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This article outlines what it means to be a strategic language learner in the context of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL). It looks at the possible roles for language learner strategies at their crucial intersection with language learning technology. We will first consider what language learner strategies have been represented in literature and also consider the kind of fine-tuning of them that is likely to be a priority for maximizing their benefits in learning more complex language functions. Then we will consider how strategies can best be applied to dealing with CALL—e.g., (1) strategies for selecting what to study, (2) strategies for how to study an L2 online, and (3) strategic material integrated into websites—where strategic options for performance of the content material are explicitly emphasized. A focus will be placed on the learning and performance of L2 pragmatics, since this is a high-stakes area of L2 learning.

The Representation of Language Learner Strategies in the Literature

Until the 1970s and the seminal work by Rubin (1975), the focus of language instruction was primarily on the teacher because it was assumed that if teachers did a competent job of teaching, learners would get what they needed. Rubin's work marked the advent of a strategic approach to language learning and language use. Although definitions of language learner strategies have varied over the years, there is some consensus among experts that language learner strategies are conscious or semi-conscious thoughts and behaviors employed by learners, often with the intention of enhancing their knowledge about and performance in a second language (L2) (Cohen, 1998, 2007).

Language learning strategies include cognitive strategies for identifying, distinguishing, grouping, practicing, and committing material to memory. So, for example, if ESL learners wanted to learn requesting behavior in English, they would need to identify those language structures that make requests more polite such as the use of modal auxiliaries (e.g., "Could you find the time...?") and the use of the past progressive (e.g., "I was wondering if..."). Likewise, language learning strategies include the metacognitive strategies for planning how to make a request, checking how it is going while in the midst of requesting, and then evaluating how it went afterwards. In addition to cognitive and metacognitive strategies, there are also affective strategies for regulating attitudes, motivation, and emotional reactions to the learning experience, in the case of making requests (such as through self-encouragement and reduction of anxiety), and the social strategies for enhancing learning, such as though cooperating with other learners and seeking opportunities to interact with native speakers in learning requesting behavior.
Advoeates of strategy instruction for learners would posit that if learners have a well-functioning strategy repertoire, then this set of strategies will enhance the learning of an L2, whether in teacher-lead instructional settings or in one of the alternative options, such as through self-access, web-based instructional settings, and other forms of independent language learning.

In contrast to language learning strategies, language use strategies are seen to come into play once the language material is already accessible, even in some preliminary form. Whereas language learning strategies would be used with an explicit goal of improving learners’ knowledge of a given language, language use strategies have their focus primarily on helping students utilize whatever amount of language they have already learned (see Cohen, 1998).

We note that there is inevitably a point of overlap between language learning and language use strategies. What starts as a language learning strategy at, say, the initial exposure to specific social functions in speaking, referred to as speech acts, such as requesting or apologizing, may quickly become a language use strategy since the initial learning phase may be brief. Furthermore, new learning is likely to take place as learners make use of what they have learned.

Research on L2 strategy use has demonstrated that learners differ in how they use strategies. A study by Vandergrift (2003), for example, reported on the strategies of two French L2 learners, Rose and Nina, when confronted with the task of listening to an announcement about how to win a ski weekend in a drawing. Although both listeners engaged in translation from their L1, Rose selected among her other strategies at least one ineffective strategy for the task, namely, the exclusive use of bottom-up processing. In contrast, Nina used a more effective strategy, which was to engage in top-down processing by using her world and text knowledge to interpret what she heard. One of her strategies was to develop a frame of reference from which she could interpret new input. Numerous other studies describe learners like Nina who most likely have the requisite ability to do better at L2 learning than their performance would suggest. It is studies like these that have prompted the learner strategy experts to devise inventions for enhancing strategy use by L2 learners. So, for example, there have been studies involving explicit strategy instruction for learners in listening (Rubin, 1990), speaking (Dörnyei, 1995; Cohen, Weaver, & Li, 1998; Nakatani, 2005), and the literacy skills of reading and writing (Macaro, 2001). These studies and others have demonstrated that learners who consciously make use of language strategies produce better results in their language performance than students who are less strategic.

Fine-Tuning of Language Learner Strategies

If we take a closer look at the language tasks in learner strategy studies, we notice that they have tended to be relatively straightforward tasks, such as describing yourself to someone who needs to meet you somewhere (as in the Cohen, Weaver, and Li, 1998, study), rather than complex tasks such as making a delicate request of someone who may well refuse your request. A more complex task would most likely require that the speaker use an intricate set of strategies in order to obtain the desired outcome.

So, for example, whereas a daughter might use a relatively direct request to borrow a car from her parents over the weekend (“Hey, dad, can I take your old car this weekend?”), she would more likely choose some indirect request strategy (“Hey, dad,

How was your business trip to Chicago? I was wondering if you’re going to be using your old car this weekend. Something important has come up and...”). Depending on the language and culture, it might be strategic for the daughter making the request to adjust the delivery of the speech act according to the age of the parent and their relative status in that speech community. The daughter would also need to know what it means to borrow a car in that particular context—that is, how big an imposition it is likely to be in that culture (e.g., whether a car is a daily necessity or a luxury) and in that specific context (e.g., borrowing a new and relatively valuable car vs. an older “spare” car). In some cases, it may be crucial to avoid suggesting the borrowing of the car altogether, but rather just to indicate the need for transportation and to leave it to the addressee to determine whether to offer a car or not. In the above example there is undoubtedly some family history involved, such as whether the father trusts his daughter to drive even this older car safely. Issues of family personalities and deep-seated relationships are also likely to play a part in the phrasing of the daughter’s request and in the father’s response to it. And it could take a number of attempts for this request to be resolved, whether the interaction ends amicably or in conflict.

Research has demonstrated that effective speech act performance entails at least two ingredients: (1) strategically selecting and making use of the language forms that are appropriate for the given task, such as in making a request (“Can I take...?”) vs. “I was wondering if...”), and (2) performing the speech act (in this case, a request for a car) in the right place at the right time, given the sociocultural norms for that speech community and for that family unit in the given situation. So, whereas natives of English and in this case, a daughter, would most likely soften the request through syntactic mitigation (e.g., “I was wondering if...”), nonnatives may well have learned this syntactic structure but would not necessarily have sufficient control over its use in their requests to know whether or when to employ it (Bardovi-Harlig, 2003). So, L2 learners may need to utilize a rather specialized set of strategies for learning and using complex language functions, such as speech acts, to really develop their performance of them.

A recent concern for greater rigor in defining and doing research on language learner strategies would suggest not viewing the strategies that learners use in performing L2 tasks as separate thoughts and behaviors, but rather as strategy chains or strategy clusters (Macaro, 2006; Cohen & Macaro, 2007). In the case of strategy chains, the learner is selecting and employing the strategies in sequence. Let us say that a male learner wishes to ask his female boss for a raise. A strategy chain would involve a series of social strategies in sequence. First, he might use two supportive moves, such as first trying to minimize the imposition (e.g., “Could I just have a minute of your time?”) and then doing his best to ground the request by way of justification for making it (“You know, I’ve been working 12-hour days these last few weeks...”). Third in the sequence would be the head act in the form of a query serving as an indirect request (“Would it be possible to consider giving me a slight raise?”).

In the case of strategy clusters, the learner employs the strategies simultaneously, in an overlapping manner. A strategy cluster for requesting a raise might include the following learner strategies: retrieving from the speaker’s L2 knowledge base language structures deemed appropriate for making that request, choosing from that material forms that are at the level of politeness due to a boss, making sure that the request is sensitive to the norms for male-to-female talk in that speech community and situation, and using a monitoring strategy to see how well these two strategies are working.
From initial research exploring the strategies L2 learners use in performing speech acts, it would appear that learners make efforts to combine various strategies—perhaps some learners more than others (Robinson, 1992; Cohen & Olthuis, 1993; Widjaja, 1997; Cohen & Ishihara, 2005). However, given gaps in their knowledge about sociocultural and linguistic norms for the given speech community, speech act performance among L2 speakers is likely to reflect, at least in part, negative transfer from the norms that they use for speech act behavior in their local L1 or other language community. Again, given the limits of their interlanguage pragmatic knowledge, they may generalize L2 speech act patterns from a situation for which they are appropriate to a situation for which they are not, producing a deviant result which may lead to pragmatic failure (getting a result you do not want). And according to the research evidence, it can take many years for L2 speakers to have their performance reflect the norms of speech act behavior for a given speech community (see Olthuis & Blum-Kulka, 1985; Barron, 2003). Hence, strategy instruction for enhancing the learning and use of speech acts may play a valuable role in improving L2 learning.

**Strategies for Learning and Performing Pragmatically**

If learners are interested in improving their grasp of L2 pragmatics, it may be beneficial for them to employ strategies designed to assist them in dealing with the rather complex challenges awaiting them. It was with this purpose in mind that a preliminary taxonomy of strategies of a generic nature was designed. The taxonomy includes (1) strategies for the initial learning of speech acts in a given sociocultural context in a given speech community, (2) strategies for using the speech act material that has already been learned to some extent, and (3) strategies for monitoring the use of these strategies (i.e., metapragmatic considerations) (see Appendix 1 for examples from the taxonomy).

Sources for strategies in this taxonomy include the general learner strategy literature, the speech act literature, and insights from recent strategy research conducted to enhance college students’ learning of Japanese L2 speech acts through a strategies-based online curriculum (Cohen & Ishihara, 2005) and from a language and culture study abroad project (Cohen, Paige, Shively, Emer, & Hoff, 2005). For the most part, the strategies listed in the taxonomy are in need of empirical validation as to their actual contribution to enhancing learners’ speech act ability, so they could be viewed as a series of hypotheses.

It would seem that taxonomies such as this one would be beneficial for learners tackling numerous types of language material. It has become clear that the day when general strategies seemed to suffice are over, and that we are now focusing more on the strategies needed to accomplish given tasks (see, for example, Oxford, Cho, Leung, & Kim, 2004).

**Strategic Learning and CALL**

We now come to the link to CALL. More and more we are seeing that the textbooks typically used for language learning are not inclusive enough, and that it is increasingly necessary to supplement them with other materials. And here is where CALL comes in. Technology brings with it the promise of exciting new venues for language learners. It has been pointed out that rapid evolution of communication technologies has changed language pedagogy and language use, enabling new forms of discourse, new forms of authorship, and new ways to create and participate in communities (Kern, 2006).

Given that instruction on the learning and use of speech acts can help learners to improve their pragmatic performance and ability to communicate with native speakers (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Kasper & Rose, 2002), CALL technologies have the potential of being a valuable conduit for disseminating information about how to use the L2 language structures in a pragmatically appropriate way in the given sociocultural context. The limited CALL research available in this area has addressed the benefits of various technologies for pragmatic and cultural instruction—multimedia and authentic materials (Hoven, 1999; Kramsch & Andersen, 1999; LeLoup & Ponsierio, 2001), telecollaboration (Furstenberg & Levett, 2001; Belz, 2002, 2003), and asynchronous and synchronous computer-mediated communication (Biesenbach-Lucas, 2005; Sykes, 2003). Yet, to date there are only a small number of learner self-access websites specifically dedicated to pragmatic development, such as the two sites dedicated to English (CLEAR, 2005; Levy, 1999), one for Russian (CLEAR, 2005), one for Japanese (Cohen & Ishihara, 2005), and one for Spanish (Cohen & Sykes, 2006).

Even where websites do exist, the challenge is to make the technology more than simply a vehicle for transmitting the content—in other words, seeing that it is accompanied by information about how to make use of the content strategically. The concern here is to avoid the situation where L2 learners are provided with language material, but do not really have strategies for successfully incorporating the material into their language performance. The question is really one of how strategies can best be applied to dealing with CALL. It actually involves three kinds of strategies: (1) strategies for selecting what to study, (2) strategies for how to study an L2 online, and (3) strategic material integrated into websites—where strategic options for performance of the content material are explicitly emphasized.

**Selecting What to Study**

It is not easy for L2 learners to determine just what material would have the biggest payoff in learning a given language. This issue is often left to the textbook writer or teacher to determine. While the issue of how to make language learners more savvy consumers of language material is dealt with elsewhere (see Cohen & White, 2007), let us just say here in passing that language learners could benefit from enhanced strategies regarding the selection of what would be for them the most appropriate approaches to L2 learning. The best website for one learner may not be the best one for another, given their learning style preferences, language strategy repertoire, and motivational level. While online instruction may consist of traditional curriculum posted on the internet, it may also reflect more innovative approaches, where learners can pick and choose according to what will be most beneficial for them at their given level of language proficiency and the needs that they have for performing in that language. The reason pragmatics was singled out above is because language learners invariably are faced with having to use language appropriately in many different social situations, and sometimes pragmatic failure in those situations can produce undesired results.
Strategies for How to Study an L2 Online

It has been pointed out that internet environments are not necessarily friendly for learners because familiar social cues are missing (Thatchcr, 2005). Some years, ago experts working with the distance learning of language recognized that learners would have different experiences learning language with the assistance of technology depending on their facility with strategies. Metacognitive strategies (particularly self-management strategies) have been found to provide the impetus for more effective L2 distance learning experiences (White, 1999). A study of distance learning, however, found that "language learners at a distance need to be shown more clearly and with more concrete examples why and how developing strategies, in particular metacognitive ones, can help promote more effective learning and by doing so, be time-saving rather than time-consuming in the long run" (Hurd, 2000, p. 77). So the mandate exists to have strategy instruction accompany technologically enhanced instruction. In other words, at the website the learners receive not just the L2 materials themselves, but also suggested strategies for how to learn material that is relevant to them, and strategies for realizing the most appropriate ways to use the material effectively in communication.

Websites Featuring the Strategic Use of L2 Pragmatics

Beyond strategies for determining what to study and how to study it, there can be strategizing about finding strategic material integrated into websites - where strategic options for performance of the content material are explicitly emphasized. The following are two examples of websites for self-access study of L2 pragmatics, which include embedded information on how to use the material strategically in performance. The two projects were designed to determine the effects of providing L2 speakers of Japanese and Spanish strategies-based materials for learning and using speech acts more successfully while communicating in those two languages - the former a less-commonly-taught language (LCTL) for much of the U.S. and the latter a more-commonly-taught language (MCTL). The precursor to this project was an earlier one to construct a website that would provide teachers, curriculum writers, and learners basic information and examples of numerous speech acts in a variety of languages. These web-based materials were designed so as to make the information as clear and accessible as possible, not just for teachers but for learners who might wish to access the site on their own in order to improve their learning of these complex speech acts.

The first phase of the project, begun in the spring and summer of 2003, involved the development of self-access, web-based instructional units for five speech acts in Japanese as a foreign language: requests, refusals, compliments, thanks, and apologies. The curricular materials were designed by Noriko Ishihara², the R.A. for the project, under the direction of the author³. The Japanese speech act material included in the units was based largely on empirical data from research reports so as to make sure the language material would be authentic, rather than using the more typical approach which is for the curriculum writer to draw largely on his/her intuitions. The materials were designed to be used on a stand-alone basis or as a supplement to an intermediate course in Japanese⁴ (see Ishihara, 2007, for more details).

A series of strategies deemed supportive for the learning and performance of speech acts, as well as those considered especially relevant for the learning of speech acts in Japanese, were identified and built into the curriculum. The aim was to ensure that learners would not simply learn the language material, but would also be learning how to be more strategic in the learning and performance of Japanese speech. Three sources were used for obtaining these speech act strategies: the empirical research literature, feedback from informants, and introspective and retrospective self-observation from the author and from Ishihara, to determine the strategies that they themselves used in producing both L1 and L2 speech acts.

Appendix 2 provides a sampling of some of the strategies which were included in the materials as being relevant to apologizing in Japanese, such as repeating the apology several times (something that would most likely be considered excessive in an American English situation), speaking hesitantly or leaving the utterance incomplete as a sign of humility, and using non-verbal signals such as bowing. Note that these strategies could apply to other speech acts in Japanese and to the performance of speech acts in other languages as well.

Once the Japanese speech act website was operative, a study was conducted to determine the effects of training intermediate learners of Japanese to learn and use pragmatic information more successfully⁵. As a result of their favorable reception by the Japanese teaching staff at a local university in Minneapolis, the web-based materials for learners were made a part of the regular third-year Japanese curriculum on a trial basis for the 2003-2004 academic year. It was determined that two modular units would be assigned to each student as homework in each of the intermediate Japanese classes⁶.

Twenty-seven students across the three-year Japanese classes volunteered as subjects in this study to determine the impact of these self-access web-based materials on the learning of Japanese speech acts and on the refining of strategies for learning such speech acts⁷. All subjects completed a series of tasks before accessing their two assigned speech act units: (1) a student background survey (with demographic questions, questions about languages learned, formal study of Japanese, travel and living experiences abroad, and current use of Japanese), (2) a measure of their language strategy repertoire for performing speech acts, and (3) 10-11 speech act tasks in Japanese consisting of written multiple-rejoinder discourse completion.

Eighteen of the students in the sample agreed to provide e-mail answers to a series of specific questions describing their language learning and use of strategies, focusing on the strategies used to comprehend and produce the two speech acts that they were randomly assigned to study. This study found that a strategies-based approach to the learning of Japanese speech acts on the web had at least some impact, especially for those students who demonstrated more limited ability in speech act performance at the outset. It is also fair to say that the learners generally perceived the strategies-based approach to the learning of speech acts as being beneficial. Averaged pre- and posttest ratings of speech act performance tended to vary according to speech act, with the "request unit" appearing to be the most effective. The Reflective E-Journaling from learners produced positive feedback regarding the value of the curriculum and the value of the norm-based nature of the materials in particular. The content also helped to clear up misconceptions about language and culture (Cohen & Ishihara, 2005). In response to the question of how the focus on speech act strategies influenced the learning of the content, a student named Linda gave the following response:

62
I thought the strategies were very helpful. When I first began the compliments unit, I noticed that my answers were a little funny in comparison to how a native speaker would respond. For example, I was too blunt when complimenting a professor, and too modest when speaking to my friends. When I learned that it is best to compliment a sensei ['teacher'] in an indirect way so that I am not asserting my ability to ‘judge’ their performance, I did much better in the following exercises when formulating my responses.

The truth is that when we made the Japanese website, the taxonomy of strategies for learning and performing speech acts was not developed the way that it was by the time that the Spanish pragmatics website was developed. The Spanish website has a far more developed strategy overlay (available at: http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/sp_pragmatics/home.html). It also has more modules. Aside from an introductory unit, it has units for the following:

- Compliment Sequences
- Gratitude & Leave Taking
- Requests
- Apologies
- Invitation Sequences
- Service Encounters
- Advice, Suggestions, Disagreements, Complaints, and Reprimands
- Considerations for Pragmatic Performance

In addition, each module contains the following elements:

- Introduction
- Encountering the Speech Act
- Strategies for Pragmatic Performance: sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic strategies
- Important Sociocultural Factors
- Language Varieties
- Summary

Not only does the current website construction process include varieties of Peninsular and Latin American Spanish, but it also has numerous video clips to demonstrate conversational dynamics, directness/indirectness and relative politeness, and most importantly guidelines for enhancing strategies for learning and performing speech acts. Appendix 3 provides just the opening section of strategies for complimenting and for refusing the compliment. The website provides extended exercises for learners to work their way through these strategy sections. Results from a small-scale study of the website with students at different proficiency levels would suggest that it is being well received. (Sykes & Cohen, 2007) Experts have also been reviewing the website and providing timely feedback.

So instead of expecting student users of the Spanish pragmatics website to know how to be properly strategic about learning the material at the site, suggestions are provided for ways to make use of the material in pragmatically appropriate ways. There are also suggestions to learners about how to complement the language material supplied with other relevant and timely material through using local speakers as resource people, since a website cannot begin to cover the full range of material to accommodate age, gender, status, and other distinctions in the given sociocultural context. Plans are underway to seek further federal funding to expand the Spanish website to include pragmatics materials specifically designed to meet the needs of nonnative Spanish-speaking educators, social workers, and medical personnel.

Summary and Conclusion

This article has explored what it means to be a strategic language learner in the context of CALL. We have looked at language learner strategies and the kind of fine-tuning of them that is likely to be a priority for maximizing their benefits in learning more complex language functions, as in the pragmatics of speech acts. Then we turned to the application of language learner strategies to CALL, noting briefly the need for learner strategies in selecting the L2 course material most suited to them and for supplementing this material where necessary, as well as the need for strategies to maximize the benefits from doing language study online. In addition, it was suggested that online L2 language sites which provide a strategic overlay can be beneficial in that learners are not just getting language content, but also are provided with suggested options for when and how to use this content.

We then focused on examples of websites that provide learners information about L2 pragmatics that they are unlikely to find in their textbooks and to supply them with strategies for using this material effectively in L2 interactions. It was noted that the two examples of websites for learning L2 pragmatics, in Japanese and Spanish respectively, both emphasize strategic choices in performing speech acts. It was also noted that the Spanish site is more developed than the Japanese one since it benefits from a more complete taxonomy of strategies. While there is still much work to do in order to incorporate strategic approaches to language learning into the curriculum, CALL provides a clearly viable and attractive avenue for doing this.

Appendices
Appendix 1

Sample Strategies from a Taxonomy of Speech Act Strategies

Speech Act Learning Strategies

Taking practical steps to gain knowledge of how specific speech acts work, such as by identifying the L2 speech acts to focus on, using criteria such as:

1. their frequency of use in common situations encountered by the L2 speaker in the given speech community (e.g., “requesting,” “refusing,” and “thankning”),
2. their potentially high-stakes value in discourse (e.g., “apologizing” and “complaining”),
3. their special role in the given community of practice within the speech community of the society, such as in creating solidarity (e.g., the use of expletives).

Asking natives (instructors and non-instructors) to model performance of the speech acts as they might be realized under differing conditions, possibly to answer questions about their performance as well. A key goal of the learner would be to see if there is variation in the realization of the speech act(s) according to:

1. the magnitude or seriousness of the issue prompting the speech act (e.g., apologizing for missing a meeting vs. spilling hot coffee on a friend),
2. the relative age of the speaker and the addressee (e.g., making a request to a senior professor vs. making a request to a young child),
3. the relative status of the speaker and the addressee (e.g., making a request to the senior vice president of a firm vs. one to a custodian),
4. the relative roles in the speaker and the addressee in the relationship (e.g., making a request to the chair of the board meeting vs. to a waiter in a restaurant),
5. the length of acquaintance of the interlocutors (e.g., making a request to a stranger about switching seats upon boarding an airplane as opposed to making an appeal for assistance to a longtime friend over morning tea).

### Speech Act Use Strategies

Practicing those aspects of speech act performance that have been learned:

1. Engaging in imaginary interactions, perhaps focusing on certain pragmalinguistic aspects of the speech act.
2. Engaging in speech act role play with fellow learners of the L2 or with native speakers playing the other role.
3. Engaging in "real play," with native speakers in the speech community, where the native speakers perform their usual roles (e.g., lawyer, doctor, shop clerk, etc.) but with the added knowledge that the learners are simply practicing speech acts and may say things that are contrary to fact (e.g., apologizing for something that in reality they did not do).
4. Engaging in interactions with native speakers without them being aware that the learner's purpose is actually to practice speech acts.

### Metapragmatic Considerations

With regard to metacognitive strategies, the learner needs to determine how much pre-planning of the speech act to do beforehand, as well as the nature of the monitoring that will go on during its delivery and the evaluation that will go on afterwards. In an effort to avoid pragmatic failure, the learner may monitor for:

1. the appropriateness of the chosen level of directness or indirectness in the delivery of the speech act (e.g., finding the right level of directness with an L2-speaking stranger on an airplane),
2. the appropriateness of the selected term of address (e.g., referring in the L2 to Dr. Stephen Blake as "Doc," "Steve," or "you"—either tu or vous),
3. the appropriateness of the timing for a speech act in the given situation (e.g., for example, whether to make an apology for a work-related incident to a colleague during a social event),
4. the acceptability of how the discourse is organized (e.g., conveying the bottom-line message right at the start of the communication, gradually building up to it, or saving it for the last possible moment),
5. the sociopragmatic appropriateness of the selected semantic formulas and the pragmalinguistic appropriateness of the linguistic material used to represent them (e.g., whether it is appropriate for a college student to give an outright refusal to the department chair's invitation to dinner and whether the refusal could include—even in jest—an informal phrase like "No way!").

### Appendix 2

**Samples of Strategies for Performing Japanese Apologies**

Selecting the pragmalinguistic material that is appropriate for the given semantic formula:

- **expression of apology** – making sure it is at the appropriate level of formality, given the severity of the infraction, the age, social status, and role in the relationship of the interlocutor for the given situation (e.g., *gomen* [nasai], *sumimasen*, *moushiwake arimasen*).
- **acknowledging responsibility** – use of *...te shimaate* to indicate lack of intention to commit the offense.

Repeating the apology several times in order to achieve the appropriate effect in Japanese speech act performance.

Speaking hesitantly or purposely leaving the utterance incomplete so as to appear humble when delivering the apology.

Using non-verbal signals (e.g., bowing) to help in the delivery of speech acts.

*(Based on Cohen & Ishihara, 2005)*
Appendix 3

Compliment Strategies

1. Hearer-oriented strategies are more common than speaker-oriented strategies.
2. "Qui is a commonly used structure.
3. Positive irony, or sarcasm, is another way of extending a compliment (in other words, by saying the opposite of what you mean).

Compliment Response Strategies

1. A request for clarification or repetition of the compliment.
2. Use of reciprocal action to maintain closeness in a relationship.

Notes

2. Thomas (1995) has popularized a distinction between socio-pragmatic norms for when to use speech acts (i.e., the rules for when the speech act is likely to be used in the given social context) and pragmalinguistic norms which govern the appropriateness of given language forms for realizing the given speech act in that context.
3. These efforts were funded partly by a grant from the Office of International Education to the National Language Resource Center at the University of Minnesota, partly through a University of Minnesota Grant-in-Aid, and partly through funding from the Digital Media Center at UMN.
4. The website http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/ is housed at the University of Minnesota's Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA).
5. Noriko Ishihara completed her doctoral studies in Second Languages and Cultures at the College of Education and Human Development, University of Minnesota, and is currently at Meiji University, Tokyo.
6. In addition, Elite Olshtain (School of Education, Hebrew University) provided invaluable assistance as curriculum advisor for the project, paying two timely and productive visits to Minnesota.
7. The Japanese speech act materials are web-based and accessible both to teachers and to learners at http://www.iles.umn.edu/IntroToSpeechActs/.
8. Gabriele Kasper (University of Hawaii) served as research advisor for this study.
9. All students were also assigned an introductory awareness-raising unit with vignettes depicting a variety of speech act situations.
10. All subjects were paid an honorarium for completing the speech act units and all before- and after-measures and those completing the e-journals received an additional stipend.
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