting not to give advice in this context would be viewed as proscribed behavior. This possibility was confirmed by the interlocutor's negative reaction

in his post-role play questionnaire when he referenced the few students who refused to give advice as bothersome. However, the details of group 1's specific strategy choices tell a more complete story of the L2 advice-giving tendencies of these beginning to intermediate-low students in a study-abroad context.

Looking specifically at group 1's preference to respect the association principle (SS: 59% vs. SE: 56%) in this context, it is clear that at both the beginning and end of the semester this group maintains a balance between strategies that show involvement (SS:27% vs. SE: 22%) and strategies that show empathy for the interlocutor's problem (SS:25% vs. SE: 23%). The students also showed respect for the interlocutor by providing information, using grounders, and requesting permission to varying degrees at semester start (7%) and semester end (12%). It is important to look at the specific strategy choices of group 1 in each component because it appears that from semester start to semester end there was some shift in their preferences and these changes reflect important developmental tendencies in the students' language while abroad.

First, we can see that group 1 preferred to show involvement in the interlocutor's situation by requesting information from the interlocutor and by signaling comprehension. It is interesting that the students in group 1 were slightly more than twice as likely to use signaling comprehension as an involvement strategy at the beginning of the semester (12%) than they were at the end of the semester (5%). This is an important change because signaling comprehension, as defined above, is a short verbal or sound utterance that signals to the interlocutor that students are following and interested in what the

interlocutor is saying, however it appears that students in group 1 are over dependent on this strategy at the beginning of the semester due to lack of other linguistic resources. By the end of the semester the students seem to have gained the ability to use other more complex strategies to signal their interest in being a part of the interlocutor's inner circle. This can be seen in their increase in requesting information from the interlocutor, which was group 1's preferred involvement strategy both at semester start (13%) and semester end (17%). This 4% increase could again signal that students in this group made gains linguistically and moved from the more rudimentary signaling of comprehension to more complex interrogative forms. However, this change does not account for the entire 7% decrease in the signaling of comprehension category. Below changes in the strategies that group 1 students used to show empathy and respect from start to end are presented.

Group 1 used a variety of strategies to show empathy and respect for the interlocutor. At both the beginning and the end of the semester group 1's preferred strategy for showing empathy to the interlocutor was the expression of agreement (SS:18% vs. SE: 12%), however as with the signaling of comprehension above, it appears that at the beginning of the semester the students may express agreement at higher levels (6% higher prevalence) due to lack of other linguistic resources. This could be further confirmed by the fact that at the beginning of the semester less than one-third of group 1's empathy component strategies were something other than the expression of agreement. In other words, strategies such as expressing surprise, concern, pessimism, and empathy only

accounted for 7% of the total empathy component strategies (25%) at the beginning of the semester. Whereas at the end of the semester, the students in group 1 added two additional strategy types to their repertoire, well wishing and the expression of sympathy; and, strategies other than the expression of agreement accounted for nearly half (11%) of all the empathy component strategies (23%) at the end of the semester. Therefore, it appears that a semester abroad has provided group #1 with more diverse strategies for the expression of empathy in this context.

However, the largest beginning to end of semester gains can be seen in their observance of the respect component of the association principle. Group 1 used strategies that showed respect for the interlocutor with 5% greater frequency at the end of the semester (12%) than at the beginning (7%). This increase came specifically in the area of providing information (SS:5% vs. SE: 9%) and grounders (SS: 2% vs. SE: 3%). Although these changes seem small, when combined they again demonstrate that the students are moving away from more rudimentary strategies and towards more complex strategies. Specifically, in sharing information about themselves and providing explanations about why the interlocutor should take their advice, the students were able to better express their desire to be associated with the personal life of the interlocutor. In fact, the interlocutor indirectly noticed these same changes on his post role-play questionnaire when he specifically mentioned that several individual students from group 1 were able to “take the conversation to the next level” and give me “really good advice.” It is also important to note that group 1 did not violate the

respect component of the association principle at any point at the beginning or end of the semester. This could indicate that violating the respect component in this context in proscribed behavior.

At the same time, Group 1 used a few other strategies that consistently violated the association principle at both the beginning (8%) and end of the semester (7%). Specifically, students violated the empathy component by expressing doubt/uncertainty, expressing disagreement, and joking. However, some of these strategies could be viewed as permitted behavior in this context due to the fact the situation called for students to impose their views on the interlocutor. Furthermore, expressing uncertainty was the most common strategy selected in this category by group 1 at both semester start (4%) and semester end (4%). This is a strategy that could be viewed as an attempt by the students to soften the advice to come and to demonstrate that they are leaving room for their position on the interlocutor's problem to shift as the interaction develops (according to the interlocutor's needs and should their advice be ill received). Interestingly, group 1 was the only group that had a few instances of students refusing to help the interlocutor- a clear violation of the involvement component of the association principle and perhaps even proscribed behavior in this context. That being said, at both semester start and semester end this strategy accounted for only 1% of group 1's total strategies. However, it is worth mentioning because it was the only strategy that the interlocutor referenced as bothersome and "awkward" on his post-role play questionnaire.

The interlocutor's comment above is further evidence as to why violating the equity principle in this situational context was perceived as acceptable. In fact, group 1 virtually did not acknowledge the equity principle with the exception of one isolated utterance at the beginning of the semester (a hint) and one isolated utterance at the end of the semester (making an offer). However, these strategies did not even account for .5% of the total strategies used. On the other hand, group 1 violated the equity principle almost exclusively when they were not respecting the association principle. Their overall preference for strategies that violate the equity principle did not vary greatly from semester start (33%) to end (36%). However, this 3% increase in their willingness and ability to violate the equity principle is important to note. When looking at the specific strategy choices that group 1 students made from semester start to semester end, it is clear that the changes over time in this area were subtle, yet they still reveal a great deal about the students stage of learning and their advice-giving forms of preference. The details of these changes are presented below

Specifically, it is important to note that group 1 did not violate the cost-benefit or fairness-reciprocity components of the equity principle at any point. Instead, they preferred to violate the autonomy-control component by using strategies that give advice with varying degrees of illocutionary force. This could indicate that advice-giving is more of a rapport-enhancing speech act between intimates due to the closeness it signals between interlocutors and the potential it creates for solidarity building between participants. In terms of specific strategy types group 1 showed a distinct preference for imperative forms (SS: 10% vs. SE:

8%) and opinion statements (SS: 9% vs. SE:9%) at the beginning and end of the semester. These two strategies accounted for a total of 19% of the strategies that violated the autonomy control component at the beginning of the semester and 17% of said strategies at the end of the semester. However, it is important to reference that the 2% change over time took the form of a decrease in imperative forms of advice. On that same token, group 1 more than doubled their use of suggestory statements from semester start (2%) to semester end (5%). Need statements were also commonly used to give advice by group 1 at both the beginning (5%) and end (5%) of the semester. Furthermore, group 1 used obligation statements (SS: 4% vs. SE: 3%), impersonal statements (SS: 2% vs. SE: 2%), and want statements (SS: >.5% vs. SE: >.5%) to give advice in similar amounts both at semester start and semester end. Moreover, this group notably added four strategy types to their repertoire of advice-giving strategies at the end of the semester, however these strategies which included participant shifts, announcing plans, assuming responsibility, and requesting a favor amounted to only 1% each (or 4% collectively) in the end of the semester data. However, this increase in advice-giving strategies could indicate that this group has developed greater awareness of the variation of advice-giving forms available to them in this context. As a result, they have by the semester's end begun to test their hypotheses with these new forms and demonstrate more variation in their advice-giving strategies, albeit only slightly. In fact, it could be postulated that the 3% decrease in respecting the association principle was transferred to the 3% increase

in the strategies that group 1 used to violate the autonomy-control component of the equity principle.

Group 2's behavioral expectations in this context appear to be similar to Group 1's behavioral expectations in many ways. However, the differences are visible in the details, therefore group 2's results as they relate to their behavioral expectations are presented below.

Group 2.

Group 2 used a total of 203 strategies in their beginning of the semester recordings and a total of 192 strategies in their end of the semester recordings. Similar to group 1, group 2 showed a strong preference for strategies that respected the association principle (SS:56% vs. SE: 53% respectively) and violated the equity-principle (SS: 40% vs. SE: 39% respectively) both at the beginning and end of the semester. Overall, these strategies accounted for 96% of all strategies at the beginning of the semester and 92% at the end of the semester. The remaining strategies fell into the category of violating the association principle, a group of strategies this group used 3% of the time at the beginning of the semester and 8% of the time at the end of the semester. The fact that group 2 followed a similar overall pattern to group 1 is further evidence that this is prescribed behavior in this situational context. This is further confirmed by the fact that the post role-play questionnaires did not indicate that the students or the interlocutor engaged in any sort of inappropriate or unexpected behavior. However, just as with group 1, group 2's story is in the details of their specific strategy choices (and lack thereof). These details are presented below.

As indicated above, group 2 showed a preference for strategies that respected the association principle both at the beginning and end of the semester (SS: 56% vs. SE: 53%). Unlike group 1, group 2 showed a distinct preference for strategies that respect the empathy component of the association principle (SS: 24% vs. SE: 24%) whereas they roughly balanced their use of involvement component strategies (SS:18% vs. SE: 14%) and respect component strategies (SS: 14% vs. SE: 15%). Similar to group 1, group 2's preferred strategy for showing empathy was expressing agreement both at the beginning and end of the semester (SS: 11% vs. SE: 13%). Followed by the direct expression of empathy (SS: 5% vs. SE: 6%) and then a pretty even distribution of strategies such as expressing surprise (SS: 3% vs. SE: 2%), expressing concern (SS: 1% vs. SE: 2%), well wishing (SS: >.5% vs. SE: 0%), offering comfort/support (SS: 3% vs. 1%), and expressing pessimism (SE: 0% vs. 1%). No change in the empathy component totaled more than a 2% increase or decrease. Therefore, it appears that group 2 entered the semester with an awareness of different ways to express empathy and their development and preferences in this area stayed relatively constant from semester start to semester end.

While not quite as unchanging as the empathy component, group 2 also maintained a rough balance between respecting the involvement component (SS: 18% vs. SE: 14%) and the respect component (SS: 14% vs. SE: 15%) both at the beginning and end of the semester. At the same time, there were some notable changes in the ways that group 2 showed involvement and respect. To show involvement, group 2 requested information, stated facts, and signaled

comprehension. Looking more closely at the involvement component, it is clear that Group 2's preferred involvement strategy was requesting information and this did not change over the course of the semester (SS: 10% vs. SE: 11%).

Therefore, it appears that requesting information from the interlocutor is a way for this group to signal their interest in being involved with the interlocutor's problem. Group 2, like group 1, also used signaling comprehension to show involvement and interest in the interlocutor's personal issue at a much a higher rate at semester start (7%) than at semester end (2%). This decrease of 5% from semester start to semester end is a preliminary indication that group 2 had begun using other, perhaps more sophisticated strategies in place of the signaling of comprehension. Similarly, there were some changes in the students' strategy choices in the respect component of the association principle. Namely that group 2 decreased in providing information by 4% from semester start (7%) to semester end (3%), while at the same time they doubled their use of grounders (SS: 6% vs. 12%). Therefore, it appears that in the area of showing respect group 2 has shifted from providing personal information about themselves (speaker oriented) to explaining and justifying why their advice is good for the interlocutor (hearer oriented). This could be a preliminary indication that this group has shifted from speaker oriented respect strategies to hearer oriented respect strategies.

Another interesting change in group 2's behaviors from semester start to semester end is in their increased willingness to violate the empathy component of the association principle (SS: 3% vs. SE: 8%) by expressing disagreement (SS: 1% vs. SE: 1%) and expressing doubt/uncertainty (SS: 2% vs. SE: 8%).

However, while expressing disagreement and uncertainty, do not directly show concern for the interlocutor's problem, a certain amount of disagreement and uncertainty may be permitted behavior in this situational context given that the interlocutor is requesting the students' perspective on an issue without a clear cut answer. Further, the 5% increase took the form of expressing uncertainty, not disagreement. Therefore, more so than with group 1, expressing uncertainty appears to be a strategy of which group 2 has acquired greater awareness throughout the semester and subsequently used for different purposes in their interactions with the interlocutor. First, it appears that some members of this group used the expression of uncertainty, *no sé* (I don't know), as a filler while they were thinking about what they should say next to address the interlocutor's needs. As mentioned above with group 1, it is also possible that group 2 used the expression of uncertainty to signal that the advice and opinions they are giving are open for discussion in this context. Also worth mentioning here is that there were no instances of violating the involvement or respect component of the association principle by group 2.

On the other hand, as with group 1, violating the equity principle appears to not only be acceptable, but even prescribed behavior in this situational context. Therefore, group 2 had no instances of respecting the equity principle, but did violate the equity principle uniformly at semester start (40%) and semester end (39%). Just as with group 1, group 2 did not have any instances of violating the cost-benefit or fairness-reciprocity components, rather they preferred to exclusively violate the autonomy-control component of the equity principle by

giving advice to the interlocutor on how to address his “problem.” This obvious, yet acceptable violation of the equity principle, in combination with the high number of involvement, empathy, and respect strategies used, suggests that group 2 had an overwhelming desire to maintain interactional harmony and build solidarity with the interlocutor (rapport-enhancement orientation). The students recognized the prescribed behavior of the context and gave advice to the interlocutor using strategies of varying illocutionary force. The wide range of strategy types utilized by group 2 included imperatives, obligations statements, need statements, suggestory statements, want statements, opinion statements, participant shifts, announcing plans, and warnings to different degrees at semester start and end.

One strategy that group 2 consistently used at both semester start and semester end was opinion statements (SS: 8% vs. SE: 8%). In the same way, impersonal statements were used just as frequently as opinion statements at the beginning of the semester, however by the end of the semester group 2 had decreased their use of impersonal statements by 6% (SS: 8% vs. SE: 2%). Therefore, it appears that throughout the semester the students in this group have shifted away from the use of impersonals, in exchange for other, more direct strategies. Interestingly, suggestory statements were also a preferred strategy at semester start (7%), however by semester end group 2 nearly doubled their preference for suggestory statements (13%). Therefore, by semester end suggestory statements had taken the role of the preferred advice strategy for group 2. Obligation statements also saw a slight increase in usage from semester start

(6%) to semester end (8%). However, there was a 4% drop in the use of announcing plans from semester start to semester end (SS: 4% vs. SE: 0%). However, this shift could again be a sign that group 2 is shifting from speaker to hearer-orientated strategies (at the very least on the part of a few participants from semester start to end). Specifically, these participants did not volunteer to take care of the problem for the interlocutor in the same way they had at the beginning of the semester; instead they focused on the actions the interlocutor needed to take to address the problem on his own. Additionally, there were some strategies that were used consistently, but in slightly different amounts from semester start to end. Namely, the use of need statements stayed relatively low and constant at both points in the semester (SS:3% vs. 4%) and the use of imperatives from semester start to semester end did not change (SS: 3% vs. SE: 3%) nor did the use of warnings (SS: 1% vs. SE: 1%). The low use of imperatives is of particular interest here, especially given the fact that it was one of the preferred strategies of group 1. However, this contrast will be addressed in greater detail in the discussion of the results. Additionally, this group did see the addition of two categories at semester end, want statements and participant shifts, however these were single, isolated occurrences (totaling 1% of the total strategies each) and therefore will not be analyzed further here. Overall, it appears that group 2 showed a distinct shift away from impersonals and towards suggestory statements at the end of the semester with their use of opinion statements and obligation statements staying relatively constant.

Comparisons.

While several similarities and differences between group 1 and 2 have already been noted above, a few additional points will be made here. First, it is important to point out the areas where group 1 appears to be approaching group 2's semester start levels at semester end. In terms of the association principle, group 1 and group 2 both considerably reduced the amount of signaling comprehension strategies they used from semester start to semester end. However, group 1's end of semester level was not far off from group 2's semester start level (G2SS: 7% vs. G1SE: 5%). Similarly, group 1 lowered their expression of agreement to group 2 levels by semester end (G1SS:18% vs. G2SS: 11% and G1SE: 12% vs. G2SE: 13%). Therefore, it appears that both groups were expressing agreement in similar amounts at semester end. In the same way, group 1 seems to have learned to express empathy throughout the semester in a way that group 2 was capable of doing at SS (G2SS: 5% vs. G1SE: 4%). Another similar approximation is seen in group 1's ability to provide information at the end of the semester (G2SS: 7% vs. G1SE: 9%). However, group 2 shifted away from providing information and towards grounders at the end of the semester; therefore, it would be interesting to see if group 1 would behave similarly once a similar level of proficiency was reached.

In terms of violating the equity principle, both groups make opinion statements in similar amounts at both the beginning and end of the semester (G1SS: 8% vs G1SE: 8% and G2SS: 9% and G2SE: 9%). However, outside of this one similarity the two groups have quite different advice-giving preferences

at semester start and end. At semester start, Group 1 appears to prefer more direct strategies such as imperatives and need statements (totaling 15% collectively), whereas group 2 seems to prefer impersonal statements and suggestory statements (15% collectively). However, by the end of the semester group 1 shows a marked increase in (more than doubling) their use of suggestory statements, this shift again nearing group 2's semester start levels (G2SS: 7% vs. G1SE: 5%). Another interesting contrast can be seen in the end of the semester use of two strategies that are often classified as carrying more direct illocutionary force, specifically imperatives and obligation statements. At the end of the semester both group 1 and group 2 used these strategies, but with exactly opposite preferences. That is, group 1 used imperatives 8% of the time and group 2 used obligation statements 8% of the time, conversely, group 1 used obligation statements 3% of the time and group 2 used imperatives 3% of the time. Therefore, it appears that both groups at semester end have gained an awareness of direct forms of advice, but the actual conventions of form they used to give direct advice were different. Furthermore, as mentioned above, group 1 decreased its use of imperatives and obligation statements at semester end, while they increased in their use of suggestory statements and diversified their advice-giving by using more strategy types. It is also important to note that group 2 generally violated the autonomy-control component more often than group 1 at both the beginning and end of the semester. In other words, group 2 produced more advice than group 1. However, the contrast was greater at semester start (G1SS: 33% vs. G2SS: 40%) than at semester end (G1SE: 36% vs. G2SE: 39%). Therefore, it appears that once again

group 1 began to close the gap and approach group 2's strategy occurrence levels (although using different forms) by semester's end. This tendency could be seen as a preliminary indication that by semester end group 1 was entering into a phase of linguistic awareness that group 2 possessed upon entering the study abroad experience. How these results relate to previous research on advice and study abroad will be addressed in the discussion of the findings. However, prior to the discussion, the other two components of Spencer-Oatey's rapport management approach will be applied to the analysis of the students' beginning and end of the semester results. First, how the students' strategy choice either enhanced or challenged the interlocutor's and/or their own face sensitivities is addressed below, followed by an analysis of the students' interactional wants.

Face Sensitivities

In this context, the students used strategies that enhanced the interlocutor's face (i.e., requesting information, requesting confirmation, statements of fact, signaling comprehension, expressing surprise, expressing agreement, expressing concern, well wishing, offering comfort/support, expressing empathy, expressing sympathy, providing information, grounders, and requesting permission) to signal their desire to be interconnected with the interlocutor through strategies that emphasized that they were caring, helpful, loyal, and respectful to the interlocutor. On the other hand, the students used strategies that challenged the interlocutor's face (i.e. expressing disagreement, expressing doubt/uncertainty, jokes, imperatives, obligation statements, need statements, suggestory statements, want statements, opinion statements, participant shifts, impersonal statements,

announcing plans, expressing pessimism, hints, refusing to help, making offers, assuming responsibility, requesting favors, and warnings) to signal their own intelligence and authority in addressing the interlocutor's problem and thus challenged the interlocutor's face as it relates to the social value of independence (or self-direction).

Below, tables 2.1 and 2.2 present the strategies students used to enhance and/or challenge the interlocutor's and their own identity face quantitatively. However, the post-role play questionnaires are also used to qualitatively analyze the international face sensitivities of the students and the interlocutor. It should also be noted here that Spencer-Oatey's (2005) respectability face is not analyzed below due to the fact that this situational context (i.e., advice-giving between intimates) did not appear to threaten the respectability face (i.e., public image) of either the interlocutor or the students. Nevertheless, it is clear that in this context identity face is both "situation specific" and "highly vulnerable" (Spencer-Oatey, 2005, p. 103).

Table 2.1

Face Sensitivities: Strategies used in enhancing the interlocutor's identity face (IIF)

| | | Group #1 | | | | Group #2 | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------|--------------|------------|----------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| | | Semester Start | | Semester End | | Semester Start | | Semester End | |
| A. Enhancing the IIF (EIIIF) | | N | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| 1. | Requesting Info | 33 | 13% | 48 | 17% | 20 | 10% | 21 | 11% |
| 2. | Requesting Confirmation | 2 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 3. | Statement of Fact | 2 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1% | 2 | 1% |
| 4. | Signaling Comprehension | 31 | 12% | 14 | 5% | 15 | 7% | 4 | 2% |
| 5. | Expressing Surprise | 6 | 2% | 9 | 3% | 7 | 3% | 4 | 2% |
| 6. | Expressing Agreement | 46 | 18% | 33 | 12% | 22 | 11% | 24 | 13% |
| 7. | Expressing Concern | 5 | 2% | 1 | 0% | 3 | 1% | 3 | 2% |
| 8. | Well Wishing | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 9. | Offering Comfort/Support | 1 | 0% | 4 | 1% | 6 | 3% | 2 | 1% |
| 10. | Expressing Empathy | 4 | 2% | 11 | 4% | 10 | 5% | 11 | 6% |
| 11. | Expressing Sympathy | 0 | 0% | 3 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 12. | Providing Information | 14 | 5% | 25 | 9% | 14 | 7% | 5 | 3% |
| 13. | Grounder | 5 | 2% | 8 | 3% | 13 | 6% | 23 | 12% |
| 14. | Requesting Permission | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total # of strategies EIIIF | | 149 | 58% | 157 | 56% | 114 | 114 | 56% | 52% |
| Total # Strategies | | 256 | 100 | 280 | 100 | 203 | 100 | 192 | 100 |

Table 2.2
Face Sensitivities: Strategies used in enhancing the interlocutor's identity face (IIF)

| | Group #1 | | | | Group #2 | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------|--------------|------------|----------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| | Semester Start | | Semester End | | Semester Start | | Semester End | |
| A. Challenging the IIF (CIIF) | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| 1. Expressing Disagreement | 7 | 3% | 2 | 1% | 2 | 1% | 1 | 1% |
| 2. Expressing Uncertainty | 11 | 4% | 11 | 4% | 5 | 2% | 15 | 8% |
| 3. Joke | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 4. Imperative | 26 | 10% | 23 | 8% | 6 | 3% | 6 | 3% |
| 5. Obligation Statement | 9 | 4% | 7 | 3% | 12 | 6% | 15 | 8% |
| 6. Need Statement | 14 | 5% | 15 | 5% | 7 | 3% | 7 | 4% |
| 7. Suggestory Statement | 6 | 2% | 14 | 5% | 14 | 7% | 24 | 13% |
| 8. Want Statement | 1 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1% |
| 9. Opinion Statement | 22 | 9% | 26 | 9% | 17 | 8% | 16 | 8% |
| 10. Participant Shift | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1% |
| 11. Impersonal Statement | 6 | 2% | 5 | 2% | 16 | 8% | 4 | 2% |
| 12. Announcing Plans | 0 | 0% | 3 | 1% | 9 | 4% | 0 | 0% |
| 13. Expressing Pessimism | 2 | 1% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1% |
| 14. Hint Refusing to Help | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 15. Help | 2 | 1% | 4 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 16. Making Offer | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 17. Assuming Responsibility | 0 | 0% | 3 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 18. Requesting favor | 0 | 0% | 3 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 19. Warning | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 1% |
| Total # of strategies CIIF | 107 | 42% | 123 | 44% | 89 | 44% | 93 | 48% |
| Total # Strategies | 256 | 100 | 280 | 100 | 203 | 100 | 192 | 100 |

Below the results of Table 2.1 and 2.2 are presented as they relate to group 1 and group 2 separately, and then a comparison of the two groups is provided.

Group 1.

As the tables above indicate, when giving advice in Spanish, group 1 enhanced the interlocutor's face with 58% of their strategies at semester start and 56% of their strategies at semester end. On the other hand, group 1 challenged the interlocutor's identity face with 42% of their strategies at semester start and with 44% of their strategies at semester end. The percentages evidence that the students maintained a rough balance between strategies that enhanced the interlocutor's identity face and strategies that challenged the interlocutor's identity face both at the beginning and end of the semester with a slight (2%) increase in their preference to challenge the interlocutor's identity face at the end of the semester. In this situational context, it appears that enhancing the interlocutor's identity face was slightly more common than challenging it. In fact, group 1 enhanced the interlocutor's face 16% more frequently than they challenged it at semester start and 12% more frequently than they challenged it at semester end. Therefore, it could be argued that when giving advice in their L2, this group of learners felt that it was necessary to ingratiate themselves to the interlocutor, in order to offset the threat they were posing to his identity face by giving advice, opinions, and suggesting solutions to his problem. At the same time the fact that the students decreased in their use of face enhancing strategies from semester start to end (2%) indicates that they were moving towards greater balance between face-enhancing and face-challenging moves. It could also

preliminarily indicate that they are moving towards increased understanding of the importance of imposing in a culture that has been said to value a high-involvement conversational style (Hernández-Flores, 2002).

In enhancing the interlocutor's face, group 1 showed a distinct preference for requesting information (13%), signaling comprehension (12%), and expressing agreement (18%) with the interlocutor at the beginning of the semester. These three strategies combined accounted for a total of 43% of the strategies used by group 1 in enhancing the interlocutor's face at semester start while the other 15% of the strategies used at semester start were scattered over 8 strategy types (grounders (2%), providing information (5%), expressing empathy (2%), expressing concern (2%), expressing surprise (2%), requesting confirmation (1%), statements of fact (1%), and offering comfort/support (.5%). At the end of the semester, group 1 considerably decreased their use of signaling comprehension (SS: 12% vs. SE: 5%) and expressing agreement (SS: 18% vs. SE: 12%), although both strategies were still important in the enhancement of the interlocutor's face. At the same time group 1 increased considerably in requesting information (SS: 13% vs. SE: 17%), providing information (SS: 5% vs. SE: 9%), and expressing empathy (SS: 2% vs. SE: 4%). It could be argued this shift away from expressing agreement and signaling comprehension represents a positive developmental movement in the students ability to address face sensitivities as the three preferred SE strategies show that students not only expanded their linguistic strategies, but also moved toward strategies that addressed the interlocutor's face needs with greater concern and detail. Smaller

gains were also seen in their expression of surprise (3%), expressing comfort/support (1%) and their use of grounders (3%). Furthermore, group 1 added expressing sympathy (1%) and well wishing (.5%) to their repertoire of strategies that enhanced the interlocutor's face. On the other hand, group 1 very slightly decreased in their expression of concern (>.5%), requesting confirmation (0%), and statements of fact (0%). However, due to the fact that these shifts were much smaller, they are not analyzed further here.

Using Schwartz's (1992) and Schwartz et. al's (2001) ten value constructs to describe this groups verbal behavior as it relates to face sensitivities in this advice-giving context, it appears that in enhancing the interlocutor's face group 1 used strategies that showed benevolence and universalism thus emphasizing their interdependence with the interlocutor. Therefore, even though the interlocutor was inviting the students to challenge his face by requesting their input on his problem, the students used strategies that go beyond this request in an effort to demonstrate to their friend through the above face-enhancing strategies that they were helpful, honest, loyal, understanding, caring and considerate. The interlocutor's post role-play questionnaires confirmed that he noticed when care was not taken to enhance his face through strategies that showed benevolence in a few cases. After an interaction in which the interlocutor felt that his face needs had been met he stated, "*tiene empatía cero menos veinte... me sentía incómodo porque era demasiado corto*" ('He has empathy zero minus twenty... I felt uncomfortable because he was too short'). Therefore, it appears that the balance

between face-enhancing and face-challenging strategies was key to maintaining the interlocutor's face in this particular advice-giving interaction.

At the same time, the students in group 1 did not shy away from challenging the interlocutor's identity face; in fact, they seized the interlocutor's request for advice as an opportunity to provide their thoughts on the situation, consequently, challenging his ability to independently make his own decisions. However, it should be noted that the students did not issue unsolicited authority-control over the interlocutor. As a result, the vast majority of the strategies that the students used to challenge the interlocutor's face in this context should be considered contextually appropriate (although not without the potential to challenge his identity face). Specifically, group 1 preferred to challenge the interlocutor's identity face through the use of opinion statements (SS: 9% vs. SE: 9%) and imperatives (SS: 10% vs. SE: 8%). Following these two primary preferences were need statements (SS: 5% vs. SE: 5%), obligation statements (SS: 4% vs. SE: 3%), expressing uncertainty (SS: 4% vs. SE: 4%), expressing disagreement (SS: 3% vs. SE: 1%), suggestory statements (SS: 2% vs. SE: 5%) and impersonal statements (SS 2% vs. SE: 2%), each of which were used to slightly varying degrees (although some showed no change over time) at both the beginning and end of the semester. Other strategies were also present, however these strategies accounted for 1% or less of the total strategies at both points in the semester. These strategies included jokes, participant shifts, announcing plans, expressing pessimism, refusing to help, making offers, assuming responsibility, and requesting a favor.

In terms of Schwartz's value constructs (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz et. al, 2001), the students used structures that challenged the interlocutor's self-direction by undermining his ability to be viewed as self-sufficient and independent; however once again, this undermining was requested and therefore should be considered a contextually permitted face-challenging move. In other words, in requesting advice and putting himself in the position of advisee, the interlocutor directly challenged his own face and thus enhanced the students' faces by emphasizing their ability to provide intelligent guidance in a sensitive situation. Along those same lines, Spencer-Oatey (2005) highlights the fact that the different aspects that affect identity face are not inherently (im)polite, but rather that "people are likely to vary in the importance they attach to all the various qualities, both because of their personal value systems and also because of the context" (p. 105). Therefore, the context of this situation permitted face-challenging behavior. The post-role play questionnaires revealed that all the strategies the students used to challenge this aspect of the interlocutor's face, with the exception of one, were acceptable and appropriate in this context (although not without potential threat). The only face-challenging strategy that the interlocutor referenced as bothersome was refusing to help. In fact, in his post-role play questionnaire, the interlocutor stated that he no longer wanted to continue the interaction when the students responded by refusing to help, which was relatively infrequent (G1SS: 1% vs. G1SE: 1%) and always accompanied by other strategies that were less offensive. In spite of the infrequency of these refusals, the interlocutor did not fail to mention them in his post-role play

questionnaires; therefore, it appears that the absence of advice is even more face-challenging than advice he does not even plan to take seriously. Therefore, it seems that it is not that one challenges his identity face, but how one challenges it that matters. Group 2's face enhancing and challenging strategies are presented below.

Group 2.

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 demonstrate that group 2 also preferred to balance between strategies that enhanced and challenged the interlocutor's identity face. Specifically, group 2 enhanced the interlocutor's face with 56% of their strategies at semester start and 52% of their strategies at semester end. At the same time, group 2 challenged the interlocutor's identity face with 44% of their strategies at the beginning of the semester and with 48% of their strategies at semester end. Similar to group 1, group 2's SE data showed an increase in their preference to challenge the interlocutor's identity face. However, group 2's increase in face-challenging strategies was double that of group 1 (4%). As a result, Group 2 balanced their face-enhancing and face-challenging strategies more than group 1. In fact, the students enhanced the interlocutor's face 12% more frequently than they challenged it at semester start, but this difference was decreased to 4% at semester end. Like group 1, group 2 offset the threat posed to the interlocutor's identity face by using a high percentage of face-enhancing strategies. The increase in face challenging strategies at the end of the semester could indicate that the group 2 has also begun to understand that imposing one's thoughts and

opinions is positively valued by the interlocutor and that greater involvement through face-challenging moves is acceptable.

However, face-enhancing strategies still constituted over half of the total strategies used by group 2 at both semester start and end. Like group 1, group 2 showed a preference for requesting information (SS: 10% vs. SE: 11%) and expressing agreement (SS: 11% vs. SE: 13%) at both points in the semester. However, apart from these two strategies, group 2 tended to use more complex and involved strategies to enhance the interlocutor's face. Specifically, group 2 supplemented requesting information and expressing agreement with greater amounts of expressing empathy (SS: 5% vs. SE: 6%), providing information (SS: 7% vs. SE: 3%), and grounders (SS: 6% vs. SE: 12%). Group 2, also signaled comprehension (SS: 7% vs. SE: 2%) to show consideration for the interlocutor while he was speaking, however, group 2 did not rely on this strategy as heavily as group 1. The decrease in this strategy from semester start to end, combined with the marked increase in grounders, seems to indicate that group 2 began to shift from merely being considerate, to strategies that showed their desire to be helpful which in turn demonstrates greater involvement in the interlocutor's life. Moreover, it could be argued that higher involvement, in this context, is more face-enhancing than other less involved strategies (e.g., signaling comprehension). Group 2's face-enhancing strategies also included an assortment of other strategies such as requesting permission, offering comfort/support, well wishing, expressing concern, expressing surprise, and statements of fact. Each of these strategies ranged from 0% to 3% frequency at SS and SE. These strategies

combined represented 9% of the strategies at the beginning of the semester and 6% of the strategies at the end of the semester. Thus, these strategies could be viewed as strategically important to face enhancement even though they were not as frequently employed as other face enhancing strategies in this context.

According to Schwartz's ten value constructs (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz et. al, 2001) group 2 seems to have similar overarching desires when compared to group 1. That is they demonstrate that they valued the friendship of the interlocutor through face enhancing strategies that showed benevolence and understanding (universalism) in an effort to emphasize their interconnectedness. Although rare, the interlocutor again commented on the absence of empathy, even when he felt the individual gave adequate advice, "Es muy fluida, y me dio muy buena solución... pero no ha entrado- no es muy emocional" (She is very fluent and she gave me a good solution... but, she didn't get into it- she is not very emotional). Therefore, once again it appears that the balance between face-enhancing and face-challenging strategies was key to maintaining the interlocutor's face in this particular advice-giving interaction. Even though he could not put his finger on exactly what was missing, the absence (rather than the presence) of face enhancing strategies was noted. It is also worth mentioning here that group 2 used compliments as a face-enhancing strategy during the introduction/situational explanation stage of the conversation (which are not included in the analysis of the advice-giving period). Specifically, compliments to the interlocutor's looks and desirability were referenced as he introduced his problem.

At the same time, the students in group 2 challenged the interlocutor's identity face through a number of strategies that provided advice, opinions, and future actions which challenged the interlocutor's independence. Again, in requesting the thoughts of the students, the interlocutor was challenging his own face, and enhancing the face of the students by suggesting that they may have been more knowledgeable or experienced than him in situations of this sort. As a result, the strategies that the students used to challenge the interlocutor's face in this context should be considered contextually appropriate (although not without the potential to challenge his identity face).

Looking at the structures that group 2 used to challenge the interlocutor's identity face, it is clear that this group preferred the use of opinion statements (8%), impersonal statement (8%), suggestory statements (7%) and obligation statements (6%) at semester start. At the same time, they also used announcing plans (4%) imperatives (3%), need statements (3%), expressing doubt/uncertainty (2%), and expressing disagreement (1%) to a lesser extent at semester start. Therefore, at the beginning of the semester it appears that group 2 preferred using strategies that were less directly imposing on the future actions of the interlocutor by avoiding overtly hearer oriented strategies (impersonals and opinion statements) in some cases; in other cases they preferred to use modals such as you can/could to convey more of a recommendation when compared to obligation statements and imperatives. However, this group's preferences in face-challenging strategies showed more changes from semester start to semester end than group 1. At the end of the semester, group 2 continued to show a preference

for opinion statements (8%), suggestory statements (13%), and obligation statements (8%), but greatly reduced their use of impersonals (2%), shifting to a preference for expressing doubt/uncertainty (8%) at the end of the semester. These percentages indicate, that at the end of the semester, group 2 stayed consistent in their preference for opinion statements, slightly increased their use of obligation statements (by 2%), nearly doubled their use of suggestory statements, and more quadrupled their expression of uncertainty. With the lesser-used strategies, the changes were less significant or the strategies evidenced no change at all. These SE strategies included expressing disagreement (1%), imperatives (3%), need statements (4%), want statements (1%), participant shifts (1%), expressing pessimism (1%), and warnings (1%). Overall, it could be argued that group 2 learned to play it safe when challenging the interlocutors face, as result they suggested (suggestory statements) and used speaker oriented statements (opinions and uncertainty) to give advice, thus mitigating the challenge they posed to the interlocutor's identity face, and leaving him with a greater ability to maintain his freedom of choice. The near elimination of the impersonals could demonstrate that the students in this group did not deem this strategy as appropriate once they had spent a semester in Spain. At the same time, group 2 used need statements (4%) and imperatives (3%). Therefore, it is clear that they were aware of more direct forms, but they seemed to be less certain of the appropriateness of these direct forms. However, when group 2 did give direct advice, they tended to use obligation statements (SS: 6% vs. SE: 8%). At the same time, group 2's preference for suggestory statements, opinion statements,

and expressions of uncertainty when challenging the interlocutor's face at the end of the semester is clear.

In terms of Schwartz's value constructs (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz et. al., 2001) group 2, like group 1, emphasized their own intelligence (achievement) in challenging the interlocutor's independence (self-direction). This highlights their independence, not interdependence, however in doing so the students meet the situational needs (and requests) of the interlocutor. The post-role play questionnaires reveal that all the strategies the students used to challenge the interlocutor's identity face were acceptable and appropriate in this context (although not without potential threat). In this group the interlocutor did not reference any bothersome or inappropriate behavior. This fact confirms that the students' face-challenging strategies were welcomed and not threatening to the interlocutor. Therefore, it appears that this group successfully enhanced their own face by giving good advice; in fact, the interlocutor referenced this on several of his post-role play questionnaires when he stated things like, "she gave me incredible advice." Overall, it seems that group 2 successfully balanced face sensitivities through a combination of face-enhancing and face-challenging strategies.

With the above face sensitivities in mind, some further commentary regarding the similarities and differences between group 1 and group 2 are made in the following section.

Comparisons.

The above results indicate that there were some differences in the specific face-enhancing or face-challenging strategies of group 1 and group 2. Namely, that in challenging the interlocutor's identity face group 1 showed a preference for more direct structures as seen in their use of imperatives, need statements and obligation statements when compared with group 2's suggestory statements, expressing uncertainty, and obligation statements. However, it is clear that there was some overlap in their use of many of the strategies that addressed the interlocutor's face. This is most clearly evidenced in their near equal preference for opinion statements. Moreover, it appears that the overarching goals of both groups were similar in terms of their desire to show benevolence through face-enhancing strategies and their willingness to challenge the interlocutor's self-direction, thus enhancing their own identity face. Furthermore, both groups from semester start to semester end increased their percentage of face-challenging strategies. In both groups, this increase demonstrates a movement towards greater balance between face-enhancing and face-challenging strategies, with group 2 almost perfectly balancing face sensitivities at semester end. These similar tendencies seem to indicate that advice-giving was acceptable in this context and that students in both groups looked to maintain both their independent and interdependent self-construals through various face-enhancing and face-challenging moves when giving advice in their L2. However, the effect that utterances of varying illocutionary force had on the face sensitivities of the interlocutor was less clear. What is known is that the illocutionary force of an

utterance can send different messages to the interlocutor. However, the scope of this paper does not include an analysis of native speaker perceptions of student utterances or native speaker production tendencies in this context. Therefore, previous research on related topics will be addressed in the discussion of the results.

However, before moving on to interactional wants, it is important to reference two common faces sensitivities of the students in both groups. First, the students in both groups uniformly enhanced the interlocutor's face by using the informal address form (*tú*) to signal closeness and camaraderie with the interlocutor, however group 1's control of this (in)formality marker was less consistent than group 2. It could also be noted here that the non-verbal domain could have had an effect on the face sensitivities of the interlocutor since individuals communicate a lot about how interested and caring they are through facial expressions and body language. However, this comment is merely suggestive because these interactions were not video recorded and the scope of this paper does not include a non-verbal analysis. The same could be said about the stylistics domain, which was briefly touched on above in the discussion of formality markers. Specifically, it would be interesting to analyze the students' tone of voice and use of laughter. As in almost every interaction at the beginning and end of the semester, laughter seemed to be used by the students to build rapport with the interlocutor.

On the other hand, the students' identity face was vulnerable in terms of their achievement as competent second language learners. Specifically, Group 1

often requested grammatical and lexical clarification during the interactions with the interlocutor at both the beginning and end of the semester. This face sensitivity was further evidenced on the students' post role-play questionnaires in their response to the question *what was your overall impression of the interaction?* The students regularly evaluated how they felt they performed linguistically as an L2 learner with a native speaker. To provide an example, one student mentioned their frustration with the subjunctive tense when she said, “[the interaction was] fine, I was trying hard to use the subjunctive correctly but I couldn't do it.” Comments like this one were common on the students' post role-play questionnaires; therefore, it could be argued that the processing load that the students experience in oral situations with native speakers poses an intricate challenge to second-language learners as they attempt to manage both their organizational and pragmatic knowledge simultaneously.

Interactional Wants

Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach upholds that people often have interactional goals that relate to either transactional or relational needs. Often both transactional and relational goals are simultaneously at work in an interaction. In terms of advice-giving between intimates, it is clear that the students' wants in this interaction were primarily relational both at the beginning and end of the semester. The context of this advice-giving situation lent itself naturally to relationship management, which in this case included promoting friendship through exerting authority-control (albeit requested) over a friend in need of help. The students' desire to promote their friendship with the

interlocutor was seen through the strategies that the students used to show empathy, involvement, and respect for the interlocutor. For example, utterances such as, “*no quiero que estés incómodo*” (‘I don’t want you to be uncomfortable’) or short utterances that expressed agreement such as, “*sí, sí claro*” (‘yes, yes of course’) were used to signal their interest in maintaining a friendship with the interlocutor. Along those same lines, statements such as, “*pienso que- que debes estar honesta con ella*” (‘I think you have to be honest with her’) demonstrate how the students exerted control over the interlocutor by imposing their thoughts, opinions, and actions on the interlocutor. This authority-control also demonstrated their interest in relational, over transactional wants.

The interlocutor, whose speech was not subject to analysis in this study, also seemed to have more relational, than transactional wants. This can be seen through his repeated requests for personal information and personal experiences from the students. Specifically, on more than one occasion he asked the students, “*a lo mejor, te ha ocurrido a ti antes, has estado en esta situación con un chico::?*” (‘maybe, this has happened to your before, have you been in this situation with a guy?’). Overall, it appears the relational wants of the interlocutor were met when the students showed interest in and empathy for his problem and subsequently made a notable effort to help him address the issue. At the same time, the students’ relational wants were closely linked to meeting the interlocutor’s needs. In most cases, it appears that both the student participants and the interlocutor’s interactional wants were by and large met with the

exception of the few interactions that involved refusals to help (as mentioned previously).

However, the students' ability to recognize and respond to the interlocutor's desire to be validated as a friend in need of advice may have also been affected by individual differences, such as personality, L2 proficiency level, personal preoccupations, and/or cultural and gender differences (Spencer-Oatey, 2005). To give an example, one group 2 student came to the final recording preoccupied with a paper he had due the next day, which seemed to affect his ability to interact as evidenced by the long pauses that occurred at the beginning of the interaction (although by the end he seemed to have recovered). Another beginning level student's personality took the conversations in a direction that was not seen in any other interaction at the beginning or the end of the semester; as a result, his interactions included higher than usual amounts of requesting information and other strategies that appeared to be unique to him (at least in this data set). Furthermore, the interlocutor openly commented on his preference for more female-like advice, which he seemed to associate with greater care and concern for all parties involved. These comments could indicate that when giving advice, especially in this relational context, the interlocutor expected that females would differ from males in their interpersonal communication style. These are just a few of the individual factors observed that could have had an influence on the achievement of interactional wants focused on promoting solidarity and friendship. However, a detailed analysis of these individual factors and how they

relate to the L2 pragmatic performance of the speech act of advice-giving does not fit within the scope of this paper.

Below the results of group 1 and group 2's behavioral expectations, face sensitivities, and interactional wants are summarized followed by a discussion of the results.

Summary of Results

In summary, the students' results were analyzed in light of Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach, particularly in terms of the three main elements associated with rapport management: behavioral expectations, face sensitivities, and interactional wants. The interactions seemed to indicate that advice-giving between intimates, in this situational context, held a rapport-enhancing orientation. This rapport-enhancing orientation was most clearly evident in the students' behavioral expectations. Both groups of students preferred to first and foremost respect the association principle, however they also frequently threatened the equity principle by giving advice, opinions, and suggesting future actions. A certain amount of threatening the association principle also appeared to be permitted behavior in this context, with the exception of refusing to help which was argued to be proscribed behavior. With regard to face sensitivities, both groups showed a preference for balancing face-enhancing and face-challenging strategies with slight variations at SS and SE. However, it was argued that violating the equity principle and challenging the interlocutor's identity face were proscribed behaviors; moreover, not giving advice could be viewed as proscribed behavior in this social context. In terms of

interactional wants, the students and interlocutor seemed to have predominately relational goals.

Discussion of Results

This study sought to describe the advice-giving tendencies of two groups of learners in a study abroad context. The first group represented students that entered their sojourn abroad with the equivalent of beginning to intermediate-low proficiency in Spanish as a second language and the second group consisted of students that entered the semester abroad at an intermediate-high level of L2 Spanish. Specifically, this study used Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management framework to analyze how these two student groups utilized 33 different strategies in the advice-giving period of an open oral-role play situation in terms of behavioral expectations, face sensitivities and interactional wants at semester start and semester end. Furthermore, the changes (or lack thereof) that took place over the course of a semester abroad were presented with the following research questions in mind:

- 1.) What are the behavioral expectations, face sensitivities, and interactional wants of the two learner groups when giving advice in a Spanish study abroad context?
- 2.) How do the two learner groups' specific strategy choices vary (if at all) from semester start to semester end?

It was found that the two groups had similar overarching tendencies with regard to respecting and violating the association and equity principles in their behavioral expectations, enhancing and challenging identity face sensitivities, and

pursuing relational interactional wants. However, there were more distinct points of comparison and contrast in the specific strategy choices of each group at semester start and semester end. These similarities and differences in the results of the two groups' advice-giving tendencies at SS and SE are discussed below in light of previous research on native speaker and L2 advice-giving, in addition to previous research on the L2 acquisition of pragmatics in a study abroad context.

Discussion.

To the best of the researcher's knowledge, no studies to date have quantitatively or qualitatively described the advice-giving strategies of L2 learners of Spanish in a study abroad setting. However, there has been some notable research done on Spanish L2 classroom learners in a foreign language context (Bodería-García, 2006; Koike & Pearson, 2005; Mwinyelle, 2005). Of particular interest to the application of this study is Bordería-García's (2006) study on L2 advice-giving tendencies in a classroom setting because in addition to evaluating learner oral production at various proficiency levels, it is the only study (again to best of this researcher's knowledge) that quantitatively analyzes both native Peninsular Spanish speaker and native American English speaker oral production data. Therefore, Bordería-García's (2006) study is used as point of departure in this discussion.

Bordería-García (2006) found that beginning L2 learners of Spanish most closely resembled native Peninsular Spanish Speakers in their L2 production of direct forms of advice, specifically in their use of imperatives. In the current study, group 1 also showed a distinct preference for direct forms of advice when

violating the autonomy-control of the interlocutor, specifically through the use of imperatives. Therefore, it appears that beginning to intermediate-low level students may prefer this form due to their limited proficiency level. This was confirmed by the fact that many of the imperative forms were ungrammatical, indicating that the students were relying on their lexical rather than their grammatical knowledge to communicate their meaning. This is further confirmed by the fact that the students with higher proficiency, in both the current study (group 2) and Bordería-García's (2006) study, did not frequently use imperatives to give direct advice, but rather preferred obligation statements. Interestingly, Bordería-García (2006) reported that her native English-speaking control group used obligation statements with the verb 'should' similarly to her group of advanced learners. At the same time, her native Spanish speaker control group did not record even one instance of the 'should'/'have to'/'must' equivalent in Spanish *deber* or *tener que*, rather within her direct category they preferred to almost exclusively use imperatives with some explicit performatives and present tense structures scattered throughout their speech. This could be seen as preliminary evidence the students in group 2 were transferring their use of obligation statements from their L1 (English) in their L2 Spanish production of advice-giving strategies.

Similarly, the students in this study and the students in all three proficiency levels in Bordería-García's (2006) study used need statements to give advice in their L2. Bordería-García (2006), again found that her native English speaker group used need statements similarly to all three of her student groups

(albeit to a lesser extent than other ‘direct’ strategies); however, her native Spanish speaker group recorded no instances of need statements when giving advice. Therefore, in terms of the most direct forms of advice, it appears that there is a distinct difference in the conventions of form used to give advice, especially once students have progressed beyond the beginner levels of Spanish L2 proficiency. In fact, other researchers have noted that L1 transfer affects L2 pragmatic performance in study abroad settings (Barron, 2003; Bataller, 2008; Dufon, 1999; Shively, 2008; Vélez, 1987) despite the access students presumably have to native speaker input. However, what is not clear is whether or not obligation and need statements as employed by the students in this study would be viewed as pragmatically (in)acceptable in the given context of advice-giving between intimates in Peninsular Spanish. Presumably, such judgments could also depend on whether or not the students are internally modifying *deber*, given that the illocutionary force of *debes* (‘must’ or ‘have to’) vs. *deberías* (‘should’ or ‘ought to’) can be quite different. At the same time, no commentary related to the illocutionary force was mentioned on the interlocutor’s post role-play questionnaire. Therefore, it could be argued that the exact form used to give advice is not as important as how the students manage rapport through behavioral expectations, face sensitivities, and interactional wants. In fact, Bordería-García (2006) found that there was no statistically significant difference in how Peninsular Spanish speakers perceived the use of different strategies, be them direct, conventionally indirect, or non-conventionally indirect strategies. That is all the strategy types presented in her perception questionnaire in low imposition

scenarios (as is the case in the current study) were judged as moderately appropriate to appropriate by native Peninsular Spanish speakers even though in their oral production data they showed a preference for imperatives.

Nevertheless, it is important to note this difference between L2 advice-giving strategy production and native-speaker production preferences. Therefore, the results of this study corroborated Bordería-García's (2006) finding that beginning students preference imperatives, whereas more proficient students tend to move away from imperatives as they become more proficient in Spanish.

The students in group 2 also appear to confirm Bordería-García's (2006) finding that intermediate and advanced students tend to rely heavily on suggestory statements (or what Bordería-García calls the can-could modal). She linked this tendency to L1 transfer because the native Spanish speakers in her data did not use suggestory statements nearly as frequently as her intermediate and advanced students. On the other hand, her native English speaker group used this strategy frequently. Therefore, she concluded that intermediate and advanced L2 Spanish learners seem to more closely follow native English speaker norms in their oral production of advice-giving strategies. Interestingly, after a semester abroad, group 2 relied even more heavily on suggestory statements than they did at the beginning of the semester, even after spending time in a region that has been said to use more direct forms in the production of advice-giving, as well as other more studied speech acts (Bordería-García, 2006; Placencia, 2004).

However, in the context of this study, group 2's shift away from impersonal statements from semester start to semester end, could be viewed as a

shift towards more native-like directness, given that the illocutionary force of impersonals is often categorized as less direct than suggestory statements. Furthermore, studies on native speaker realization of requests in Peninsular Spanish have recorded the use of the conventionally indirect modal *poder* (Blum-Kulka, 1989; House & Kasper, 1989; Placencia, 1998). Therefore, it is possible that students in group 2 have heard suggestory statements being used in other directive speech act scenarios and are generalizing their knowledge to the advice situation. At the same time, it may also be that suggestory statements transfer between English and Spanish with greater ease than do other strategies, consequently the students in group 2 have learned to be cautious which has resulted in the overuse of suggestory statements.

Interestingly, opinion statements were also frequent in Bordería-García's (2006) advice-giving data in all native speaker and student groups with the exception of beginners. Therefore, it appears that this strategy is frequently employed when giving advice in both English and Spanish. However, beginners in the current study were well aware of this form upon arrival and used it as their second most frequent advice-giving strategy after imperatives at semester start and used it as their preferred (albeit only slightly more than imperatives) strategy in violating the autonomy-control of the interlocutor at the end of the semester.

Furthermore, the learners non-advice-giving units were not qualitatively analyzed in Bordería-García's (2006) data, however she did mention in a qualitative description that advanced students seem to more frequently employ "positive politeness" strategies and that these strategies overtly work on

enhancing the face of the interlocutor in a way that her beginning and intermediate students were incapable of doing; however, the data in the current study does not confirm this finding. Rather, it appears that both group 1 and group 2 used a variety of face-enhancing strategies to balance the face-challenging strategies used to give advice and opinions. However, as mentioned in the results group 2 tended to use more complex and lengthier face-enhancing strategies when compared to group 1.

Mwinyelle (2005) referred to these face-enhancing and association principle strategies as supporting moves and he found that his at-home student groups that received explicit instruction in the proper use of supporting moves utilized more supporting moves at the end of the semester (i.e., after the treatment). His group of fourth semester Spanish students most easily compare with group 1, who (over the course of the semester in Spain) shifted away from more rudimentary forms such as signaling comprehension, towards more complex forms that expressed involvement, empathy, and respect for the interlocutor. Therefore, it could be argued that over a semester abroad group 1 improved in their ability to show empathy, involvement and respect for the interlocutor, much in the same way that the explicit instruction of appropriate supporting moves had an effect on Mwinyelle's (2005) at home group in their advice-giving abilities. However, Mwinyelle's (2005) delayed post-tests revealed that these gains were not uniformly retained. Therefore, it would be interesting to test group 1 after several months back in the U.S. to determine whether the study abroad experience had a more lasting impact on this beginning to end of the semester change.

However, the strategies that students in group 1 and group 2 used to give advice to the interlocutor at both the beginning and end of the semester could be the result of several other influences. Mwinyelle (2005) and Koike and Pearson (2005) based their explicit instruction of advice strategies on a Mexican native speaker norm when teaching the speech act of advice to students in an at home L2 classroom setting. Although, the native speaker data was not quantitatively presented in either of these studies, it is clear that a movement away from direct forms was considered appropriate and indicated that students were approximating the Mexican norm of advice-giving. Specifically, Mwinyelle (2005) states:

For instance, the pretest data of these learners show a use of “want” and “need” expressions, direct commands without softeners... and fewer appropriate linguistic items. After the treatments, however, the posttest data reveal significant improvement... For example, the direct commands tend to be replaced by indirect commands and more subjunctive sentences....” (p.142)

Therefore, it is possible that the at home instruction the students in both groups received before departing to Spain put an emphasis on indirect forms of advice whether or not it was explicitly taught under the umbrella of pragmatics. This could explain group 2’s frequent use of impersonal statements (which often require the use of subjunctive forms in advice-giving) at the beginning of the semester. Therefore, once again the increased use of suggestory statements and decreased use of impersonal statements at SE, could be viewed as a movement that is more closely approximating the Peninsular Spanish speaker advice-giving

norms that the students were exposed to over the course of the semester. In fact, a few studies on Spanish pragmatic variation have found similar differences between Mexican and Peninsular Spanish speakers across different speech acts (Curc6, 1998; Marquez-Reiter & Placencia, 2004). However, these comments should only be considered suggestive especially given the fact that there was no quantitative native speaker data presented in Miwinyelle's (2005) study or the current study.

Another possibility that could explain group 2's preference for suggestory statements and the minimal use of imperatives is a desire to be more "polite" in Spanish, which could be the result of resistance to the native speaker directness norm or alternatively it could be the result of a lack of awareness of the native speaker norm. One of Shively's (2008) students revealed in a journal that she viewed imperative requests as impolite and therefore refused to use direct requests even after receiving explicit instruction in class on the use of direct requests as a common native speaker strategy that native speakers do not view as inappropriate. In their entrance and exit interviews, only a few group 2 participants commented on noticing that Spaniards tended to be more direct, however, these students did not comment on whether or not they viewed this negatively or positively, yet when asked about their perceptions of Spaniards in general the majority of the students gave positive evaluations based on their time in Spain. Therefore, it is more likely that the students were merely unaware of this tendency towards directness despite their extended stay in the target culture. In fact, many students mentioned that their access to native speakers outside of

the university and home-stay setting was limited to service encounters and the bar scene (with other Americans) at night, although, there were some students who established greater access to native speaker networks.

Several researchers (Bataller, 2008; Barron, 2003; Hoffman-Hicks, 2000) have pointed out that the study abroad context alone does not always facilitate greater awareness of native speaker pragmatics. In fact, some researchers have found a divergence from the native speaker norm even after studying in the target culture (Barron, 2003; Hoffman-Hicks, 2000). Specifically, Hoffman-Hicks (2000) studied the development of pragmatic strategies across different speech acts in a French L2 study abroad setting. It was concluded that native speaker exemplars of certain speech acts were more accessible than others to L2 learners in a study abroad setting. Specifically, Hoffman-Hicks (2000) found that students began to exhibit more native like behaviors in their greetings and leave-takings, whereas the students in her study did not develop as much in their ability to give or respond to compliments in French. Therefore, it is suggested that learners did not gain as much access to the complimenting behavior of native French speakers. In the current study, it is also possible that students were not frequently exposed to native speaker advice-giving, which could explain group 2's heavy reliance on suggestory statements and group 1's limited evolution in advice-giving from semester start to end. It is also worth mentioning here the fact that group 2's advice-giving interlanguage showed greater evolution over time (as most clearly evidenced by their strategy shifts) which could be an indication that learners who enter the study abroad experience with a higher proficiency level are more

linguistically affected by the study abroad experience than lower proficiency students. However, when looking at the overarching advice-giving tendencies of both group 1 and group 2, differences between the two groups are less obvious. Specifically, with respect to their preference for respecting the association principle, violating the autonomy-control component of the equity principle, balancing face sensitivities and emphasizing relational interactional wants.

When comparing these results with previous research on native English speaker advice-giving, the data seem to indicate that students interlanguage pragmatic behavior when giving advice in Spanish does not consistently reflect native English-speaker norms. For instance, both student groups seemed to avoid using hints which both Bordería-García (2006) and Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) suggested is a common advice-giving strategy in American English and which Bordería-García (2006) identified as common strategy among her most advanced L2 Spanish speakers (Bordería-García, 2006). This difference could be due to contextual factors or it is also possible that the students in this study were not “advanced” enough to transfer this strategy. However, it could also be argued that the learners are exhibiting distinct interlanguage pragmatic behavior, which is different from native speaker tendencies in both their L1 and L2. This coincides with what other researchers in study abroad have concluded (Kinging, 2003; Shively, 2008) is representative of the fact that learners are active agents of their own learning and are often in the process of building a new L2 identity that reflects their diverse linguistic and cultural experiences. However, Shively (2008) also pointed out that there is an “unresolved tension” in SLA research between

identifying L2 behaviors that are the result of ethnocentric resistance and those behaviors that indicate that a learner is “exercising agency in their learning of the L2, by taking in new knowledge and actively constructing their own identity as an emergent bilingual speaker of the L2” (p.24).

Moreover, the interlocutor in the current study’s comments on his overall impressions of the learners (as recorded on his post role-play questionnaires) seem to indicate, especially at the end of the semester, that he was more concerned with the empathy and interest the students showed than with their organizational competence. This is most clearly evidenced by the interlocutor’s post role-play comments on his end of the semester interaction with Juan, a student who entered the semester with one of the lowest proficiency levels in group #1:

The first time he was really limited because he didn’t know much, but he tried hard and I appreciate that.... This time, it was the longest conversation, we spent 9 minutes... we took it to the next level, not only that but because Juan is Juan and I love that. He was really empathetic; he tried to help me, in his way. He got involved personally, he was really active, he was telling me all the things he was about to do for me. He lead the conversation, I was listening and learning. I was impressed... and he gave good advice in his way.

Therefore, it appears that learner proficiency level is independent of their ability to successfully manage rapport in an advice-giving context. This finding coincides with Bardovi-Harlig and Dornyei’s (1998) finding that pragmatic errors

were considered more severe than grammatical errors. Furthermore, Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford (1990, 1993) found that despite advanced grammatical knowledge of a language, many learners still produce pragmatically inappropriate behavior.

More than anything, the results of this study provide some insight into the interlanguage pragmatic advice-giving tendencies of native English-speaking L2 learners in a Spanish study abroad context. As pointed out above, some of the results of this study confirm previous research on L2 interlanguage pragmatic behaviors, while other findings in the current study seemingly contradict prior research. However, the limited scope of this paper combined with the incomplete pragmatic map of both L1 (English and Spanish) and L2 (Spanish) sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic production tendencies make it difficult to broadly generalize the findings. In the final chapter below, the findings of this study will be summarized, followed by some potential pedagogical implications, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Study

This study investigated the advice-giving interlanguage pragmatic development of 17 native American English-speaking L2 learners in a Spanish study abroad setting. Two distinct proficiency groups were identified. Then, using Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach, the results were analyzed in terms of the each groups' behavioral expectations, face sensitivities, and interactional wants. Similarities and differences were found between the two groups and these results were compared and presented quantitatively in an effort to establish what changes, if any, took place in the students' advice-giving behaviors over the course of a semester in Spain. The results of the two groups demonstrated that both groups showed similar overarching preferences for respecting the association principle through involvement, empathy, and respect strategies and through strategies that violated the autonomy-control component of the equity principle. Furthermore, learners balanced the interlocutor's face sensitivities by both enhancing and challenging his identity face. Moreover, the interactional wants of the students were predominately relational. However, upon carefully examining the specific strategy preferences of each group more complex patterns emerged. Specifically, it was found that the specific strategies used by Group 1 and Group 2 were notably different at both the beginning and end of the semester. This seems to indicate that learner proficiency level had an impact on the interlanguage pragmatic performance and development of these particular L2

learners in an advice-giving context. Furthermore, the findings of the current study seemingly confirmed previous research on the acquisition of Spanish L2 advice-giving and previous research on L2 interlanguage pragmatic development in a study abroad setting.

Pedagogical Implications

Based on the limited available research on Spanish native speaker advice-giving, it was suggested that the students differed from Spanish NSs when giving advice in Spanish. Therefore, it appears that students could benefit from explicit instruction due to the fact that the experience of residing in the target language community for a semester does not appear to be sufficient to fully raise students' awareness of native speaker norms. Other studies (Cohen, 2001; Koike, 2005; Mwinyelle, 2005; Shively, 2008) have pointed out that explicit instruction can raise learners' awareness of L2 pragmatic norms in both study abroad and at home contexts. Once a clearer picture of L1 Spanish advice-giving norms is established, a framework for teaching the speech act of advice to L2 learners can be recognized. In fact, a few researchers have begun to outline best practices for the teaching of pragmatics (Cohen & Ishihara, 2010; García, 1996), which could potentially be used in teaching advice-giving to L2 learners of Spanish.

The current study also has implications for those who prepare students for a sojourn abroad. Specifically, study abroad administrators could aid in preparing students with pragmatic knowledge before and during the study abroad experience by helping students understand how culture is often imbedded in language. This type of multilateral effort could help students develop their L2 pragmatic

competence and intercultural understanding. Furthermore, the study of interlanguage pragmatics when compared to native speaker norms, could provide textbook publishers with a valuable new direction to take language learning, especially given the research that points out that pragmatic failure is often judged more harshly than organizational competency failures.

Limitations

As is the case with all research, this study has several limitations. First, the limited sample size makes the findings difficult to generalize. For this reason, the findings of this study should be interpreted as relevant to this particular group of L2 Spanish learners. Participant specific characteristics present limitations as well. Specifically, the current study included more females than males, however gender was not a controlled variable. Therefore, it is possible that gender had an effect on the results. In fact, other researchers have noted the effect of gender on pragmatics (García, 1996).

Along those same lines, the study abroad context does not frequently provide researchers with large groups of students enrolled in the same exact course with the same instructor (unlike intact, at home, classroom studies). As a result, the study abroad context makes it difficult to tightly control learner variables such as L2 proficiency and the effect of instruction. However, the biggest limitation of this study is the lack of L1 (English & Spanish) native speaker control groups. Unfortunately, due to time and resource limitations, gathering native-speaker data during the Fall 2010 semester was not feasible. The final section below makes recommendations for future research.

Future Research

The limitations of the research point to the need for an increased number of native speaker speech act realization studies that focus not only on the specific strategies used to perform a given speech act, but also on a more complete analysis of native speaker discourse. Native-speaker studies could then be compared to the Spanish interlanguage of the students, especially as it relates to different aspects of their organizational and pragmatic competence. Furthermore, given the numerous studies done on Spanish pragmatic variation, it would be interesting to see how L2 interlanguage pragmatics is affected by diverse study abroad locations (i.e. the various regions and dialects of Latin America). Moreover, given the fact that many American learners of Spanish are taught by instructors from Mexico and other parts of Latin America, a greater corpus of data on Spanish pragmatic variation across speech communities is vital to providing students with the resources they need to be successful, pragmatically competent L2 speakers. Additionally, more studies that evaluate learner personality, identity, and the effect of individual factors on L2 learning are needed if we are to understand the many factors that affect language acquisition in a study abroad context.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J.L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Bachman, L.F. (1990). *Fundamental consideration in language testing*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., 1999. The interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: a research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning* 49, 677–713.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Dornyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), 233-262.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1990). Congruence in native and nonnative conversations: Status balance in the academic advising session. *Language Learning*, 40, 467-501.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1991). Saying "No": Native and nonnative rejections in English. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, 2, 41-57. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, Division of English as an International Language.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1993). Learning the rules of academic talk: A longitudinal study of pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 279-304.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins.
- Bataller, R. (2008). *Pragmatic development in a study abroad setting: Requesting a service in Spanish*. Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International: The Humanities and Social Sciences. University of Iowa.
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. New Jersey: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1985). *Language testing: Cross-cultural pragmatics and the testing of communicative competence*. SAGE: (<http://ltj.sagepub.com/content/2/1/16.refs.html>)

- Bordería-García, A. M. (2006). *The acquisition of pragmatics in Spanish as a foreign language: Interpreting and giving advice*. Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International: The Humanities and Social Sciences. University of Iowa.
- Brown, Penelope & Levinson, Stephen C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M., (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Cohen, A. D. & Shively, R. L. (2007). Acquisition of requests and apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of study abroad and strategy-building intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(2), 189-212.
- Cohen, A.D. & Ishihara, N. (2010). *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Pearson Education.
- DeCapua, A. & Hubber, L. (1995). 'If I were you...': Advice in American English. *Multilingua*, 14(2), 117-32.
- DeKeyser, R. (1991). Foreign language development during a semester abroad. In B. Freed (Ed.). *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 104-119). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- DuFon, M. A. (1999). *The acquisition of linguistic politeness in Indonesian by sojourners in naturalistic interactions*. Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International: The Humanities and Social Sciences. Manoa: University of Hawaii.
- Fitch, K. L. (1994). A cross-cultural study of directive sequences and some implications for compliance-gaining research. *Communication Monographs*, 61(3), 185-209.
- Freed, B.F. (1990). Language learning in a study abroad context: the effects of interactive and non-interactive out-of-class contact on grammatical achievement and oral proficiency. In J. Atlatis (Ed.). *Linguistics, language teaching and language acquisition: the interdependence of theory, practice, and research* (pp. 459-477). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Freed, B.F., Dewey, D.P., Segalowitz, N., & Halter, R. (2004). The language contact profiles. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 349-356.
- García, C. (1989) Apologizing in English: Politeness strategies used by native and non-native speakers. *Multilingua*, 8(1), 3-20.

- García, C. (1993). Making a request and responding to it: a case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 127–152.
- García, C. (1996). Reprimanding and responding to a reprimand: a case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 663–697.
- García, C. (2007) Different Realizations of solidarity politeness. In M.A. Placencia & C. García (Eds.) *Research on politeness in the Spanish-speaking world*. Mahwah, N.J. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- García, C. (2009). ‘Cuento conmigo’: The expression of sympathy by Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 408–425
- Goldsmith, D. J., & Fitch, K. (1997). The normative context of advice as social support. *Human Communication Research*, 23(4), 454-476.
- Hernández-Flores, N. (1999). Politeness ideology in Spanish colloquial conversation: The case of advice. *Pragmatics*, 9(1), 37-49.
- Hoffman-Hicks, S. (1999). *The longitudinal development of French foreign language pragmatic competence: Evidence from study abroad participants*. Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International: The Humanities and Social Sciences. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. In W. Lörcher & R. Schulze (Eds.), *Perspectives on language in performance* (pp. 1250-1288). Tübingen: Narr.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride, & J.Holmes (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 279-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- The Institute of International Education. (2010). *Open Doors Data*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Isabelli, C.L. (2001). *Motivation and extended interaction in the study abroad context: factors in the development of Spanish language accuracy and communication skills*. Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International: The Humanities and Social Sciences. Austin: University of Texas.
- Kasper, G. (1989). Variation in interlanguage speech act realization. In C. Gass, D. Preston & L. Selinker (Eds.). *Variation in second language acquisition discourse markers and pragmatics*. Clevedon, UK.
- Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(2), 149-169.

- Kinging, C. (2008). Language learning in study abroad: Case studies of Americans in France. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(supplement), iii-131.
- Koike, D. A., & Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in the development of pragmatic competence. *System*, 33(3), 481-501.
- Lafford, B.A. (2004). The effect of context of learning on the use of communication strategies by learners of Spanish as a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 201-26.
- Lafford, B.A. & Ryan, J. (1995). The acquisition of lexical meaning in a study abroad context: the Spanish prepositions POR and PARA. *Hispania*, 75, pp. 528-47.
- Martínez Flor, A. (2007). Learners' use of downgraders in suggestions under focus on forms and focus on form treatment conditions. *Revista Canaria De Estudios Ingleses*, 55(Nov), 167-180.
- Martínez Flor, A. (2005). A theoretical review of the speech act of suggesting: Towards a taxonomy for its use in FLT. *Revista Alicantina De Estudios Ingleses*, 18, 167-187.
- Matsumura, S. (2001). Learning the rules for offering advice: A quantitative approach to second language socialization. *Language Learning*, 51(4), 635-679.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2008a). Pedagogical intervention and the development of pragmatic competence in learning Spanish as a foreign language. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 16 (1), 49-84.
- Furman, N., Goldberg, D., & Lusin, N. (2010). *Enrollments in Languages Other Than English in United States Institutions of Higher Education*. Web Publication: Modern Language Association.
- Marquez-Reiter, R., & Placencia, M. E. (2004). Displaying closeness and respectful distance in Montevidean and Quiteño service encounters. In R. Marquez-Reiter & M. E. Placencia (Eds.), *Current trends in the pragmatics of Spanish* (pp. 121-155). Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Mwinyelle, J. B. (2006). The acquisition of pragmatic competence in an L2 classroom: Giving advice in Spanish. *Dissertation Abstracts International: The Humanities and Social Sciences*. Austin: University of Texas dissertation.
- Olshtain, E. (1983). Sociocultural competence and linguistic transfer. In S. Gass & L. Selinker, (Eds.). *Language transfer in language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

- Pinto, D.R. (2002). "Perdóname ¿llevas mucho esperando? Conventionalized Language in L1 and L2 Spanish." Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International: The Humanities and Social Sciences. Davis: University of California.
- Placencia, M. E. (1998). Pragmatic variation: Ecuadorian Spanish vs. Peninsular Spanish. *SAL*, 2(1), 71-106.
- Placencia, M. E. (2004). Rapport-building activities in corner shop interactions. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 8(2), 215-245.
- Placencia, M.E. (2007). Studies on politeness in Colombian, Ecuadorian, and Peruvian Spanish. In M.E. Placencia & C. García (Eds.). *Research on politeness in the Spanish-speaking world* (pp. 59-89). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Regan, V. (1995). The acquisition of sociolinguistic native speech norms: effects of a year abroad on second language learners of French. In B.F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 245-267). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Searle, J.R. (1976). The classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1-24.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209-241.
- Shively, R. (2008). *Politeness and social interaction in study abroad: Service encounters in L2 Spanish*. Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International: The Humanities and Social Sciences. University of Minnesota.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005). (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1), 95-119.
- Sykes, J. (n.d.). *Dancing with words: Strategies for learning pragmatics in Spanish*. Retrieved December 1, 2009, from CARLA & the University of Minnesota: http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/sp_pragmatics/acknowledgements.html
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied linguistics*, 4(2), 91-112.
- Tusi, A. (1994). *English conversation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vélez, J. A. (1987). *Contrasts in language use: A conversational and ethnographic analysis of service encounters in Austin and San Juan*. Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International: The Humanities and Social Sciences. Austin: University of Texas.

Wolfram, W. & Schilling-Estes, N. (2006). *American English: Dialects and Variation*. Cambridge/Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

APPENDIX A
IRB APPROVAL



Office of Research Integrity and Assurance

To: Barbara Lafford
UCENT

fd **From:** Mark Roosa, Chair *SM*
Soc Beh IRB

Date: 09/14/2010

Committee Action: Exemption Granted

IRB Action Date: 09/14/2010

IRB Protocol #: 1009005468

Study Title: Pragmatic Competence: The Case of Advice in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) Abroad

The above-referenced protocol is considered exempt after review by the Institutional Review Board pursuant to Federal regulations, 45 CFR Part 46.101(b)(1) (2) .

This part of the federal regulations requires that the information be recorded by investigators in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. It is necessary that the information obtained not be such that if disclosed outside the research, it could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

You should retain a copy of this letter for your records.

APPENDIX B
INSTRUMENTS

Role-Play advice situations

Situation #1:

Person #1: You have a good friend that suddenly seems to be taking a romantic interest in you. In general, her interactions with you have been different lately. Specifically, the way she has been looking at you lately, calling/texting you continually, and always asking you to hang out is different than in the past. You don't want her to get the wrong idea because you are not interested in your friend romantically, but you want to stay friends with this person and so you don't know what to do. One day while at lunch with a mutual friend you discuss the situation.

Person #2: You are at lunch with a friend and she explains to you that one of your mutual friends seems to be showing romantic interest in her. You have a feeling that this person might be interested in her as well because you have also noticed some changes in this person's behavior. Your friend is not sure what she should do, so she talks to you about the situation.

Spanish Translation:

Persona #1: Tienes una amiga que parece tener un interés romántico en ti. En general, su comportamiento contigo ha cambiado recientemente. Específicamente, la manera en que él/ella te mira, la frecuencia con que te manda textos/te llama, y siempre quiere salir contigo es diferente que en el pasado. Tú no quieres que ella piense que te gusta como novia porque no te interesa tener una relación romántica con ella, pero quieres mantener una amistad con esta persona y no sabes qué hacer. Un día mientras estás almorzando con una amiga, le explicas la situación.

Persona #2: Estás almorzando con un amigo y él te explica que piensa que una amiga vuestra parece tener un interés romántico en él. Presientes que es cierto porque tú también has notado algunos cambios en el comportamiento de esta amiga. Tu amigo no sabe qué hacer y habla contigo sobre la situación.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

PART I:

1. Gender: Male / Female
2. Age: _____
3. Country of birth: _____
4. What is your native language?
 - 1.) English 2.) Spanish 3.) Other _____
5. What language do you speak at home (growing up)?
 - 1.) English 2.) Spanish 3.) Other _____
 - a. If more than one, with whom do you speak each of these languages?

6. What language do you speak at your current place of residence in the U.S.? Check all that apply.
 - 1.) English 2.) Spanish 3.) Other _____
7. In what language(s) did you receive the majority of your *precollege* education?
 - 1.) English 3.) Other _____
8. Have you ever been to a Spanish-speaking region *for the purpose of studying Spanish*?
Circle one: Yes / No
 - a. If yes, when? _____
 - b. Where? _____
 - c. For how long? ___ 1 semester or less ___ 2 semesters ___ more than 2 semesters
 - d. Describe your living situation (e.g., lived with host family, other Spanish-speakers, other English speakers, dormitory, alone):

9. Other than the experience mentioned in Question 7, have you ever lived in a situation where you were exposed to a language other than your native language (e.g. by living in a multilingual community, visiting a community for purposes of study abroad or work; exposure through family members, etc.)?

Circle one: Yes / No

If yes, please give details below. If more than three, list others on back of this page.

| | Experience 1 | Experience 2 | Experience 3 |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Country/Region | | | |
| Language | | | |
| Purpose | | | |
| Living Situation | | | |
| From when to when | | | |

10. In the boxes below rate your language ability in each of the languages that you know. Use the following ratings:

0) Poor, 1) Good, 2) Very good, 3) Native/native-like

How many years (if any) have you studied this language in a *formal school* setting?

| Language | Listening | Speaking | Reading | Writing | # of years of study |
|----------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|---------------------|
| English | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Spanish | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | |

11. Have you studied Spanish in school in the past at each of the levels listed below? If yes, for how long?

- a. Elementary School: __No __Yes, for _____ years.
- b. Junior High (middle) School: __No __Yes, for _____ years.
- c. High School: __No __Yes, for _____ years.
- d. University/college: __No __Yes, for _____ years.
- e. Other (please specify): _____
 __No __Yes, for _____ years.

12. What year are you in school? (circle one):

- Freshman Sophomore
- Junior Senior
- Graduate Student
- Other. Please specify: _____

13. What is your major? _____

14. What is your minor(s) or specialization?

15. Please list all the Spanish courses have taken prior to this semester. This includes Spanish language courses as well as content area courses taught in Spanish. **List the most recent courses first:**

- Course name and number
- Semester (e.g. Fall 2009, Summer 2010)
- _____
- _____

Optional: Other important background information:

PART II: All of the Questions that follow refer to your use of Spanish (*prior to your arrival in Spain*), not your native language, unless the question states otherwise.

1. On average, how much time did you spend speaking, *in Spanish*, outside of class with native or fluent Spanish speakers during in the past year?
 Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
 0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5 more than 5
2. In the last year, outside of class, I spoke *Spanish* to:
 - a. _____ My instructor(s)
 Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
 7
 On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
 0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
 more than 5

- b. _____ Friends who are native or fluent Spanish speakers
Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7
On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5
- c. _____ Classmates
Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7
On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5
- d. _____ Strangers whom I thought could speak Spanish
Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7
On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5
- e. _____ A host family, Spanish roommate, or other Spanish speakers
in the dormitory
Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7
On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5
- f. _____ Service personnel
Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7
On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5
- g. _____ Other. Please specify:

Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7
On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5

3. How often did you spend doing each of the following activities *outside of class*?

- a. Reading in *Spanish* for class assignments *outside of class*?
Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7

- On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5
- b. Reading *Spanish* newspapers, magazines, or books for leisure
outside of class?
Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7
On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5
- c. Reading e-mails, chat posts, Facebook entries, and/or surfing the
Internet in *Spanish outside of class*?
Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7
On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5
- d. Listening to Spanish television, radio, movies or other videos
outside of class?
Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7
On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5
- e. Listening to Spanish music *outside of class*?
Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7
On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5
- f. Trying to catch other people's conversations in *Spanish outside of
class*?
Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7
On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5
- g. Writing in *Spanish* for class assignments *outside of class*?
Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7
On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?
0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5

- h. Writing letters, personal notes, blogs, e-mails, chatting, or engaging in other forms of social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Second Life) in *Spanish outside of class*?

Typically, how many *days per week*? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7

On those days, typically how many *hours per day*?

0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5
more than 5

4. List any other activities you commonly did using Spanish in the year prior to this semester?

Reflective Interview Questions:

Arrival Questions:

Is this your first time in a foreign country?

If not, where else have you been?

What was the purpose of your travel?

Why did you decide to study abroad? What do you hope gain from this experience?

Why Spain? (Especially over other study abroad destinations like Latin America)

How long have you studied Spanish? Have you ever studied any other languages?

Why did you decide to study Spanish (over other languages)?

What do you know about Spain?

How do you expect or hope to spend your time while here in Spain?

What do you think of your living situation? Are you excited to live with a family?

Is there anything specific that you expect to learn while here in Spain?

What do you believe is the best way to learn Spanish while here?

How do you plan to utilize your time for language learning (if that is even a goal) while in Spain?

Overall, how do you feel this experience will affect your future?

Final/Pre-departure Interview Questions:

So, how has your experience in Spain been overall? Was the experience what you expected and hoped for?

Can you describe your typical week in Spain?

How were your classes? Did you enjoy your instructors?

Did you get along well with your host family? Did you regularly eat dinner with your host family? Did you ever participate in activities outside of the home with your host family?

What did you typically do in the evenings?

How often did you communicate with your friends and family in the U.S.?

How did you primarily communicate with people at home (Phone, email, facebook skype)?

Did you have any visitors from home this semester? If so, who and for how long did they visit?

What was a typical weekend like for you? Did you travel a lot? Where to?

Who did you primarily spend time with outside of class?

Did you meet any Spaniards besides your host family here in Spain? If so, who?

What was your general impression of Spain and Spaniards?

How do you feel your language has developed over the last four months? To you feel optimistic about your Spanish?

Do you plan on continuing your study of Spanish once you return home?

Has this experience changed your perception of yourself or your worldviews in general?

What is your best memory? (and worst?) If you could change anything about the experience what would it be?

In general, what would you say you have learned from this experience?

Overall, how do you feel this experience will affect your future?