

Studies in the Linguistic Sciences
Volume 28, Number 1 (Spring 1998)

CULTURE AND SPEECH ACTS: EVIDENCE FROM INDIAN AND SINGAPOREAN ENGLISH

Yamuna Kachru
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
ykachru@uiuc.edu

This paper aims at exploring how varieties of a language differ along sociocultural parameters in language use. It focuses on bringing together research in regional and social variation by studying how the speech act of request is realized in two Outer Circle varieties of English: Indian and Singaporean. The empirical study reported herein shows significant effect of sociocultural factors on the choice of request strategies by Indian and Singaporean subjects. The conclusion raises some questions regarding the methodology, especially the conceptualization of social distance and linear association between politeness and indirectness in crosscultural speech-act research.

1. Introduction

There is a long tradition of research on language variation in linguistics, and the study of geographical and social dialects has resulted in a great deal of insight in how varieties differ from each other. The major focus of research on regional variation, however, has so far been on the structural parameters, i.e., how varieties differ in their phonology, lexicon, and grammatical structure. For instance, differences between the newer (e.g., American) and older (e.g., British) varieties of English have generally been described with respect to such structural features only (e.g., in Quirk et al., 1985). The studies of social variation have focused on the frequency distribution of grammatical features, and have also, to some extent, looked at the ethnic variation in the use of language (e.g., Labov 1972).

A great deal of work, however, still remains to be done on how varieties may differ along sociocultural parameters in language use. Not much systematic effort so far has been directed toward determining how conventions of language use differ across varieties, and how they may have a role in characterizing varieties as distinct. For instance, there is very little information available on questions such as whether the American, British, and Canadian varieties differ as to when an apology or compliment or command is appropriate or what the instruments of these speech acts are, or how conventions of writing expository or argumentative prose differ in the three varieties. That such conventions vary across languages and cultures has been demonstrated by recent research on cross-linguistic strategies utilized for producing narratives (e.g., Chafe 1980), speech acts such as request, apology, expressing gratitude, complaining, correction, etc. (e.g., Blum-Kulka et al. 1989, Blum-Kulka & Kasper 1990, Huang 1996, Silva 1998, Y. Kachru 1991, 1994, 1995a, Kajiwarra 1994, Kasper & Blum-Kulka 1993, Okole

1990, Rose 1992, K. K. Sridhar 1991, Wierzbicka 1985a, b, among others), and conventions of writing expository or argumentative prose (e.g., Choi 1986, 1988, Clyne 1983, 1987, Connor & Kaplan 1987, Hinds 1983, 1987, Y. Kachru 1987, 1988, 1992, 1995b, 1996, 1997, among others).

Research on nonnative varieties of English is even more sketchy. Although some theoretical (e.g., B. Kachru 1986, 1987), small scale (e.g., Y. Kachru 1987, 1988, 1991, Valentine 1988) and large scale empirical studies (e.g., B. Kachru 1983, Chishimba 1983, Lowenberg 1984, Magura 1984, among others) on a few aspects of some of the varieties are available, I do not know of any systematic study that utilizes a large data base to demonstrate the relevance of sociocultural parameters in defining a variety (see, however, K. K. Sridhar 1991, S. N. Shridhar 1996 for a preliminary attempt in this direction).

This paper is an attempt to fill this gap by bringing the traditions of research in regional and social variation together and focusing on the sociocultural conventions of linguistic interaction through English in the nonnative contexts of the Outer Circle varieties (B. Kachru 1985). The focus is on the speech act of request in two Outer Circle varieties, Indian and Singaporean English. But, before discussing the study and its findings, it may be useful to review briefly the current state of research on crosscultural speech acts. This body of research is relevant for our purposes here because interactions in indigenized Outer Circle varieties of English represent a crosscultural phenomenon. Almost all users of Outer Circle varieties are bi/multilinguals, and live and function in communities socioculturally different from the Inner Circle English-speaking communities.

2. Crosscultural speech act research

Recent research on crosscultural speech acts has raised serious questions about the universal applicability of several theoretical notions of pragmatics (Levinson 1983, Green 1989), including speech acts (Searle 1969), Gricean maxims (Grice 1975), and politeness principles (Brown and Levinson 1987). Unlike theoretical discussions, where an implicit assumption is made that speech acts refer to the same social acts in all cultures, Fraser et al. (1980:78) explicitly claim that although languages may differ as to how and when speech acts are to be performed, every language 'makes available to the user the same basic set of speech acts ... the same set of strategies — semantic formulas — for performing a given speech act.' In contrast, Wierzbicka 1985a, 1985b claims that speech genres and speech acts are not comparable across cultures and suggests a semantic metalanguage for the crosscultural comparison of speech acts.¹ Flowerdew 1990 points out some of the central problems of speech act theory, including the basic question of the number of speech acts. Wolfson et al. (1989:180) suggest that 'just as different cultures divide the color spectrum into noncorresponding overlapping terms, so the repertoire of speech acts for each culture is differently organized'. Matsumoto 1988, 1989 questions the adequacy of the theoretical notions of conversational implicature as proposed by Grice, and 'face' as postulated by Brown & Levinson 1987 to account for the politeness phenomena in Japanese conversational interactions. Wetzel 1988 concludes that the notion of

'power' as discussed in Brown & Gilman 1960 is culturally bound, and therefore, not applicable to a discussion of verbal interaction in Japanese (see also Ide 1984, McGloin 1984).

Discussing the problems in attempting to use the speech act theory in the analysis of conversation, Schegloff 1988 claims that speech act theoretic analysis has no way of handling temporality and sequentiality of utterances in actual conversation. Schmidt (1983:126) points out the limited applicability of speech act theory in the analysis of conversation because speech acts 'are usually defined in terms of speaker intentions and beliefs, whereas the nature of conversation depends crucially on interaction between speaker and hearer.'

Furthermore, crosscultural speech act research so far has utilized only a limited range of variables, e.g., those of social distance and dominance (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper 1989), and, as Rose 1992, 1994 points out, even those are not well-defined and the instruments are also problematic (Rose & Ono 1995).

As regards the data for empirical research on speech acts, only a few studies have utilized the ethnographic method of observation and analysis of utterances produced in real life interactions. Notable among them are the studies of compliments in American English by Manes and Wolfson 1981, a comparative study of compliments in American and South African English by Herbert 1989, invitations in American English by Wolfson et al. 1983, requests in Hebrew by Blum-Kulka et al. 1985, and apologies in New Zealand English by Holmes 1990. The bulk of speech act research, including crosscultural speech act research, has been conducted using either role play or written questionnaires. Furthermore, only a limited range of speech acts have been researched, the most commonly studied ones being requests and apologies, as in Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper 1989.

Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper 1989 represents the culmination of the project on Crosscultural Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) initiated in 1982 by a number of researchers in several countries. Data were collected from native speakers (NSs) of Danish, American, Australian, and British English, Canadian French, German, Hebrew and Argentinian Spanish, and nonnative speakers (NNSs) of English in Denmark, Germany, and the United States, NNSs of German in Denmark and NNSs of Hebrew in Israel. The instrument used for data collection was a Discourse Completion Task (DCT) consisting of scripted dialogues of sixteen situations, eight each for requests and apologies. The tasks were constructed to account for variation in speech act realization determined by social distance and domination. The tasks did involve some role play in that the subjects were, for example, asked to assume the roles of a waiter, a professor, etc. According to Blum-Kulka (1989:68), the results of the CCSARP data 'revealed the prominence of conventional indirectness as a highly favored requesting option exploited by all the languages studied.' For apologies, Olshtain (1989:171) claims that the CCSARP data showed 'surprising similarities in IFID [Illocutionary Force Indicating Device] and expression of responsibility preferences.'

In this study, I propose to demonstrate that an integrated approach utilizing the insights of sociolinguistics is better suited to make the interaction of sociocul-

tural parameters and strategies of performing speech acts in indigenized varieties of English clearer. The data are drawn from Indian and Singaporean varieties of English.²

3. The study

3.1 The method

A Discourse Completion Task (DCT) questionnaire — a modified version of the DCT questionnaire used in Rose 1991 — was administered to approximately 100 students at a constituent college of the Delhi University and the National University of Singapore in January 1993 (reproduced in Appendix A). It is different in two crucial respects from the CCSARP instrument: it does not contain any scripted dialogue, thereby forcing the subjects to come up with a verbal response, and it does not involve any role play. The questionnaire describes situations that students in an Indian or Singaporean college or university setting may encounter, and seeks to elicit responses to such situations. A subject, for example, does not have to pretend to be a police officer, or a university professor. The data consist of responses to the 9 request situations given in the questionnaire. Although a large number of responses were gathered, for various reasons, several responses had to be discarded. The reasons for discarding responses were select responses to only some of the items, reported request rather than direct request, and facetious remarks (e.g., 'I will not say anything, I will dump all her things in the garbage' in response to item no. 2). The responses that were utilized for this study number 40 from India and 72 from Singapore.

3.2 The subjects

The subjects were bachelors degree candidates in their respective institutions and a majority had commenced learning English at the age of three. They were bilinguals and a majority of them used a language other than English at home (See Appendix B (i) for a copy of the instrument used to elicit student data, and B (ii) for a summary profile of the subjects). Note that there were significant inter- and intra-group variations in the language use habits of the Indian and Singaporean subjects. For instance, English was listed as a home language of 36% of Singaporeans, while no Indian subject listed it as such. 43% of Singaporean, but only 27.5% of Indian subjects reported using English for all purposes, including conversation with their parents, grandparents, and siblings.

3.3 The purpose

The objective of the study was to determine whether there were any significant differences between the two cultural groups (Indian and Singaporean) in the use of request strategies in 'identical' situations, and whether the request strategies use varied significantly according to the social parameters of 'relative' social distance and social status. The two terms 'identical' and 'relative' need some explanation.

It is difficult to claim *a priori* that any social situation can be deemed 'identical' across cultures in view of the fact that institutions such as family vary among cultures. Nevertheless, there are some 'universals' in that concepts such as

intimacy, social distance, status, rank, role, etc. have been found to be useful in discussing how social behavior varies in societies and cultures that have been studied so far. Subjects responding to the questionnaires in this study had dual membership: on the one hand, they were members of Indian and Singaporean cultures, respectively, and on the other, they were members of a community of college/university students with shared characteristics. International students from various countries were consulted to ensure that the situations that figure in the questionnaire were such that any student could imagine himself/herself in them and respond accordingly.

What is meant by 'relative' social status and distance is that there is no absolute scale to measure the differences between individuals ranked vertically in terms of status or horizontally in terms of social distance from a given subject in any culture. Status and intimacy/distance are negotiated on the basis of variables such as communicative situations. For instance, though an older sister has a higher status in the family, in a given academic or sports situation, her status may be lower to a younger sister who has the institutional role of, say, a chair of a committee or a captain of a team. Similarly, though a colleague at work may not be an intimate friend, he/she may be less 'distant' as compared to a fellow member of the same profession from a different institution. Conversely, members from different institutions who share ideologies and approaches may feel more 'intimate' as compared to colleagues from the same institution who adhere to competing ideologies and approaches. Again, international students from many countries were consulted to ensure that social status and distance between interactants in the situations set up in the questionnaire would be perceived similarly in any group.

3.4 The analysis

The methodology used to analyze the data comprises a variety of statistical tests to explore significant differences between the two cultural groups, viz., the Indian and the Singaporean. First, a Goodness-of-Fit Test was done by using the Chi-Square distribution for testing the hypothesis that significant differences exist between the groups. Then, a Proportion Test was done to test the hypothesis that there are differences in the proportion of the use of one kind of request strategy (i.e., the use of *Impositives*) between the two cultural groups. Lastly, Categorical Analysis using Log Linear Modelling Techniques was done with a view to quantifying the magnitude of association among the variables of culture and response types (Direct Request, Desire Statement, Query Preparatory, and Hint). Hierarchical Log Linear Analysis was done to fit a Hierarchical Saturated Model and produce parameter estimates for such a model. The Log Linear Estimation was subjected to two Goodness-of-Fit Tests, Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square, and Pearson Chi-Square.

3.5 The results

A simple analysis of the request strategy types adopted by the Indians and the Singaporeans shows that there were both similarities and differences between the two cultural groups (See Appendices C (i) and C (ii) for the distribution of re-

quest strategy types). In seven situations out of the nine (i.e., in all situations except 'Mess on the Bed', and 'Bus Trip'), the most favored request strategy in both the groups was the same: Query Preparatory (see Table 1).

Table 1
Request Strategy Types
Comparison of the Indian and Singaporean DCT Data

Strategy Type	Indian (N=360)	Singaporean (N=648)
A. Direct Request	22.22%	6.17%
B. Desire Statement	6.95%	1.86%
C. Impositive (A+B)	29.17%	8.03%
D. Q-Preparatory	63.05%	75.15%
E. Hint	7.78%	16.82%
F. Q-Preparatory + Hint	70.83%	91.97%

However, in a different combination of seven situations, (i.e., excluding the 'Bus Trip' and 'Dinner'), the second most favored strategy among the Indian subjects was Direct Request. Direct Request was also the first preference strategy in case of 'Bus trip' among the Indian subjects. Among the Singaporeans, the second most preferred strategy in six situations (except for 'Music', 'Test Postponement', and 'Bus') was hint, and in case of 'Bus Trip', it was the first preference response.

Table 2
Distribution of Main Request Strategy Types
Indian N=360; Singaporean N=648

Situation	Subjects	Direct Req	Desire Stat	Q-Prep	Hint
S1 (Music)	Indian	.27%	.00%	.70%	.03%
	Singaporean	.20%	.01%	.72%	.09%
S2 (Bed)	Indian	.70%	.08%	.17%	.05%
	Singaporean	.22%	.00%	.49%	.29%
S3 (Test P)	Indian	.08%	.00%	.87%	.05%
	Singaporean	.00%	.04%	.96%	.03%
S4 (Photo)	Indian	.02%	.02%	.93%	.03%
	Singaporean	.00%	.00%	.99%	.01%
S5 (Test H)	Indian	.25%	.05%	.62%	.08%
	Singaporean	.04%	.07%	.79%	.10%
S6 (Bus)	Indian	.28%	.02%	.62%	.08%
	Singaporean	.01%	.00%	.44%	.55%
S7 (Dinner)	Indian	.02%	.28%	.50%	.20%
	Singaporean	.01%	.03%	.72%	.24%
S8 (Library)	Indian	.15%	.00%	.78%	.07%
	Singaporean	.01%	.00%	.87%	.12%
S9 (Menu)	Indian	.22%	.18%	.48%	.12%
	Singaporean	.05%	.01%	.79%	.14%

Overall, the Singaporean subjects displayed a distinct preference for the strategies of Query Preparatory and Hint in contrast to the Indian subjects. Though the Query Preparatory was the preponderant request strategy among the Indian subjects, too, a significant number of these subjects used direct requests. If we exclude the situational factor, there was a substantial difference between the two groups in the choice of request strategies, and this is attributable to culture-specific factors. Whereas about 71% of the Indian subjects used Query Preparatory and Hint strategies, their use was a much higher 92% among the Singaporeans. While the Indian preference for Impositives was 30%, only around 8% of the Singaporeans chose this strategy in the sample responses (see Table 2).

Although this simple analysis does not reveal all the factors at play in the choice of request strategies, even this rough analysis points to the existence of significant cultural group-related differences in the choice of strategies for performing speech acts. A comparison of the use of Alerters in the request speech acts by the two groups also confirms this point of cultural group-specific differences (see Table 3).

Table 3
Comparison in the Use of Alerters
Indian N=360; Singaporean N=648

Situation	Indian	Singaporean
1. Music (+D, =S)	45.0%	48.6%
2. Bed (-D, +S)	32.5%	40.3%
3. Test P (-D, +S)	2.5%	65.3%
4. Photo (+D, +S)	12.5%	76.4%
5. Test H (-D, =S)	62.5%	44.4%
6. Bus (+D, =S)	62.5%	61.1%
7. Dinner (-D, +S)	17.5%	68.0%
8. Library (+D, +S)	15.0%	70.8%
9. Menu (+D, -S)	30.0%	73.6%
All 9 Situations	31.11%	60.96%

Where D : Social Distance; S : Social Status; + : positive value for D; - : negative value for D (+ and - : higher vs. lower for S); and = : equal.

A Chi-Square Test was performed to test the null hypothesis that the cultural group membership of the subjects was irrelevant to the choice of request strategy types. The response types used by the two groups of subjects across the nine situations were regrouped in the form of a Contingency Table (see Table 4; numbers in parenthesis show the estimated expected frequency numbers).

Thus results showed that the relevance of cultural group membership to the choice of request strategy type was statistically significant at 0.5 percent significance level.

Table 4
Contingency Table with Expected and Observed Numbers

Strategy	Culture Group	
	Indian (C1)	Singaporean (C2)
1. Impositive	105 (56.07)*	52 (100.93)*
2. Query Preparatory	227 (255.36)*	487 (459.64)*
3. Hint	28 (48.93)*	109 (88.07)*

*Estimated Expected Frequency Numbers

$$\chi^2 = 86.4279 \text{ and } \chi^2 = 10.(r-1)(c-1), \alpha 60$$

A proportions test also provides the empirical evidence for the significant association between culture group and request strategy. For the purpose of this test, we used the proportion of impositives in total request strategies adopted by each cultural group. Thus, the total number of request strategies used by the Indian group is (N_x) = 360 and that used by the Singaporean group is (N_y) = 648.

Results showed that there was statistically significant difference in the use of the impositive by the two cultural groups.

$$\hat{P}_0 = 8.819 \quad Z\alpha = 0$$

Thus the result provided evidence that the occurrence of impositive strategy is much higher in the Indian group as compared to the Singaporean group.

A log linear analysis of the data was done with a view to ascertaining whether there is a significant association between the cultural group and the response type in each of the 9 situations. The data used for this purpose are given in Appendix D. The software package used for this and subsequent analyses was the SPSS window 5.0. The results of the analysis are summarised below (* indicates statistical significance):

Table 5
Log Linear Analysis
Association between cultural groups and RSType in S1-S9

S No.	Situation	Pearson ChiSquare	P-value of the Test
S1	Music	2.26	0.518
S2	Mess on the bed	34.29	0.000*
S3	Test Postponement	10.86	0.013*
S4	Photo	3.87	0.275
S5	Test Help	10.89	0.012*
S6	Bus	34.74	0.000*
S7	Dinner	15.84	0.001*
S8	Library	not done due to empty cells	
S9	Menu	19.54	0.000*

* indicates statistical significance

The above results show that cultural group was a significant factor in determining the choice of the request strategy in all situations except S1, S4 and S8. A log linear analysis excluding the situation factor to test the association between cultural group and response type also resulted in suggesting that the null hypothesis can be rejected comfortably.

In order to further test the nature of interaction between culture, social distance, social status, and the choice of request strategy, a hierarchical analysis was performed on the combined data. In order to avoid too many zero cells, social distance was collapsed into two levels: Equal and Non-Equal. Response type was collapsed into three: Impositive, Query Preparatory, and Hint.

The fitted model is a four-way interaction saturated model. *r*-level interaction models were discarded because they would give inconsistent parameter estimates. What the fitted model shows is the four way interaction among the variables: culture, social distance, request strategy, and social status. The Chi Square test results were as follows:

Pearson	χ^2	=	7.01569	2 DF	P = .030
ML	χ^2	=	6.45132	2 DF	P = .040

Thus, the null hypothesis of no four-way interaction among the factors can be rejected for both the Pearson Chi Square test and the Maximum Likelihood Chi Square test.

4. Discussion and conclusion

The Contingency Table Goodness of Fit Tests and Proportions Tests provide evidence for the presence of significant association between cultural group and response type. The log linear analysis also confirms this. Furthermore, from the hierarchical model fitting, evidence is found that the choice of the request speech act strategy is a very complex phenomenon in which not merely the culture, but also social parameters, viz., social distance and social status interact in a multi-dimensional fashion. The model utilized here is very robust and has considerable predictive power. Some of the conclusions that can be derived from this model and the parameter estimates are the following:

1. Members of the Indian cultural group in their request transactions with strangers who are of non-equal status are 1.78 times more likely to choose Impositives than Query Preparatory as the speech act strategy. In contrast, the Singaporean cultural group in the same situation is 1.78 times more likely to choose the Query Preparatory strategy.
2. Members of the Indian cultural group in their request strategy with strangers who are of equal status are 1.43 times more likely to choose Hints than Query Preparatory. The Singaporean group, on the other hand, is more likely to choose the Query preparatory in the same situation.
3. Members of the Indian cultural group in their request speech act with strangers of non-equal status are 2.54 times more likely to choose Impositives than Hints.

The Singaporeans in the same situation are 2.54 times more likely to choose Hints than Impositives.

4. The ratio of probability of choice of Impositives to Query Preparatory by the Indian group to that by the Singaporean group is 3.1684.

Impressive as these results are, there are some problems with such studies. I will first mention a set of conceptual problems, and subsequently, a methodological issue.

The conceptual problem has to do with the simplistic notion of social distance and imposition. The conceptualization of D in Brown & Levinson 1987 conflates status, rank, and role, which interact in complex ways in many different languages and cultures. Also, there does not seem to be a strong association between indirectness and politeness (Huang 1996, Silva 1998). Similarly, directness is not always associated with impoliteness (Silva 1998). A full treatment of these observations, however, is a topic for another paper.

Methodologically, most studies on speech act research, including this one, use a captive pool of subject — the university or college students. Although there is nothing wrong with eliciting data from students, their verbal behavior can not be generalized to entire cultures. Therefore, these research efforts need to be supplemented by ethnographic observational studies, analyses of data elicited from diverse groups of users of English, and interview data. I have collected some interview data from another, smaller group of students in India and Singapore which is awaiting analysis. It would be interesting to see if the conclusions drawn from the study presented here are further corroborated by the interview data.

NOTES

¹ It is interesting to note that the same arguments can be made on the basis of data from varieties of English, certainly the indigenized varieties used in Africa, South Asia, South-East Asia, and other parts of the world.

² Dr. Jean D'souza and Dr. Anne Pakir helped me in data collection in Singapore and Gaurav Kachru in India. Mr. S.S. Sacchidananda assisted me with the statistical analysis of the data and Dr. Rosa Shim and Professor S. N. Sridhar gave me their comments on the statistical treatment. I am grateful to all of them. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, 1995, and the SEAMEO Regional Language Center (RELC) Seminar, Singapore, 1995.

REFERENCES

- BLUM-KULKA, Shoshana. 1989. Playing it safe: the role of conventionality in indirectness. In Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper 1989:37-70.
- , B. DANET, and R. GHERSON. 1985. The language of requesting in Israel society. *Language and Social Situation*, ed. by J. Forgas, 113-41. New York: Springer Verlag.
- , J. HOUSE, & G. KASPER (eds.). 1989. *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- , & G. KASPER (eds.). 1990. *Politeness*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14:2.
- BROWN, R., & A. GILMAN. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. *Style in Language*, ed. by T. A. Sebeok, 253-76. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- BROWN, Penelope, & S. C. LEVINSON. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CHAFE, Wallace L. (ed.). 1980. *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural and Linguistics Aspects of Narrative Production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- CHISHIMBA, Maurice (1983) African varieties of English: Text in context. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Ph.D. dissertation.
- CHOI, Yeon-Hee. 1986. A study of coherence in Korean student's argumentative writing in English. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 16:2.67-94.
- . 1988. Text structure in Korean students' argumentative writing in English. *World Englishes* 7.129-42.
- CLYNE, Michael G. 1983. Linguistics and written discourse in particular languages: Contrastive studies: English and German. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 3.38-49.
- . 1987. Discourse structure and discourse expectations: Implications for Anglo-German academic communication. In Smith 1987:73-83.
- CONNOR, Ulla, & Robert KAPLAN (eds.). 1987. *Writing Across Languages: Analysis of L2 Text*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- FLOWERDEW, John. 1990. Problems of speech act theory from an applied perspective. *Language Learning* 40:1.79-105.
- FRASER, Bruce, Ellen RINTELL, & Joel WALTERS. 1980. An approach to conducting research on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. *Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research*, ed. by D. Larsen-Freeman, 75-91. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- GREEN, Georgia. 1989. *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. [2nd ed. 1996]
- GRICE, H. P. 1975. Logic and conversation. *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, ed. by Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan. New York: Academic Press. 41-58.
- HERBERT, Robert K. 1989. The ethnography of compliments and compliment responses: A contrastive sketch. *Contrastive Pragmatics*, ed. by Wieslaw Olesky, 3-35. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- HINDS, John. 1983. Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text*. 3:2.183-95.
- . 1987. Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In Connor and Kaplan 1987:141-52.

- HOLMES, Janet. 1990. Apologies in New Zealand English. *Language in Society* 19:2.155-99.
- HUANG, Mei-chen. 1996. Achieving cross-cultural equivalence in a study of American and Taiwanese requests. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Ph.D. dissertation.
- IDE, Sachiko. 1982. Japanese sociolinguistics: Politeness and women's language. *Lingua* 57:357-85.
- KACHRU, Braj B. 1981. Socially realistic linguistics: The Firthian tradition. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 31.65-89.
- . 1983. *The Indianization of English: The English Language in India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1985. Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*, ed. by Randolph Quirk & Henry Widdowson, 11-30. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1986. *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions and Models of Non-Native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- . 1987. The bilingual's creativity: Discoursal and stylistic strategies in contact literature. *Discourse Across Cultures: Strategies in World Englishes*, ed. by Larry E. Smith, 125-40. New York & London: Prentice Hall. [Earlier versions in *The Alchemy of English* 1986:159-73, *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 13:2.37-55 (1983), and *Language Style and Discourse*, ed. by O.N. Koul, 21-46, New Delhi: Bahri Publications, 1986.]
- (ed.). 1992. *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press. [2nd edition]
- KACHRU, Yamuna. 1987. Cross-cultural texts, discourse strategies and discourse interpretation. In Smith 1987: 87-100.
- . 1988. Writers in Hindi and English. In Purves. 1988:109-37.
- . 1991. Speech acts in world Englishes: Toward a framework for research. *World Englishes* 10:3.299-306.
- . 1992. Culture, style and discourse: Expanding noetics of English. In B. Kachru 1992:340-52.
- . 1993. Social meaning and creativity in Indian English. *Language, Communication and Social Meaning*. GURT 1992, ed. by James Alatis, 378-87. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- . 1994. Crosscultural speech act research and the classroom. *Pragmatics and Language Learning Monograph* 5, 1994:39-51.
- . 1995a. Lexical exponents of cultural contact: Speech act verbs in Hindi-English dictionaries. *Culture, Ideology and the Dictionary*, ed. by Braj B. Kachru & Henry Kahane, 261-274. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- . 1995b. Contrastive rhetoric in world Englishes. *English Today* 11:1.21-31.
- . 1996. Language and cultural meaning: Expository writing in South Asian English. *South Asian English: Structure, Use and Users*, ed. by Robert J. Baumgardner, 127-40. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

- . 1997. Culture and argumentative writing in world Englishes. *World Englishes 2000*, ed. by Michael Forman & Larry E. Smith, 48-67. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- KAJIWARA, Kaori. 1994. Apologizing in the home: A cross-cultural study of American and Japanese families. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, M.A. thesis in Linguistics.
- KASPER, G., & S. BLUM-KULKA (eds). 1993. *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LABOV, William. 1972. Rule for ritual insults. *Studies in Social Interaction*, ed. by David Sudnow, 120-69. New York: Free Press.
- LEVINSON, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LOWENBERG, Peter H. 1984. English in the Malay Archipelago: Nativization and its functions in a sociolinguistic area. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Ph.D. dissertation in Linguistics.
- MAGURA, Benjamin. 1984. Style and meaning in African English: A sociolinguistic study. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Ph.D. dissertation in Linguistics.
- MANES, J., & N. WOLFSON. 1981. The compliment formula. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *Conversational Routines*, 115-32. The Hague: Mouton.
- MATSUMOTO, Yoshiko. 1988. Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12:403-26.
- . 1989. Politeness and conversational universals: Observations from Japanese. *Multilingua* 8:207-21.
- MCGLOIN, Naomi H. 1984. Some politeness strategies in Japanese. *Papers in Linguistics*. 19:1.127-46.
- OKOLE, Bertram A. 1990. Self justification and denial of responsibility in conversational encounters: An Igbo example. *Language Sciences* 12:4.345-66.
- OLSHTAIN, E. 1989. Apologies across languages. In Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper 1989:155-73.
- QUIRK, Randolph, S. GREENBAUM, G. LEECH, & J. SVARTVIK. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- ROSE, K. R. 1992. Method and scope in cross cultural speech act research: A contrastive study of requests in Japanese and English. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Ph.D. dissertation.
- . 1994. On the validity of DCTs in non-native contexts. *Applied Linguistics* 15.1-14.
- , & R. ONO. 1995. Eliciting speech act data in Japanese: The effect of questionnaire type. *Language Learning* 45.191-223.
- SCHEGLOFF, Emanuel A. 1988. Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12.55-62.
- SCHMIDT, Richard W. 1983. Interaction, acculturation, and the acquisition of communicative competence: A case study of an adult. In & Judd 1983: 137-74.
- SEARLE, John R. 1969. *Speech acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

- SILVA, Rosangela S. 1998. Pragmatic competence and transfer abilities: Native and non-native speakers of Portuguese. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Ph. D. dissertation.
- SMITH, Larry E. 1987. *Discourse Across Cultures: Strategies in World Englishes*. London: Prentice Hall International.
- SRIDHAR, Kamal K. 1991. Speech acts in an indigenized variety: Sociocultural values and language variation. *English around the World: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, ed. by Jenny Cheshire, 308-18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SRIDHAR, S.N. 1996. Toward a syntax of South Asian English: Defining the lectal range. *South Asian English: Structure, Use, and Users*, ed. by Robert J. Baumgardner, 55-70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- THOMAS, Jenny. 1983. Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics* 4:2. 91-112.
- VALENTINE, Tamara. 1991. Getting the message across: Discourse markers in Indian English. *World Englishes* 10:3.325-34.
- WETZEL, Patricia J. 1988. Are 'powerless' communication strategies the Japanese norm? *Language in Society* 17.4.555-64.
- WIERZBICKA, Anna. 1985a. Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts: Polish vs. English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9:145-78.
- . 1985b. A semantic metalanguage for a cross-cultural comparison of speech acts and speech genres. *Language in Society* 14:491-514.
- WOLFSON, Nessa, L. D'AMICO-REISNER, & L. HUBER. 1983. How to arrange for social commitments in American English: The invitation. In Wolfson & Judd 1983:116-28. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- , & E. JUDD (eds.). 1983. *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*, Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- , T. MARMOR, & S. JONES. 1989. Problems in the comparison of speech acts across cultures. In Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper (eds.) 1989: 174-96.

APPENDIX A
DCT Questionnaire

There are ten situations described below. Please read the descriptions of each situation and write down what you would say in that situation.

1. You are studying in your room for an important examination. You hear loud music coming from a room opposite your room. You don't know the student who lives there, but you want the loud music to be turned down. What would you say to the student?
2. You are on a school trip and you share a room with one of your friends. One evening when you come back to your room, you find your friend's clothes, books, etc. on your bed. You want the mess to be cleaned up. What would you say?
3. There is a test in class in two weeks, but you will miss class that day because you have to go out of town for your cousin's wedding. You want to know if your professor will allow you to take the test on another day. What would you say?
4. A friend from out of town is visiting you. You are showing your friend around the campus and the city. You want someone to take your photograph together. You see a man dressed in a suit with a briefcase. You want him to take your picture. What would you say?
5. Next week there is a test in your class which is difficult for you. You know your friend is doing well in that subject. You and your friend are having lunch together and you want to see if your friend will help you prepare for the test. What would you say?
6. You get on the bus to go home and you are carrying a lot of books. You are tired and you would like to sit down. The bus seems full, but then you notice that a student is taking up two seats. What would you say to free the seat so that you can sit down?
7. You are having dinner with your friend's family. The food is delicious and you would like some more. What would you say to your friend's mother, who is serving the food?
8. You go to the library to return a lot of books, and your hands are full. You see someone who looks like a professor standing near the door of the library. You need help to open the door. What would you say to this person?
9. You go to a fancy restaurant to celebrate your birthday with some friends. You wait for fifteen minutes, but no one comes to ask you what you want. A waiter passes by. You want him to bring you copies of the menu. What would you say?

Thank you very much.

APPENDIX B (i)

Data Sheet

Please fill in the following information.

1. Name (optional) _____

2. Check One: Male _____ Female _____

3. Class _____ (e.g., 1st year BA, or whatever)

4. Home language _____

5. Age at which you began learning English _____

6. Medium of Education at High School _____

7. Languages in addition to English that you speak, read and write fluently:

8. Please circle the letters that represent the purposes for which you use English.

A. Conversing with parents, grandparents, etc.

B. Conversing with siblings

C. Writing letters to members of family

D. Conversing with friends

E. Writing letters to friends

F. Listening to Radio

G. Viewing Television Programmes

H. Reading for Pleasure

I. Writing for Pleasure

J. All academic work (Reading, Writing, Discussion, etc.)

Thank you.

APPENDIX B (ii)

Profile of Subjects

	Indian	Singaporean
1. Total Number	40	72
2. Male	17	16
3. Female	23	56
4. 1st year	24	12
5. More Advanced	16	60
6. Home Languages*	7	2
7. HL+English#	5	11
8. Age at which E introduced		
3 yrs. or below	31	32
4 yrs.	6	7
above 4 yrs.	3	33+
9. Medium of Education		
English	40	69
Other Lg(s)	--	3
10. E used for purposes A-J [see 8 in Appendix B (i)]		
All ten purposes	11	31
All other than A	5	7
All other than C	--	6
All other than A & C	--	6
Selective purposes@	24	22

Notes:

* Indian languages such as Hindi, Panjabi, etc., and Chinese dialects such as Mandarin and Cantonese in Singapore.

e.g., bi-/trilingual use of Hindi and/or Panjabi and English by Indian and Mandarin and English by Singaporean subjects.

+ There was more variation among Singaporean subjects as regards the age at which English education began:

5 yrs.	19
6 yrs.	5
7 yrs.	7
Above 7 yrs.	2

@ There were 23 different combinations of purposes reported by Indian subjects and 17 different ones by Singaporean subjects.

APPENDIX C (i)

Distributon of Request Sequence Types

Strategy	Indian Data								
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9
Direct Request	11	28	3	1	10	11	1	6	9
Desire Statement	0	3	0	1	2	1	11	0	7
Performative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>[Impositives</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>16]</i>
Q-Preparatory	28	7	35	37	25	25	20	31	19
Hint	1	2	2	1	3	3	8	3	5
<i>[Q-P + Hint</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>24]</i>

APPENDIX C (ii)

Distributon of Request Sequence Types

Strategy	Singaporean Data								
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9
Direct Request	14	16	0	0	3	1	1	1	4
Desire Statement	1	0	3	0	5	0	2	0	1
Performative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>[Impositives</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>5]</i>
Q-Preparatory	52	35	69	71	57	32	52	62	57
Hint	5	21	0	1	7	39	17	9	10
<i>[Q-P + Hint</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>67]</i>

APPENDIX D

Data Used for Log Linear Analysis

SITUATION	CULTURE	RSTYPE	SOCDIST	SOCSTAT	COUNT
1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	2	1	1	0
1	1	3	1	1	28
1	1	4	1	1	1
1	2	1	1	1	14
1	2	2	1	1	1
1	2	3	1	1	52
1	2	4	1	1	5
2	1	1	2	1	28
2	1	2	2	1	3
2	1	3	2	1	7
2	1	4	2	1	2
2	2	1	2	1	16
2	2	2	2	1	0
2	2	3	2	1	35
2	2	4	2	1	21
3	1	1	2	2	3
3	1	2	2	2	0
3	1	3	2	2	35
3	1	4	2	2	2
3	2	1	2	2	0
3	2	2	2	2	3
3	2	3	2	2	69
3	2	4	2	2	0
4	1	1	1	2	1
4	1	2	1	2	1
4	1	3	1	2	37
4	1	4	1	2	1
4	2	1	1	2	0
4	2	2	1	2	0
4	2	3	1	2	71
4	2	4	1	2	1
5	1	1	2	1	10
5	1	2	2	1	2
5	1	3	2	1	25
5	1	3	2	1	3
5	2	1	2	1	3
5	2	2	2	1	5
5	2	3	2	1	57
5	2	4	2	1	7
6	1	1	1	1	11

SITUATION	CULTURE	RSTYPE	SOCDIST	SOCSTAT	COUNT
6	1	2	1	1	1
6	1	3	1	1	25
6	1	4	1	1	3
6	2	1	1	1	1
6	2	2	1	1	0
6	2	3	1	1	32
6	2	4	1	1	39
7	1	1	1	2	1
7	1	2	1	2	11
7	1	2	1	3	20
7	1	4	1	2	8
7	2	1	1	2	1
7	2	2	1	2	2
7	2	3	1	2	52
7	2	4	1	2	17
8	1	1	1	2	6
8	1	2	1	2	0
8	1	3	1	2	31
8	1	4	1	2	3
8	2	1	1	2	1
8	2	2	1	2	0
8	2	3	1	2	62
8	2	4	1	2	9
9	1	1	1	3	9
9	1	2	1	3	19
9	1	4	1	3	5
9	2	1	1	3	4
9	2	2	1	3	1
9	2	3	1	3	57
9	2	4	1	3	10

Note:

R(equest) S(ategy) Type: 1 = Direct Request, 2 = Desire Statement, 3 = Q-P, and
4 = Hint

Soc(ial) Dist(ance): 1 = positive value, 2 = negative value

Soc(ial) Stat(us): 1 = equal, 2 = unequal