English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 25, No.1 Spring 2019

A Socio-Pragmatic Study of Speech Act of Offers by Korean L2 Learners of English

Sujung Min
(Kongju National University)

Min, Sujung (2019). A socio-pragmatic study of speech act of offers by Korean L2 learners of English. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *25*(1), 123-139.

Taking a cross-cultural pragmatic approach, the present study compared the speech act of offers realized by Korean L2 learners of English and native English speakers. The study attempted to find out whether there is pragmatic transfer from Korean (L1) among L2 learners of English in the strategies used to realize the speech act of offers in English. The participants included 56 Korean university students and 20 native English speakers. The study used the purposive sampling to select the participants. The data consisted of responses to a total of 36 items of written discourse completion test per participant to elicit the speech act of offers. The responses were coded using 10 categories to determine the strategies used. The data for giving offers were analyzed according to frequency and the choice of offering strategies per offer types. Results showed that Korean L2 learners of English were not as balanced as native English speakers in the use of strategies. Findings also demonstrated differences in the choice of the offer strategies between two groups of participants with regard to offer types. Findings call for further research on pragmatic transfer of the varied English proficiency levels and considering adequate pedagogical instructions and practices.

[speech act of offers/offer types/offer realization/pragmatic transfer]

I. INTRODUCTION

A considerable body of research on second language acquisition (SLA) and L2 learning has demonstrated that the successful language use depends on the speakers' knowledge of both linguistic and socio-cultural rules of the target language (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1990; Blum-Kulka 1982; Canale & Swain 1980; Kasper 1992; Nelson, Al-Batal, & Echols, 2002; Olshtain & Cohen, 1991; White, 1991). Undeniably, the accuracy of language use has gained

momentum in the long history of L2 teaching and learning, nevertheless language learners need to acquire knowledge of appropriateness and politeness to be pragmatically competent. The knowledge composes the way the speakers comprehend and formulate speech acts (Koike, 1989). Therefore, being able to use language appropriately comprises not only having knowledge of grammar and lexicon, which are of great importance, but also acquiring knowledge of socio-cultural components of the target language (Olshtain & Cohen, 1991). The socio-pragmatic knowledge according to which the particular culture functions is of great significance in inter-cultural communication.

Research in the related fields of SLA and L2 learning indicated that the learners' L1 plays an important role in L2 learning. That is, L2 learners may transfer the pragmatic conventions and norms of their L1 into their speech acts in L2. Pragmatic transfer refers to the influence of the L1 knowledge onto their use of L2 in both positive and negative ways (Kasper, 1992; Oldin, 1989). While a majority of empirical studies of pragmatic transfer has been carried out to probe L2 learners (Koike, 1996; Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1985; Takahashi & Dofun; 1989), various pragmatic components such as speech acts, implicatures, and discourse markers also have been explored in the field (Hassall, 2003; Oldin, 1989; Scarcella, 1990; Shahrokhi, 2012; Shahroki & Jariah, 2012).

Research revealed that while speech acts are universal, the socio-pragmatic rules dictating the appropriate representation of any certain speech act extensively differ among languages (Allami, 2012; Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Cohen & Olshtain, 1993; DeCapua, 1998; Eisenstein & Bodman, 1993; Golato, 2002; Matsumura, 2001; Nelson et al., 1996). When L2 learners transfer the socio-pragmatic rules of their L1 into L2, or they are only unaware of the rules, this often brings about communication breakdowns or cross-cultural misunderstanding (Kasper, 1992; Kotani, 2002; Qin, 2003).

Reflecting the speakers' cultural norms and values, speech acts themselves play a crucial role on demonstrating the need to improve pragmatic competence and awareness in L2 (Babaie & Shahrokhi, 2015). This also applies to the speech act of offers. Offers occur in all languages but not all languages represent offers in the same way (Barron, 2017). Offers are considered as everyday language usage for the purpose of presenting something to be accepted or refused. Offers are could be recognized as face-threatening acts due to its partly commissive and partly directive nature (Barron, 2003, 2005). Therefore, the social factors and relationship between the interlocutors play an important role in selecting appropriate strategies in giving offers (Allami, 2012). Considering issues concerning politeness and face (Barron, 2003, 2005), high level of pragmatic competence is required in order for the speakers to perform the speech act of offers.

This study aimed to compare the speech act of offers as realized by Korean L2 leaners

of English and native English speakers to find out whether there was pragmatic transfer from Korean (L1) among the Korean L2 leaners of English in the use of strategies for giving offers. The convincing evidence for transfer is demonstrated in Babaie and Shahrokhi (2015). However, little research has been done dealing with the socio-pragmatic approach to the speech act of offers in the context of Korean L2 learners of English. Intended as an initial trial to report the pragmatic transfer as far as the realization of the speech act of offers is concerned, the present study aimed to investigate the pragmatic transfer in the choice strategies in English realized by Korean L2 learners. When a given culture permit or even favor more direct strategy in a particular situation than the other, a comparable indirect strategy might lose its effectiveness when transferred from one culture into another. Western culture is prone to make offers by using more indirect strategies, whereas in Eastern culture this pattern might not always be effective (Al-Darraji, Ismail, & Abdulah, 2013). Therefore, this study also addressed the concept of politeness and face-saving in the use of strategies as realized for the speech act of offers.

II. SPEECH ACT OF OFFERS

While speech acts themselves are universal, any language provides its speakers with culture specific categories of verbal interaction and the socio-pragmatic rules governing the appropriate performance of certain speech act (Allami, 2012; Babaie & Shahrokhi, 2015; Matsumura, 2001; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Cohen & Olshtain, 1993). Therefore, any specific speech act category can only by properly understood in cultural context since cultures differ in the rules when certain speech act can be performed with politeness and appropriateness (Babaie & Shahrokhi, 2015; Benthalia & Davies, 1989 Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). In this regard, speech acts shed a great deal of light on cultural themes and prompted many studies in interlanguage pragmatics (Qin, 2003).

In any speech community, people are supposed to cooperate with one another. An example which represents such cooperative attitude is the speech act of offers (Hussein, 1984). Hussein (1984) maintained that offer is benevolent in nature since the offeree is free to accept or refuse what is offered. Searle (1979) and Emondson and House (1981) categorized offers as commissive speech acts as the speaker commits oneself to a future action. Others such as Hancher (1979) and Perez-Hernandez (2001) emphasized the role of hearer and argued that offers are more than commissives since the speaker tried to persuade the hearer to accept the proposed action, and therefore directives. The effect of commissive and directive nature of offers on interlocutors is the cooperative illocutionary act (Barron, 2017). The conditional nature of offers is also highlighted by

researchers (Schneider, 2003; Wunderlich, 1977). The execution of an offer is always conditional on the reaction of the hearer in which he indicates if he wishes the speaker to fulfill the deed offered or not. Offers also could be categorized as ritual and substantive (Barron, 2003) given that offers are realized through a sequence of offers and refusals. As Barron (2003) argued, sincerity condition is satisfied only when reoffers occur. Reoffers are to restate the speaker's intention and refusals are to show politeness, thus ritual offers. On the other hand, substantive offers refer to the speech act in which felicity condition for successful speech act of offers is met, hence both sincerity condition and illocutionary intention are communicated in the first offer (Allami, 2012).

Concerning the politeness, offers may be a threat to the offeree's negative face due to their commissive and directive nature. Therefore, the social and contextual factors including the relationship between interlocutors play an influential role in selecting appropriate strategies in giving offers. Much of the research on speech act of offers concerns politeness issues and has been conducted cross-culturally (Allami, 2012; Babaie & Shahrokhi, 2015; Barron, 2003, 2005, 2017; Terkourafi, 2001; Yongbing, 1998). Taking into consideration aspects of pragmatics, sociolinguistics and cognitive linguistics, Terkourafi (2001) studied offer and request realizations in Cypriot Greek. Variables considered in the data consisted of the gender, age, distance, and social class of the speakers. Based on the result, Terkourafi (2001) proposed that politeness is assumed to the extent that specific realizations of offers and requests are conventionalized for some use. Allami (2012) investigated the strategies used to realize the speech act of offers in Persian using the DCT and naturally occurring interactions containing offers. He reported that Persian speakers tend to be more indirect and sociocultural factors of age, gender, offer type, social distance and relative power did not prove to be significantly effective in the use of offer strategies in Persian. Yongbing (1998) compared speech act of offers and others in English and Chinese and concluded that the two languages are different in the use of conversational formulas and rules constraining the speech acts. Using the tools of DCT and questionnaires, Barron (2003) conducted an experiment by comparing realizations of speech act of offers by Irish learners of German, German native speakers and Irish native speakers. She showed that the frequency of the offer-refusals (reoffers) is significantly different between learners' data and the German native speakers in terms of reoffers where the learners were more apt to reoffer in a variety of situations. The study also revealed that pragmatic transfer significantly decreased as a result of L2 proficiency development. From the cross-cultural perspective, Barron (2003)'s study suggests that ritual offers of offer-refusal sequence represent Irish English offering speech act and German reoffers are more substantial in nature. In Korean L2 context, Min (2018) conducted an

experiment by comparing realizations of giving offers of advice by Korean L2 learners of English and native English speakers to investigate whether Korean L2 learners' perception of directness differs depending on their proficiency level. She concluded that learners' proficiency in L2 has an effect on the realizations of offering advice speech acts and perception of directness in the use of strategies by L2 learners is influenced by the development of their proficiency.

This study aimed to identify strategies used to realize the speech act of offers by Korean L2 learners of English and English native speakers and examine to what extent Korean L2 learners of English demonstrate pragmatic transfer from L1 into L2 in general and with reference to specific offer type in particular. The convincing evidence for transfer is demonstrated in Babaie and Shahrokhi (2015). Little research has been done dealing with the pragmatic transfer in the speech act of offers with reference to specific social variable in the context of Korean L2 learners of English. Intended as an initial trial to report the socio-pragmatic analysis of pragmatic transfer as far as the realization of the speech act of offers is concerned, the present study aimed to investigate the pragmatic transfer in Korean L2 learners' realization of offer speech act. When a given culture favors a certain strategy in a particular situation than the other, it is probable for the strategy might lose its effectiveness in different cultural context. This aspect is closely related with the appropriateness and politeness issues in language use. This study, therefore, also addressed the concept of politeness in the use of strategies as realized for the speech act of offers.

Although there has been a body of research in various speech acts of Korean L2 learners of English (Chung & Min, 2003; Min, 2013), the speech act of offers as realized by Korean L2 learners and the comparative analysis with that of native English speakers represent a little studied area except Min (2018). We still know little about how the speech act of offers is realized in Korean L2 learners' discourse. Based on the objectives aforementioned, the present study aims to provide the bases for understanding pragmatic transfer by focusing on the following questions.

1. To what extent the realization of the speech act of offers is different between Korean L2 learners of English and native English speakers in term of token frequency and type?

2. To what extent the use of offer strategies is different between Korean L2 learners of English and native English speakers with regard to social factor, that is, offer type?

III. METHODS

1. Participants

The participants included a total of 56 Koran L2 learners of English from three universities in Korea and 20 native English speakers. Korean participants were all BA students in English education or English-related departments and aged between 20 and 24. A group of native English speakers consisted of 20 participants who were aged between 18 and 49 with various academic backgrounds. They are either studying in graduate school or teaching English as full-time instructors in universities in Korea. The study used the purposive sampling to select the participants so that the participants were assumed to share certain key characteristics related to the purpose of the investigation (Dörnyei, 2007). There was no age-limit set for the participants since age was not considered to the concern of the study. English proficiency of Korean participants is considered to be high-intermediate based on their average TOEIC score of 830 with minimum score of 810 and 980 in maximum except for nine students who did not provide their scores. Their level of English competence can also be inferred from the environment in which they get much access to learning English learning and their experiences of studying abroad in English speaking nations which ranged from 4 to 23 months. 15 students have not been to any English speaking nations.

2. Instruments and Data

The data for the present study was gathered from a written questionnaire in a form of Discourse Completion Task (DCT). Though the naturalness and authenticity of the data elicited by DCT is under doubt due to the fact that some designed situations may be unfamiliar to the participants, the quality response requires cultural familiarity not situation familiarity (Lorenzo-Dus, 2001). For this reason, the DCT is still considered to be reliable method in the research area on cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics. Thus, DCT questionnaire was prepared for the study and was modified for naturalness and cultural familiarity by one Korean colleague and two native English speakers. Thirty six scenarios were formed controlling for three frequent types of offers (Hospitable, Gift, Help), social distance, and relative power. The three subcategories of the offer involved 12 situations each, so the questionnaire was extended to include a total of 36 items. The participants were instructed to feel free to produce as much responses in each situation they think adequate for an offer. This was done to avoid the time pressure that the participants may face due to the high number of items in the questionnaire and accordingly may trigger unreliable responses. The answer sheets were checked for

invalid ones. The data gathered was coded according to their categories based on the classification by Barron (2003). The number was tagged to each strategy.

3. Data Analysis

The data collected through DCT questionnaire was categorized based on Barron (2003) which modified the categorization of cross cultural speech act realization in Blum-Kulka et al. (1989). Barron (2003) schematized offer strategies into eight categories; Mood Derivable, Hedged Performative, Locution Derivable, Want Statement, Suggestory Formula, Query Preparatory, State Preparatory, and Strong Hint. In addition to the eight strategies, Imperative was added following Allami (2012) and Barron (2017). The nine strategies are also schematized into two categories based on the directness level. Although Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) divided the indirect strategies into conventionally indirect and non-conventionally indirect, this study adopted two levels of directness. Direct offer includes Imperative, Mood Derivable, Hedged Performative, Locution Derivable, and Want Statement. On the other hand, indirect offer includes Suggestory Formula, Query Preparatory, State Preparatory, and Strong Hint. Following the analysis of the DCT, it was observed that there is an offer strategy not to be categorized into any of the nine categories. The Korean speakers tend to use Request as a way to offer. So Request was added to the list of eight offer strategies in Barron (2003). Consequently, 10 categories were used to code the corpus of offers. Offers were elicited in the context of 36 different situations. Only the head acts of each offer statement were analyzed based on the ten categories of offer strategies. The frequency use and the percentage of offer strategies employed by two groups of participants were analyzed. A detailed description of the strategies employed for offer is as follows:

Imperative: utterances in which the imperative form itself conveys the illocutionary force as in *Take it!*

Mood Derivable: utterances in which the mood of the verb indicates the illocutionary force. For example, stop drinking. *Its' not good for you, Let me help you*.

Hedged Performatives: utterances in which illocutionary force is explicitly uttered in the form, but it is modified by hedging, as in *I'm asking you to stop smoking. It's not good for you*.

Locution Derivable: utterances in which the illocutionary force is clear from the semantic meaning of utterance. For example, *Give me your bag*.

Want Statement: utterances that state the speaker's desire that the hearer carry out the act, as *in I want you to stop drinking if you watch your weight*.

Suggestory Formula: utterances which contain s a suggestion to do something, as in

How about stop drinking? You know it's not good for health.

Query Preparatory: utterances which question the preparatory conditions of the offer that are customized in a specific language, as in *Do you want me to help you? or Could you stop drinking?*

State Preparatory: utterances which explicitly assert the preparatory conditions for an offer in a conventionalized way, as in *If you want, I can help you prepare the midterm*.

Strong Hint: utterances that consist of partial reference to an object necessary for fulfilling the offer act, as in *This fried noodle is so tasty*.

Request: utterances in which the request form indicates the illocutionary force, as in *Please come to my place this evening*.

IV. RESULTS

1. Frequencies of Overall Offer Strategies

The descriptive statistics of the findings clarifies the common offer strategies used by Korean L2 learners of English and native English speakers based on the results of a close analysis of responses in DCTs. In total 1910 offers were identified for Korean L2 learners and 721 in the data of native English speakers. Table 1 illustrates that both native English speakers and Korean L2 learners tend to use indirect offer strategies. In the results of analysis,

TABLE 1

Frequency and Percentage of Offer Strategies by Two Groups of Participants

Offer strategy	KL2L (%)	NES (%)
Imperative	0 (0)	88 (12.39)
Mood Derivable	342 (17.91)	36 (5.07)
Hedged Performative	0 (0)	4 (0.05)
Locution Derivable	192 (10.05)	91 (12.82)
Want Statement	38 (2.0)	10 (1.4)
Suggestory Formula	191 (11)	21 (2.96)
Query Preparatory	915 (47.91)	361 (50.85)
State Preparatory	134 (7.02)	78 (10.99)
Strong Hint	57 (0.3)	32 (4.5)
Request	42 (2.20)	0 (0)
Total	1910	721

Table 1 illustrates that both Korean l2 learners and native English speakers tend to be indirect when they offer. Query Preparatory strategy was found to be the most frequently used by both Korean L2 learners and native English speakers as a realization of offer

speech act. The native English speakers selected 361 Query Preparatory strategies (50.58 %) out of a total of 721 offer strategies. Korean L2 leaners employed 1910 strategies among which 915 (47.91%) were the Query Preparatory strategies. The second most frequently used strategy by both native English speakers and Korean L2 learners was direct strategy. Among the native English speakers, Locution Derivable was found to be the second most favored strategy (12.82 %). The raking was followed by Imperative and State Preparatory. On the contrary, Korean L2 learners chose Mood Derivable strategies as the second most frequently used strategy, registering 342 (17.91%) cases. Locution Derivable strategy was their third preference (10.05 %) in their speech act of offer. Although both Korean L2 learners and native English speakers showed consistency in their most popular strategy for giving offers, there were obvious variations in their use of offering strategies. In responses of native English speakers, two direct strategies of Imperative and Locution Derivable and one indirect strategy of State Preparatory amount to more than 36% of total instances of offers. On the other hand, for Korean L2 learners, two direct strategies of Mood Drivable and Locution Derivable and one indirect strategy of Suggestory Formula amount to about 40% of total occurrences of offers.

The data indicated that there were few instances of Strong Hint and Want Statement in both groups of participants. And the least frequent strategies among the participants were Performative and Request in the responses of Korean L2 learners and native English speakers each. Moreover, none of the Korean L2 learners chose Performative statements and Imperative when they offer. It is notable that while Request strategy was found only in the responses of the Korean participants, registering 42 (2.2%). It is not used at all among the native English speakers. Though Imperative was not selected by the Korean L2 learners, the strategy ranked the third among the native English speakers for giving offers.

2. Frequency of Strategies across Offer Types

An in-depth analysis of strategies realizing the different offer types by two groups of participants revealed a slight difference between the two groups. Overall the offer strategies did not spread evenly across three different types of offers as seen in Table 2, 3, and 4.

Hospitable offers include offers of food or drink, and offers relating to the role of host. Examples are ‘this dish was prepared by my mother!’ and ‘come one in and wait here’. As Table 2 clearly showed, Query Preparatory as in ‘do you want some tea?’ (60.21%) was the clear choice for hospitable offers among the Korean L2 learners. The next two categories were State Preparatory (11.26%) as in ‘I can give you some more time’ which

was mostly selected to address a close person and Suggestory Formula (10.99%) as in 'why don't you dropping in at my place for a cup of tea?'

TABLE 2
Distribution of Strategies Used for Hospitable Offers

Offer strategy	KL2L (%)	NES (%)
Imperative	0 (0)	32 (11.23)
Mood Derivable	49 (6.41)	10 (3.51)
Hedged Performative	0 (0)	2 (0.70)
Locution Derivable	25 (3.27)	36 (12.63)
Want Statement	10 (1.31)	1 (0.35)
Suggestory Formula	84 (10.99)	11 (3.86)
Query Preparatory	460 (60.21)	160 (56.14)
State Preparatory	86 (11.26)	21 (7.37)
Strong Hint	32 (4.19)	12 (4.21)
Request	8 (1.05)	0 (0)
Total	764	285

In the group of native English speakers, Query Preparatory, Locution Derivable, and Imperative were the main offer strategies selected by the participants. While the second and third preference were the direct strategies of Locution Derivable and Imperative, most of the offer occurrences of the strategies were hedged using down graders and mitigators as in 'have some more if you like it!' or applying polite verbs.

Moving to Gift offers, as shown in Table 3, Mood Derivable (43.88%) and Locution Derivable (25.32) were the two most favored strategies in the responses of Korean L2 learners as in 'It's yours!'. Following the two strategies, Query Preparatory (13.46%) was the next frequently employed strategy for gift offers. On the contrary, native English speakers selected Locution Derivable, Imperative, and Query Preparatory as the most preferred strategies for giving gift offers at roughly same rate (25% each). As in the use of strategies for hospitable offers, the most of the offers were hedged with polite verbs and down graders. The use of hedging device is to mitigate the directness of utterances and consequently to reduce the potential face threatening act.

Considering help offers, Korean L2 learners mainly gave help offers using Query Preparatory (65.85%) through utterances like 'do you want a help?' or 'do you want me to help you?' The next favored offer strategy in this category was Suggestory Formula (12.89%) like 'how about coming to my home and doing some work together?' This was followed by Mood Derivable (7.32%) through utterances like 'let me help you!' and State Preparatory (6.79%) with utterances like 'I can help you to clean up your office'. Locution Derivable was ranked the fourth through utterances like 'I am so good at cleaning up!' and 'I arrange papers well!'

TABLE 3

Distribution of Strategies Used for Gift Offers

Offer strategy	KL2L (%)	NES (%)
Imperative	0 (0)	45 (24.73)
Mood Derivable	251 (43.88%)	16 (8.79)
Hedged Performative	0 (0)	0 (0)
Locution Derivable	145 (25.32)	44 (24.18)
Want Statement	10 (1.75)	6 (3.30)
Suggestory Formula	33 (5.77)	5 (2.75)
Query Preparatory	77 (13.46)	49 (26.92)
State Preparatory	9 (1.57)	6 (3.30)
Strong Hint	19 (3.32%)	11 (6.04)
Request	16 (2.80)	0 (0)
Total	572	182

In the responses of native English speakers, most of help offers were realized via Query Preparatory and State Preparatory (59.84 % and 20.08%). Despite the shared strategies for help offers between the two groups of participant, one important difference in use stands out. That is, while State Preparatory was the preferred strategy in both groups of participants, it is employed to significantly higher extent in native English speakers (20.08% vs. 6.79%). Mood Derivable, on the other hand, was used only limited extent in the group of native English speakers. Moreover, the strategies used for help offers were mainly hedged to reduce the effect of threatening the negative face of interlocutors.

TABLE 4

Distribution of Strategies Used for Help Offers

Offer strategy	KL2L (%)	NES (%)
Imperative	0 (0)	11 (4.33)
Mood Derivable	42 (7.32%)	10 (3.94)
Hedged Performative	0 (0)	2 (0.79)
Locution Derivable	22 (3.83)	11 (4.33)
Want Statement	6 (1.05)	3 (1.18)
Suggestory Formula	74 (12.89)	5 (1.97)
Query Preparatory	378 (65.85)	152 (59.84)
State Preparatory	39 (6.79)	51 (20.08)
Strong Hint	6 (1.05)	9 (3.54)
Request	18 (3.14)	0 (0)
Total	574	254

V. DISCUSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to shed light on speech act theory, which is one of the most rigorous theories in inter-language pragmatics by investigating the speech act of offers by Korean L2 learners and native English speakers. The first research question asked about to what extent the realization of the speech act of offers is different between Korean L2 learners of English and native English speakers. As the findings reveal, there is a range of differences including a higher use of Mood Derivable strategy in Korean L2 learners, a higher use of Locution Derivable and State Preparatory in native English speakers, and a number of differences in strategy use which might be interpreted as inter-language features and cross-cultural differences. Request was among the strategies specific to the offer strategy selected by Korean L2 learners. In general, it can be assumed that both Korean L2 learners and native English speakers try to avoid imposing themselves on their interlocutors. Both groups also tend to give the choice to their interlocutors by using Query Preparatory or Suggestory Formula. Compared to the Korean L2 learners, however, native English speakers used more hedging devices to be less direct in their offers when they use strategies like Locution Derivable and Imperative. The frequent use of Locution Derivable might have been interpreted as the result of the speakers' efforts to save negative face of the hearers by being more indirect. Query Preparatory strategy accentuates the loss of the speaker by maximizing the benefit of the hearer (Leech, 1983).

Imperative was employed only by the native English speakers, but mostly hedged or mitigated with various devices which minimize the face threatening effect on the hearers. Surprisingly, Request is among the strategies employed by Korean L2 learners. The use of request form in offering maximizes the benefit of the hearers because it is conventional and safe strategy for offering help and gifts in Korean society, consequently observe the politeness issue. Such Korean culture-specific nature of offers is well represented in the use of Korean language. When people offer, they frequently employed the Request strategy to soften or minimize the face threatening effect because of commissive and directive nature of offers.

Specifically, a higher use of offer strategies with a variety of hedging markers including polite verbs and down graders were clear in the data of native English speakers relative to that of Korean L2 learners. As such, the comparative analysis sheds light on some of the socio-pragmatic as well as inter-language contexts.

However, an in-depth qualitative analysis of offer type revealed the differences also to relate to a certain degree to offer type. The second research question asked about the role of intervening variable of offer type in selecting the of offer strategies by Korean L2 learners and native English speakers. The analysis reveals the effect of offer type on the

selection of strategy realization. Specifically, hospitable offers in Korean L2 learners and native English speakers were found to be prototypically realized using Query Preparatory strategy. Specifically, Query Preparatory is more frequent in Korean L2 learners for the hospitable offers. Locution Derivable and Imperative ranked the next in native English speakers. Of course, it is mostly hedged to reduce the effects of threats to the negative face of the offeree. It is notable that Imperative was not used at all in Korean L2 learners.

For gift offers, clearly the most popular strategies were Mood Derivable and Locution Derivable in Korean L2 learners. Locution Derivable was also the most frequently used in native English speakers and then Imperative followed. The two strategies by native English speakers were mainly hedged. Given the gift offers highlight the generosity of the speakers, such use of strategies with hedging device save the speaker's positive face and the hearer's negative face at the same time by maximizing benefit to the hearer (Leech, 1983).

In order to give help offers, Korean L2 learners selected Query Preparatory as the most favored strategy followed by Suggestory Formula. Want Statement and Strong Hint was ranked the least as strategies used for giving help offers at the same rate. The high rate of selecting Query Preparatory was also shown in the responses of native English speakers. State preparatory rated the second favor for native English speakers. As Allami (2012) maintained, Query Preparatory and State Preparatory reflect the speaker's willingness to save negative face of the hearer by being indirect.

The degree of politeness and face saving efforts is the main concern in speech acts. To be more polite by minimizing potential threats to the hearer is important for language use both as L1 and L2. The differences in selecting strategies for the speech act of offers between Korean L2 learners and native English speakers may be due to the transfer of politeness strategies from L1 to L2 or the developmental nature of inter-language. In spite of the fact that certain social condition demands the use of speech acts, culture plays a critical role in the variation of production and perception of certain speech act in different situations. For now, however, little can be said of the effect of offer type on offer strategy realization for both groups of participants. Inevitably, it is important to guide L2 learners to their being perceived as more appropriate in their speech act behaviors in English. Further research is needed to determine the particular situational circumstances which favor or avoid specific strategy. In addition, a logical next step in the analysis of offers in Korean L2 learners and native English speakers is a cross-cultural analysis of offer modification in the offers at hand given the role of modification increasing directness and indirectness levels.

REFERENCES

Al-Darraji, H., Foo, T., Ismail, S., & Abdulah, E. (2013). Cultural values underlying speech act of inviting: The case of Iraqi EFL speakers. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, 4*(8), 1051-1057.

Allami, H. 2012. A sociopragmatic study of the offer speech act in Persian. *RALS*, *3*(1), 110-129.

Babaie, S., & Shahrokhi, M. (2015). A cross-cultural study of offering advice speech acts by Iranian EFL learners and English native speakers: Pragmatic transfer in focus. *English Language Teaching*, *8*(6), 133-140.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning*, *49*, 677-714.

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

Barron, A. (2005). Offering in Ireland and England. In A. Barron & K. Schneider (Eds.), *The pragmatics of Irish English* (pp. 141-176). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Barron, A. (2017). The speech act of 'offers' in Irish English. *World Englishes*, *36*(2), 224-238. Doi:10.1111/weng.12255.

Beebe, L., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Benthalia, A., & Davies, E. (1989). Culture and language use: A problem for foreign language teaching. *IRAL*, *27*(2), 102-120.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, *3*, 29-59.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and Apologies* (pp. 1-34). Norwood, NJ: Albex.

Canal, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of commuicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 1-47.

Cohen, A., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners, *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*(1), 33-56.

Chung, B,. & Min, S. (2013). Pragmatic transfer in refusal strategies by Korean learners of English. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society*, *12*(2), 129-147.

DeCapua, A. (1998). Pragmatic transfer and cultural stereotyping. *IAL (Issues in Applied Linguistics)*, *9*(1), 21-36.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Edmonson, W., & House, J. (1981). *Let's talk, and talk about it: A pedagogic interactional grammar of English*. Munich: Urban und Schwarzenberg.

Eisenstein, M., & Bodmah, J. (1993). Expressing gratitude in American English. In G. K. S. Blum-Kulka (Ed.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 64-81). New York: Oxford University Press.

Golato, A. (2002). German compliment responses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *34*(5), 547-571.

Hancher, M. (1979). The classification of cooperative illocutionary acts. *Journal of Language in Society*, *9*, 1-14.

Hassall, T. (2003). Requests by Australian learners of Indonesian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *35*, 1903-1928.

Hussein, A. (1984). The realization of request in English and Arabic: A contrastive study. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Baghdad, Iraq.

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

Koike, D. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts in interlanguage. *Modern Language Journal*, *73*, 79-89.

Koike, D. (1996). Transfer of pragmatic competence and suggestions in Spanish foreign language learning. In S. Grass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across culture: Challenges to communication in a second language* (pp. 257-281). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Kotani, M. (2002). Expressing gratitude and indebtedness: Japanese speakers' use of "I'm sorry" in English conversation. *Journal Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *35*(1), 39-72.

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

Lorenzo-Dus, N. (2001). Complement responses among British and Spanish university students: A contrastive study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *33*(1), 107-127.

Matsumura, S. (2001). Learning the rules for offering advice: A quantitative approach to second language socialization. *Language Learning*, *51*(4), 635-679.

Min, S. (2013). A study on Korean EFL learners' refusal strategies with implication for interlanguage pragmatics. *The Modern English Society of Korea*, 57(1), 353-376.

Min, S. (2018). The speech act of offering advice in learner English in Korean context. *Journal of Language Science*, *25*(4), 201-219.

Nelson, G., Al-Batal. M., & Echols, E. (1996). Arabic and English compliment responses: Potential for pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, *17*(2), 411-432.

Oldin T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. London, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Olshtain, E., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1985). *Degree of approximation: Non-native reactions to native speech act behavior*. New York: Newbury House.

Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. (1991). Teaching speech act behavior to nonnative speakers. In M. Celce-Murica (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 156-165). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Perez-Hernandez, L. (2001). The directive-commissive continuum. *A Journal of English and American Studies*, *23*(1), 77-98.

Qin, H. (2003). Pragmatic failures in interpreting business negotiation. *Journal of the Harbin Institute of Sociology*, *5*(2), 119-121.

Scarcella, R. (1990). *Teaching language minority students in the multicultural classroom*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Schneider, K. (2003). *Diminutives in English*. Tubingen: Niemeyer.

Searle, J. (1979). *Expression & meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shahrokhi, M. (2012). Perception of dominance, distance and imposition in Persian males' request speech act strategies. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*, 678-685.

Shahrokhi, M., & Jariah, M. (2012). The realization of apology strategies by Persian males. *Proedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*, 692-700.

Takahashi, S., & Dofun, M. (1989). Cross-linguistics influence in indirectness: The case of English directive performed by native Japanese speakers. Manuscript. University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Terkourafi, M. (2001). Politeness in Cypriot Greek: A frame-based approach. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge. UK.

White, R. (1993). Saying please: Pragma-linguistic failure in English interaction. *ELT Journal*, *47*(3), 193-202.

Wunderlich, D. (1977). Assertions, conditional speech acts, and practical inferences. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *1*(1), 13-46.

Yongbing, L. (1998). A study of conversational formulas – from conversational perspective. Retrieved September 23, 2009, from the www:http://www.educ.utas.edu.uers/JOURNAL/Articles/Yongbing/Yongbing.html

Examples in: English

Applicable Language: English

Applicable Level: College

Sujung Min
Department of English Education
Kongju National University
56 Gongjudaehak-ro, Gongju
Chungcheongnam-do 32588, Korea
Email: sujmin@kongju.ac.kr

Received in January 15th, 2019
Reviewed in February 26th, 2019
Revised version received in March 5th, 2019