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ABSTRACT

Heritage language (HL) is a linguistic system that arises in the context of early childhood bilingualism, both sequential and simultaneous, when one of the languages is not fully acquired. The performance of speech acts in HLs is yet to be understood, and this dissertation is a first step in this direction. The study investigates the pragmatic competence of adult Heritage Russian (HR) speakers dominant in American English by focusing on their ability to comprehend and produce requests for favor that appeal primarily to the addressee's good will.

The data were collected through a questionnaire and role-play enactments in native-speaker (NS) and HR populations. A comparison with the established NS baseline indicates that HR speakers lack full knowledge of Russian-specific linguistic conventions and sensitivity to finer aspects of illocutionary meanings. Nevertheless, they can perform speech acts because they efficiently combine pragmatic and structural linguistic knowledge from their two languages. This combination of linguistic material is unique to HR speakers and involves internal restructuring of Russian pragmatic norms and linguistic convergence conditioned by language contact. Specifically, HR speakers re-analyze the Russian impersonal modal *možno* (which normally marks permission requests) as a generalized marker of any request. The influence of English leads HR speakers to overuse politeness marker *pożalujsta* in indirect requests, contrary to NS preference. Also unlike NS, HR speakers tend to avoid the negative particle *ne* in indirect requests with a finite modal (due to incomplete acquisition and transfer) and to orient their requests to the speaker (transfer effect). Combination of linguistic material
leads to the emergence of new pragmatic conventions, specific to HR, which involve
možno + požalujsta for requests addressed to peers and embedding under performative +
požalujsta for formal situations.

The resulting composite pragmatic matrix of HR requests proposed in this study is
based on an abstract linguistic structure that combines Russian and English pragmatic
conventions. Requests produced by HR speakers do not involve overt code-switching at
the surface, but exhibit cross-linguistic influence at the abstract level. The abstract
convergence of two languages within HL pragmatics indicates that languages in contact
interact within all levels of an utterance.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Heritage speakers (HSs) can be described as "a riddle, wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma," to borrow Winston Churchill's words said about Russia in 1939; but there definitely exists a key to understanding the phenomenon of speakers who are neither native nor second language users of a language. That key is research. In the last 15 years there has been an explosion of studies of heritage languages in the U.S. Specifically, the field of Russian as a heritage language (HL) has attracted the attention of several prominent Slavicists and linguists, such as Maria Polinsky, Olga Kagan, Dan Davidson, Kathleen Dillon, Ben Rifkin, Aneta Pavlenko, and others. These and other researchers have focused on the issues of classification and placement of Russian heritage speakers (Kagan, 2005; Kagan & Dillon, 2002; Kagan & Friedman, 2004), methodology of teaching Russian as a HL (for example, Kagan, Akišina & Robin 2003; Niznik, Vinokurova, Voroncova, Kagan & Cherp, 2009), and largely on describing grammatical competence of Russian heritage speakers, identifying restructured elements, and looking for causes of such restructuring (Polinsky, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2005, 2006, 2008a,b,c, d, 2011; Bermel & Kagan, 2000; Kagan & Dillon, 2010; Isurin, 2011; Isurin & Ivanova-Sullivan 2008; Pereltsvaig, 2008; Laleko, 2010, 2011; Smyslova 2009 *inter alia*). The research carried out by these scholars has contributed greatly to our understanding of the structure of heritage Russian and serves as the basis for pedagogical considerations in heritage language education. However, one area has been overlooked in HL research thus far. Since Hymes (1974) grammatical competence has been viewed as only one piece of the complex linguistic knowledge of a speaker. Adequate performance is based
not only on the knowledge of grammar rules and the ability to form cohesive and coherent sentences, but also on the knowledge of communicative strategies and the socio-cultural appropriateness of linguistic forms. This dissertation attempts to fill the gap in the study of language contact, bilingualism, and heritage languages by bringing attention to the pragmatic competence of Russian heritage speakers. More specifically, the study focuses on the comprehension and production of requests by adult heritage speakers (HSs) of Russian who live in the U.S. The choice of the directive speech acts is not accidental.

First, requests are pervasive in language and represent one of the most risky communicative behaviors: speakers expose their positive face when attempting to get somebody else to perform an action for their benefit and, perhaps, not for the immediate benefit of the hearers. Second, despite all the grammatical deficiencies, lexical lacunae and syntactic limitations, even lower-proficiency HSs often have sufficient communicative competence that allows them to function in Russian, performing many daily communicative tasks. Therefore, it is expected that Russian HSs can formulate requests with relative ease, thus providing rich data for analysis. Third, the syntactic form of a prototypical Russian request is different from a prototypical English request (Mills, 1991). Moreover, the level of politeness in Russian requests is frequently modified by morpho-syntactic forms, such as word order, the subjunctive, and verbal aspect, that may be unavailable to HSs due to incomplete acquisition and/or attrition, as prior research has indicated (Polinsky, 1995, 2006, 2008a; Pereltsvaig, 2008; Laleko, 2011; Isurin & Ivanova-Sullivan, 2008). This means that when being asked to do something, Russian HSs may not be tuned in to the subtle meanings of the linguistic forms they hear; and
when making requests, they may not be able to express the appropriate levels of politeness and deference. How then do HSs perform a function for which they may have no readily available linguistic form? What knowledge of Russian-specific conventions for creating a request do HSs have? How do they compare to age-matched native speakers (NSs) of Russian in their ability to interpret and express subtle differences in the level of politeness of requests? The findings presented in this study will give answers to these questions and will provide an empirical basis for several future research agendas.

First, by investigating speech acts in a reduced language, such as heritage Russian, we have an unprecedented opportunity to understand what elements of pragmatic knowledge remain and how they function in a language when it is deprived of its normal enriching and supportive social environment. After Pinto and Raschio's study of requests in Heritage Spanish (2007), the current work presents one of the first investigations of speech acts in heritage languages to date. It is hoped that this study can be replicated in future work on requests in other heritage languages which will allow to advance our knowledge of the unique linguistic systems known as heritage grammar.

Second, this study adds new information to our still very limited knowledge of pragmatic competence of Russian HSs. Together with Laleko's study of discourse-pragmatics in heritage Russian (2010, 2011), this work strives to understand how and why utterances produced by HSs, which seem to be well-formed at the surface, still violate NS norms and preferences at the levels of discourse-related and illocution-related domains.

Finally, the current study will serve as an important step toward a more informed heritage language pedagogy. As HSs stop being unexpected and 'illegitimate' members
of Russian language classrooms and start populating such immersion government sponsored language programs as National Security Language Initiative for Youth, Critical Language Scholarship and National Language Flagship in growing numbers, the field of second language acquisition in Russian needs to develop more effective and specific methods for addressing the needs of this population of learners. While some teaching materials for heritage Russian have already been developed (for example, Kagan, Akišina & Robin 2003; Niznik, Vinokurova, Voroncova, Kagan & Cherp, 2009; Kagan & Kudyma, 2011 inter alia), they do not specifically address the issue of the pragmatic competence of HSs. Before we can do that, we first need to understand the extent of HSs' pragmatic knowledge and possible lacunae. By establishing a descriptive norm for requests in heritage Russian, this study serves as a step toward research-informed pedagogy targeted specifically at HSSs.

To recapitulate, it is hoped that a study of requests in heritage Russian will make simultaneous contributions to several fields, including heritage languages, language contact, bilingualism and heritage language pedagogy.

CHAPTER 2. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

This dissertation brings together two large and disparate topics, and as a result, there are several content areas from each topic that constitute the background of the study. From the standpoint of heritage language research, I will examine heritage languages and heritage speakers (HSSs), in general, and the language characteristics of heritage speakers of Russian, in particular. From the standpoint of research on pragmatic
competence, the background areas to be reviewed include speech act theory, requests speech act studies, (in)directness and politeness of speech acts, and cross-cultural and interlanguage studies of requests. In order to bring these content areas together, I will also examine research on Russian requests, and finally, look at studies of requests in heritage languages. All of the areas that constitute the background to this study are constantly expanding, adding new findings and refining old ones. A comprehensive overview of these topics is beyond the scope of this dissertation, and therefore, only the most salient works that characterize the evolution of thinking on heritage languages and requests will be reviewed.

2.1. Heritage Languages and Heritage Speakers

2.1.1. Necessary distinctions

Before I begin the discussion of how to define heritage speakers (HS), I will describe three important sociolinguistic concepts with regard to language use in a bilingual setting (after Polinsky, 2000; Benmamoun, Montrul & Polinsky, 2010). The first important distinction we must make is between first and second language which refers to the temporal order of acquisition. The second distinction that is important to the discussion is between a primary and a secondary language, and refers to the prevalence of usage (Polinsky, 2000). Usually, a bilingual person's first language is also his/her dominant, or primary, language which is used in the majority of social situations. However, in the course of a person’s life, and as social circumstances change (e.g., marriage, immigration, etc.), the first language may lose its primary function and become secondary in the prevalence of use. Immigration is one of the social contexts
characterized by such a change. The shift in language use may happen because an immigrant may not have much opportunity to use his/her first language in everyday life or because he/she may decide to abandon it altogether for whatever reasons. Schooling plays a crucial role in forming the dominant status of a language and is connected to the third distinction important to this discussion - the one between majority and minority languages. In any language contact situation, each of the languages involved acquires either a majority or a minority status, depending on the relative political, socioeconomic and sheer numerical power of its speakers (Fishman, 1991). Language contact in immigration contexts differs from other language contact settings because immigrant languages have the lowest status, and because speakers of these languages are often viewed as intruders into a stable cultural, economic, political and linguistic environment (monolingual or bilingual). Although it does sometimes happen that both languages create an impact on each other in a language contact situation, usually the minority language experiences a greater degree of assimilative influence from the majority language (Weinreich, 1979).

The degree of the influence caused by the majority language on the minority one determines the degree of stability of personal bilingualism (i.e. stability of a person's two languages). The very low status of immigrant languages, combined with the great assimilative pressure from the host (majority) language community, makes immigrant bilingualism very unstable. Speakers of immigrant languages, most often having no political or socioeconomic power, face insurmountable challenges in keeping their languages alive across generations. The situation in the U.S. with its large and diverse immigrant populations demonstrates very well what happens to immigrant languages in a
host community without social and political support. Immigrants, who often speak only the language(s) of their native country at the time of arrival in the U.S., quickly learn at least some English, driven by economic and/or personal necessity. Whether they attain high levels of proficiency in English or not, they usually lose some control of their native language(s) in the process\(^1\), and eventually lose the language completely by the forth or fifth generation (Fishman, 1991). A large role in the maintenance and loss of immigrant languages belongs to schooling. As a rule, the status of the majority language is reinforced by schooling while that of the minority (immigrant or ethnic) language is downgraded\(^2\).

All three distinctions - first vs. second language, primary vs. secondary language, and majority vs. minority language - are important to the definition of heritage speakers, which will be discussed in the next section.

### 2.1.2. Definition and Complexities of the Phenomenon of Heritage Speakers

The most widely accepted and broad definition of heritage speakers is the one proposed by Guadalupe Valdés that describes them as individuals “who [were] raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who [speak] or merely [understand] the heritage language, and who [are] to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language”\(^3\) (2001, pp. 39-40). A heritage speaker may be born outside of the United

---

\(^1\) For a discussion of bidirectional transfer and first language attrition in L1 Russian, see Pavlenko and Jarvis (2002), Pavlenko (2000, 2003), and Isurin (2011).

\(^2\) Two-way immersion school programs that are growing in some parts of the U.S. are an exception worthy of mention.

\(^3\) Although Valdés here uses the word English and describes the socio-linguistic context of the U.S., the definition can be applied to any other country which has immigrant communities. For the purposes of this dissertation, the current definition is most useful.
States and immigrate to the country in early childhood or may be born to an immigrant non-English-speaking family in the U.S.

To show multiple complexities inherent in the heritage language situation and to tie up the three aforementioned sociolinguistic distinctions, Valdés' definition needs to be unpacked and several important points must be added. First, it is understood from this definition that HSs are early bilinguals because they have input in both the home language and the majority language early in life. Even if inside their home children receive monolingual input in the immigrant language, English enters their lives any and every time they leave the house: on a playground, in a store, on public transportation, on TV, radio, etc. Two important points to be made here are that usually the child has significantly more input in the home language only in early childhood simply because with the onset of schooling less time is spent at home, and that the proportion of input in the two languages varies even in early childhood, depending on the family and the availability of language resources in the home language outside the home.

Second, it is also important to keep in mind that parents of these young bilinguals (and future heritage speakers) do not always speak the standard variety of the immigrant language, nor are they the ideal monolingual speakers of that language. Regardless of how low or high their proficiency in English (their second language) is, they often engage in code-switching and exhibit effects of cross-linguistic influence (Pavlenko & Jarvis, 2002; Pavlenko, 2003; Isurin, 2011) and even attrition (Seliger & Vago, 1991; Laleko, 2011) in their first language, which is sometimes quite extensive. Hence, heritage speakers are exposed to a particular variant of the immigrant language of their parents at

---

home, which is not necessarily the standard variety spoken by educated monolingual
speakers of the metropoly, and is not necessarily free from the influence of the majority
language.

The third important point that needs to be explicated in Valdes' definition is that
the quality and quantity of input in the home language becomes drastically reduced with
the onset of schooling (and sometimes even earlier) as formal education is conducted in
the overwhelming majority of cases only in English. This means that from the age of five
or six (and sometimes even earlier) and onward, children from immigrant families start to
explore the world mostly through their second language. Due to schooling, children are
exposed to a much more contextually diverse input in the majority language than in the
home language: they learn about outer worlds, animals, and atmospheric phenomena
only in the majority language. This learning in the majority language happens through
both oral and written channels, each of which with its variety of styles: lectures,
discussions, essays, reflection papers, literary texts, documentaries, etc. Schooling in the
majority language also gives bilingual children access to the high register variety of that
language and develops their sensitivity toward different registers.

In comparison, input in the home language is drastically decreased quantitatively
and qualitatively, and the functional range of that language also becomes greatly reduced.
Since schooling is not usually available in the children's home language, they have access
only to the variety spoken by their parents, only to its colloquial register and usually only
in the oral communication context; hence, we find a reduction of the full dialectal range
and mediums of expression in the heritage language (Valdés, 2000). In addition, heritage
speakers have many more interlocutors in their dominant (majority) language: teachers,
school administrators, peers, and friends' parents (not to mention salespeople, bus drivers, postmen, etc.). The asymmetry of language input and use steadily increases with each year of schooling and climaxes in the teenage years when children are interested in spending significantly more time with their friends than with their parents or grandparents (Benmamoun et al., 2010).

This asymmetry of input has direct consequences not only for the repertoire of media, styles and registers of the home language, but also for the structural development of the heritage language. According to O'Grady and Lee (2011), at least some features of language acquisition are shaped by clear and frequent input ("The Input Strength Hypothesis"). As early immigrant bilinguals receive fewer and fewer instances of unambivalent form-meaning mappings in their home language, they are unable to construct relevant generalizations about language structures and, as a result, do not develop the same competency in the language as their monolingual peers. In fact, the effect of experience, including both the quality and quantity of input, plays a major role in language processing (Sorace & Serratrice, 2009), and HSs lack this experience in both categories.

To recapitulate, the interruption of first language (L1) acquisition, characterized by an impoverished and reduced input, and the concurrent expansion of the second/majority language cause the first (home) language to weaken both socially and structurally. The result is a morphologically restructured, and a lexically and stylistically reduced language.

At the same time, it is important to note that all the linguistic deficiencies of heritage language speakers are usually distributed over the different skill categories
unevenly and may be concealed by linguistic strengths in other areas that may remain robust and native-like. For example, HSs often possess a degree of fluency (as measured in words per minute) that is close to NSs speech rate, native-like or entirely native pronunciation, certain sensitivity to idiomatic expressions, cultural associations, a fairly good understanding of native contexts of language use and function, and other features of native competency (Benmamoun et al., 2010). Because of these skills, HSs are often perceived as native speakers of their home languages especially by outsiders (i.e., people outside of their speech communities). Yet, monolingual speakers of those languages that become heritage languages in the context of immigration immediately recognize linguistic deficiencies of heritage speakers. For example, many Americans consider the children of their Russian-speaking neighbors fluent in Russian, yet any fully developed Russian monolingual will reject the same children as full speakers of Russian, and may lament the loss of the 'great Russian language' or even view HSs as intellectually lazy. Indeed, the relation between HL speakers' linguistic competency and identity is complex with the two factors not always interdependent.

Wong (2010) points out that the ethnolinguistic identity of HSs is a dynamic phenomenon which can be defined best as an interrelation between self-agency and public (or collective) views. Thus, the public view of HSs as speakers or forgetters of their home language is only half the picture. The other half comes from HSs themselves who often feel ambivalent about their linguistic identity and sense that they do not have the self-agency in their home language. In other cases, they may exploit their linguistic identity to their benefit, shifting between the identities of English NS, ESL learner, bilingual or NS of the home language. In this study, half of the heritage speakers in the
surveyed population consider their native language to be Russian (51%), a quarter believe it is English (25.5%), and 12% view themselves as bilingual in Russian and English. Six percent struggled with identification and could not give a definitive answer. A quote from one of the study's participants colorfully illustrates the ambivalence of a heritage speaker's linguistic identity: "English is my first language in my head, but Russian is the first language in my heart."

Finally, an important point needs to be made about the resulting proficiency of adult HSs who start out as early bilinguals. Such a complex phenomenon as heritage language with multiple and interrelated factors that bring about its existence naturally exhibits a great range of variance. Measuring heritage speakers' proficiency and competence is just as complicated as the phenomenon itself. Without doubt, age of arrival, literacy skills, language attitudes at home, parents' level of education, and amount of schooling all influence children's proficiency in the home language (Benmamoun et al, 2010). A mixture of these and other social variables produces heritage speakers of vastly different levels of proficiency. There are also idiosyncratic individual differences, which can enhance or diminish a speaker's proficiency so that even such seemingly reliable factors as the age of arrival or presence of schooling cannot serve as perfect predictors of proficiency and competence. There are heritage speakers (including in this study) who are quite proficient despite the fact that they were born in the U.S., have never lived in the country of their parents and never had any schooling in the home language. There are others who receive at least some schooling in the home language (in private Sunday schools in the U.S., through home schooling, or in the schools of the metropoly), and who are less competent or proficient. In fact, there are studies that show that schooling in the
home language in the immigration context does not seem to have a significant effect on the linguistic proficiency of heritage speakers who immigrated before the end of the critical period, i.e., before puberty (studies of Korean and Chinese schools cited in Benmamoun et al., 2010, p. 24)\(^5\).

Tying up these various points with socio-linguistic distinctions between first and second, primary and secondary, majority and minority languages discussed in the previous section, gives us a more refined definition of heritage speakers. In contemporary linguistics they are viewed as asymmetric early childhood bilinguals who grow up to have different proficiencies in their two languages. They start developing linguistic competency in one language (their L1), but are interrupted in this development by the introduction of another language (L2) that has the majority status in the society, that is reinforced through schooling and other social institutions, and that over time becomes their dominant and primary language (Benmamoun et al., 2010). In contrast, their first (home) language, having a minority status with all its consequences and receiving a diminished input, becomes secondary, reduced in usage, lexically weakened and morphologically restructured. In adulthood, these people still speak the home language (their L1) with at least some degree of proficiency. This proficiency varies greatly among HSs as the linguistic development in their HL is influenced by a great number of social variables, such as age of immigration, schooling, presence of a larger speech community, familial attitudes toward language maintenance, to name a few. The linguistic (and cultural) identity of HSs is dynamic, being shaped by both their self-...

\(^5\) This is not to say that such schooling does not play a role in language maintenance; the studies cited here point to no significant influence on the development of proficiency; neither do these studies claim that schooling in immigration does not play a role in maintaining or developing cultural competency.
identification (which is not always correlated with their proficiency in HL) and the views of the language communities involved.

The next section will show how this definition is applied to heritage Russian and will describe linguistic competency of a typical Russian heritage speaker.

2.1.3. **A Linguistic Portrait of Russian Heritage Speakers**

Despite some favorable conditions for language maintenance, such as generally high level of education of immigrants from the former Soviet Union and new technologies which allow for easy maintenance of linguistic and cultural connections with the native country, the language spoken by Russian-speaking immigrants of the late 20th and early 21st centuries and their children in the U.S. undergoes grammatical, lexical and functional reduction, and has distinct features separating it from the Russian spoken in the Russian Federation today. Polinsky (1997, 2000) argues that there exist two varieties of Russian in the U.S.: Émigré Russian (ER) and American Russian (AR). Speakers of the first variety include immigrants whose schooling has largely been completed in a Russian-speaking country before the emigration. Their speech is characterized by heavy lexical borrowing and extensive code-switching (Andrews, 1998; Polinsky, 2000; Pavlenko, 2003; Dubinina, 1998; Mikhaylova, 2006) as well as some morpho-syntactic changes, such as the use of overt pronouns in contexts where it is not permitted (Polinsky, 2000), and limited use of imperfective forms in pragmatically-conditioned telic predicates (Laleko, 2010). Speakers of the second variety consist of children who arrived in the U.S. with their parents before the critical acquisition age and children born in the U.S. to Russian-speaking families. Their schooling, as a result of
this immigration, took place predominantly in English. It is this second group, bearers of American Russian, who are considered heritage speakers and who are the focus of the current study.

With rare exceptions, these children grow up hearing mostly ER in their homes and, therefore, regard it as the standard of spoken Russian. In the absence of a system of checks and repairs, such as schooling, the language they hear undergoes further restructuring. As is the case with other immigrant languages, adult children of Russian-speaking immigrants do not reach ultimate attainment in the language of their parents, and instead become speakers of a "restricted language with no register variation and with a grammar of its own" (Polinsky, 2000, p. 451).

Absence of register variation is exemplified by the fact that AR speakers (HSs of Russian) confuse familiar and formal second-person pronouns: they prefer the informal ty for any situation, but if corrected, may start using the formal Vy indiscriminately. They often overuse informal social etiquette phrases, such as privat, poka and kak dela in formal contexts (Polinsky, 1997, 2000). On the lexical level we observe a reduction of the vocabulary range. Since the main exposure of immigrant children to Russian happens in early childhood, they often consider words in so-called “parent-talk” normal lexical items. As a result, they overuse diminutives even in those situations that clearly call for standard non-diminutive forms (Polinsky, 2000; Bermel & Kagan, 2001). In addition, their vocabulary contains lexical borrowings from English; in fact, certain borrowings have become a norm in the speech of both ER and AR speakers: paund, lojer, bejbisitter, inšurans, and taksy, among others (Andrews, 1999; Polinsky, 2000). HSs calque English collocations, for example, tjaželo rabotat' or brat' trajn, and expand semantically
restricted Russian words on the basis of their more general English counterparts: for example, šans (instead of vozmožnost') (Bermel & Kagan, 2000)

The main language reduction in AR happens on the grammatical level. The following is a list of features, which characterize the AR grammatical system:

1) the reduction of the case system in production (Polinsky, 1997, 2000, 2006; Smyslova, 2009) and comprehension (Sekerina & Pugach, 2005; Polinsky, 2011);
2) the restructuring of a 3-gender nominal system into a 2-gender system (Polinsky, 2008c);
3) the disappearance of aspectual pairs and the lexicalization of aspect (Polinsky, 2006, 2008a; Pereltsvaig, 2008) and significant reduction of the pragmatically-conditioned functions of the imperfective aspect (Laleko, 2010; Mikhaylova, 2012);
4) the reduction of verbal conjugation paradigms (Polinsky, 1997, 2006);
5) the gradual loss of the subjunctive with the tendency to use more past tense forms without by in lieu of the subjunctive forms and to replace the subjunctive conjunction čtoby with the indicative complementizer čto (Polinsky, 1995), and
6) the weakening and reorganization of syntactic relations and narration strategies, such as the weakened (or completely absent) null pronominalization both in subordination and coordination (Polinsky, 1997, 2008a); the use of esli instead of li; weakened sensitivity to object vs. subject relative clauses (Polinsky, 2011) and the decline in the use of the VS word order (Isurin & Ivanova-Sullivan, 2008).

As is evident from above, there is already a significant body of knowledge regarding the linguistic profile of heritage speakers of Russian, despite the fact that the heritage language field is very young. The overwhelming majority of this research has
concentrated on the grammatical features of Heritage Russian and its isolated linguistic modules, with morphology and syntax being the most studied. Laleko's work (2010) stands out in this regard as the first published study on discourse pragmatics of heritage Russian. Laleko examines context-dependent functions of the imperfective (the unmarked member of the privative aspectual opposition in Russian) and shows that advanced HSs exhibit reduced sensitivity toward these functions. Specifically, in situations of aspectual competition that are usually resolved in favor of the imperfective in the presence of specific discourse-pragmatic triggers - such as reversible action or backgrounding - HSs are significantly less sensitive to the imperfectivizing pragmatic circumstances than NSs. At the basic clause structure, HSs' aspect remains quite target-like, but at the higher, discourse-related domain (which corresponds to the CP-domain in generative representations), HSs exhibit signs of vulnerability. In particular, even the most proficient of them disregard the imperfectivizing triggers and seem to view the aspectual choice as a simple 'yes-no' choice, free of external (i.e., pragmatic) influences. This behavior suggests a covert restructuring of aspect in heritage Russian, which turns the aspectual opposition from a privative type (which has perfective as a marked member of the pair and the imperfective as the unmarked member able to replace the marked form under the right contextual conditions) into an equipollent type (where both members are marked and are logically complimentary to each other). Laleko's study is particularly important to this dissertation as it shows that even advanced Russian HSs lose control over the so-called soft constraints on linguistic material, i.e., the intersection between linguistic and non-linguistic, or discourse-pragmatic, information (Sorace, 2005; Sorace & Keller, 2005).
To summarize, Heritage Russian (also known as American Russian in some of Polinsky's works) is a language that has undergone a morphological and semantic reduction, shows signs of cross-linguistic influence from English, and an overt and covert restructuring of morpho-syntax.

Having reviewed research available to date on speakers of heritage languages in general and of Russian in particular, I have sketched a general linguistic portrait of the experimental group in this study. The next section will provide theoretical background on the notion of communicative competence and various aspects of speech act pragmatics as they relate to the goals of the present study.

2.2. Pragmatics

2.2.1. Pragmatic Competence

Broadly speaking, "pragmatics is the study of the use of language in context for the purpose of communication" (Ninio & Snow, 1999, p. 347), but in a more focused definition, "pragmatics is the study of how linguistic properties and contextual factors interact in the interpretation of utterances" (Noveck & Sperber, 2004). Pragmatics is divided into two interrelated subfields: discourse pragmatics that is concerned with textual organization, and speech act pragmatics that studies language use in performance of social acts. It is the latter area of pragmatics that is the focus of this dissertation.

Chomsky (1965, 1957) first defined competence as the specific capacity for language that is characteristic of human beings and that enables a child to acquire his first language (and any other language he is adequately exposed to in early childhood). It is the intuitive implicit knowledge of the grammatical system of a language that enables the
speakers to produce grammatically correct sentences and recognize ill-formed, ungrammatical ones. Chomskian competence is an idealized concept and is contrasted with performance, which refers to a speaker's actual production of meaningful sentences. Performance is usually not perfect and is characterized by hesitations, disfluencies, errors (slips of tongue) and contextual limitations (like interruptions resulting in incomplete utterances).

This view brought on criticism from sociolinguists, such as Dell Hymes, who pointed out that Chomsky's approach to competence is too narrow. Since Hymes' major work "Foundations in Sociolinguistics" (1974), a broader definition of linguistic competence has been widely accepted. It has been understood that grammatical competence alone does not adequately describe the complexity of a speaker’s linguistic knowledge. Performance (being the actual production and comprehension of language) is regulated not only by the knowledge of grammatical rules and the ability to form cohesive and coherent sentences, but also by the knowledge of all components of communicative events, attitudes and beliefs about them, norms and rules for turn-taking in a conversation, conventions of language use, communicative norms and strategies associated with particular social contexts, and the socio-cultural appropriateness of linguistic forms. Hymes describes communicative competence as the speaker's "ability to participate in [the] society as not only a speaking, but also a communicating member" (Hymes, 1974, p. 75).

---

6 It needs to be mentioned that the competence vs. performance debate is the result of a misunderstanding of the original concept of competence proposed by Chomsky. His notion of competence was meant to refer to the architecture of small units, not to the entire communicative event. Although both camps (supporters of competence and advocates for performance) use the term “competence”, it has very different meanings for them. No linguist would deny that a competent speaker must possess both types of competencies (intuitive knowledge of small units and of the communicative events).
Pragmatic competence is a fundamental aspect of the broader notion of communicative competence and can be defined as that which "... a speaker needs to know, and a child needs to learn, to be able to use language appropriately in specific social/cultural settings" (Swann et al., 2004, p. 43). This definition can be tailored specifically toward the performance of speech acts, as in this formulation by Dale Koike: pragmatic competence is "... the speakers' knowledge and use of rules of appropriateness and politeness which dictate the way the speaker will understand and formulate speech acts" (Koike, 1989).

A large contribution to the study of communicative competence came from the field of second language acquisition which is concerned with defining the dimensions of learners' proficiency in a second language and devising tools for measuring it. Lyle Bachman (1990) defined communicative competence in a person's second language (L2) as consisting of organizational competence and pragmatic competence. The former, according to Bachman, has two components: grammatical competence and textual competence. Pragmatic competence is made up of sociolinguistic and illocutionary competences. The latter is defined as the ability to recognize and carry out fundamental language functions, such as requesting information, conveying information, influencing others, etc. Sociolinguistic competence, as part of pragmatic competence in Bachman's system, is the ability to adjust one's language to the demands of different social contexts in accordance with social conventions (for example, by choosing between appropriate terms of address or non-standard vs. standard forms, etc.)

This elaborate definition can be restated with the help of two notions introduced by Leech (1983). Being pragmatically competent requires both the knowledge of
pragmalinguistics (i.e., linguistic resources available to speakers) and sociopragmatics (rules governing the appropriateness of linguistic forms in various social contexts) as well as processing skills that mobilize this knowledge in communication. Speakers must have a good command of a variety of forms (grammatical and lexical resources) that are routinely used to perform certain social functions, in order to understand and express their communicative intent successfully. At the same time, they need to know the sociocultural norms and rules that govern the use of these linguistic forms in various social contexts, and be able to adjust their language in accordance with social conventions. Pragmatic competence is, therefore, crucial to making the language work in interactions with peers, families, social superiors and subordinates.

Drawing from the existing formulations of pragmatic competence, the following working definition is adopted for this dissertation: pragmatic competence is the knowledge and ability of speakers to comprehend and produce acts performed by speaking in the language-specific way and in accordance with that language's social conventions of politeness expected in different contexts.

Having identified the general parameters of pragmatic competence, I can now provide background on speech act theory, directive speech acts, universal and language-specific aspects of directives, and conventions for politeness strategies. The sections 2.2.2 through 2.2.5 will highlight those aspects of knowledge of speech acts that are most salient to this study.
2.2.2. **Speech Act Pragmatics**

Although the concept of speech acts originated in the philosophy of language (Austin, 1962; Grice, 1957; Searle, 1969), its various parameters were further developed by linguists. Austin (1955) first brought to the fore the use of language for purposes other than describing facts, and formulated a general theory of speech acts. He proposed that utterances have three universal characteristics: specifically, each has a function (illocutionary force) in addition to a particular linguistic form (locution which expresses its propositional content), and an effect on the interlocutor (perlocutionary force).

The theory distinguishes two aspects of the meaning of an utterance. First, the propositional meaning or the content is an aspect of utterance meaning that arises through the grammatical composition of the meanings of its various parts. Second, the illocutionary force is an aspect of utterance meaning that originates from the speaker's intention in delivering the utterance. An illocutionary act (also known as a speech act) then is an act that can be carried out by speaking with a certain intent.

According to Austin's view, language use consists of acts that carry a communicative purpose. Searle (1969) developed the idea of social acts performed by using language further. He distinguished five basic speech acts (as he called them): representatives (or assertives), directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. He argued that speech acts were the minimal units of human communication (rather than linguistic expressions) that have form and function. Of these, directives, and specifically requests, are the most studied speech acts to date. Requests have been investigated in a variety of languages and comparatively, in L1 child and L2 adult acquisition both cross-
sectionally and developmentally. Requests are also the focus of this dissertation, and hence require a more detailed background.

2.2.3. **Requests: Definition, Description, and Classification**

Searle defined 'directives' as speech acts whose “... illocutionary point... consists in the fact that they are attempts (of varying degrees, and hence, more precisely, they are determinates of the determinable which includes attempting) by the speaker to get the hearer to do something” (1976, p. 13). He listed a number of verbs that evoke the directive speech act, such as 'order', 'ask', 'request', 'command', 'beg', 'plead', 'pray', but also 'advise', 'invite', and 'permit'. It is obvious, however, that these verbs express different intensity of the action performed by them and different social contexts: begging is a different type of asking somebody to do something than ordering. Searle himself categorized 'requests' as being a broad concept that includes the meanings of 'order' and 'command'.

Since Searle's definition, the terms 'directives' and 'requests' have been used in the literature inconsistently, some researchers treating them the same way as Searle (e.g., House & Kasper, 1987), others using them as interchangeable synonyms (e.g., Ervin-Tripp, 1977) while still others seeing 'requests' as a subtype of 'directives' (e.g., Schmidt, 1983) or vice versa. In this dissertation I will use the definition proposed by Becker (1982, p.1), which closely follows Searle's original thought:

'request' refers inclusively to an utterance that is intended to indicate the speaker's desire to regulate the behaviour of the listener - that is, to get the listener to do something.
Furthermore, requests have interactional, illocutionary and sociolinguistic aspects (Ellis, 1994). The interactional aspect includes two features: requests are by nature 'pre-action' speech acts (i.e., they often initiate discourse), and secondly, they can be performed in a single turn or may be stretched out over several turns (i.e., involve some kind of pre-request turns). The most important feature of the illocutionary aspect of requests is a set of felicity conditions that must be met in order to produce the requestive illocutionary force. Searle identified four such conditions for all speech acts: preparatory, sincerity, propositional content, and essential. Specifically for requests, these conditions require that the hearer must be able to perform the action (preparatory); the speaker must believe that the hearer is able to perform it, must indeed want the hearer to perform the action (sincerity), and must make reference to a future act by the hearer (propositional); finally, the utterance must count as an attempt to get the hearer to perform the action (essential). Other illocutionary features of requests include the following:

- requests can be realized by means of several strategies differing in the degree of directness;
- requests can be modified internally (by linguistic devices that mitigate their force or upgrade it) and externally (by adding pre- or post- request turns);
- requests can be encoded from the speaker's, the hearers, joint or impersonal perspectives (Ellis, 1994).

Finally, the sociolinguistic aspect of requests consists of two features: 1) requests are inherently imposing, and their specific linguistic realization depends on a variety of social factors that have to do with the nature of relationship between the interlocutors and
the degree of imposition; and 2) while felicity conditions for the requests seem to be universal, the specific linguistic realizations of requests differ across cultures. This latter point is particularly important to the present study as it attempts to identify the norms of linguistic realization of requests in heritage Russian.

Another point in the discussion of requests that is relevant to this dissertation has to do with classification of their different types. There is no unified established system for such classification, and almost every researcher creates his or her own list of different request types. For example, Ervin-Tripp (1976, 1977) identified six types of requests made by children in the process of L1 acquisition: need statements, imperatives, embedded imperatives (a term she uses for conventionally indirect requests), permission directives, question directives and hints. It is evident that this list mixes functions and forms of requests. For example, the types 'need statement' or 'imperative' focus on linguistic forms while 'permission directives' refer to the function/goal of request. A review of literature for this dissertation points to a general lack of and, consequently, a need for a uniform defining principle that would identify various request types. The goal that speakers attempt to achieve by issuing requests could serve as such principle. In fact, researching requests in Israeli society, Blum-Kulka (1985) noticed that the goal of the request is one of the three most influential factors that account for the variation of strategies speakers employ when issuing a request (the other two being the age of the addressee and the relative power of the speaker). Blum-Kulka defines the goal of request as the relationship between the speaker's intent and the hearer's compliance. A request is successful when there is compliance from the hearer that corresponds to the intent of the speaker.
Defining various goals to establish a functional classification of requests is, however, an enormous task given the social and semantic possibilities, but some researchers have made attempts. For example, Achiba (2003) identifies four groups of requests her child subject makes: requests for goods, requests for the initiation of action, requests for the cessation of action, and requests for joint activity. She further explains that requests for goods could be subsumed under the category 'requests for the initiation of action' because compliance with such requests would mean that the hearer would have to perform the action of giving the desired item to the speaker who requests it. She argues, however, that the two categories should remain separate because they focus differently on the end goal: objects vs. performance of action. Achiba also unpacks the category 'requests for goods' as existing in two possible social scenarios. One is when the speaker asks the addressee to provide him with the requested goods, and the other is where the speaker asks the addressee to grant him permission to have the goods. Compliance in both scenarios results in the speaker receiving the requested goods, either by having them handed over or by having permission to take them himself. Achiba's classification applies a uniform principle for the identification of requests (namely, the request's goal) and, therefore, offers a more sound system for analysis. Following Achiba and Blum-Kulka, this dissertation adopts the classification of requests by their goals, and more specifically, Achiba's definition of request for goods with both possible social scenarios.

Finally, no discussion of classification of requests can go without a description of (in)directness of speech acts, which deserves a dedicated section of its own.
2.2.4. **(In)Directness in Requests**

The understanding of (in)directness in speech acts relies on two important notions introduced by Leech in 1983: pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic systems. The former concept refers to "the particular resources that a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions" (1983, p.11) whereas the latter denotes "the more specific 'local' conditions on language use" (ibid.). Brown and Levinson (1987) went further and elaborated on what exactly can be considered "specific local conditions on language use." For example, they defined three socio-cultural variables that influence the production and comprehension of speech acts. These factors include the degree of social distance and power hierarchy between participants (both dependent on age, race, gender, and class) as well as the degree of the imposition created by the speech act on the hearer. In the case of requests, these factors also include difficulty of implementation of the requested act. These "specific local conditions of language use" influence the speaker's choice of direct or indirect strategies in issuing requests.

Searle (1975) defined direct speech acts as either performative utterances, containing performative verbs, or utterances in which the illocutionary force (speaker's intent) exactly matches their locution (propositional content): for example, imperatives. Early work on speech acts and their functions focused on performative verbs, which have the unique capacity of committing the action they denote, such as: to thank, to apologize, to ask/request, to promise, to appoint, to advise, etc. Subsequent research of various speech acts showed that speakers often intend something more than or entirely different from what can be understood from the basic meaning of the words and their structural organization in an utterance (i.e., propositional content). Hence, much of existing
research concentrates on the investigation of various forms of indirectness and conventions that dictate the choice between direct and indirect strategies.

There are two types of indirectness discussed in the literature: conventionally indirect speech acts and non-conventionally indirect acts, also known as hints. The latter type is an open-ended class of strategies for performing a speech act which have no formal or propositional limitations. One advantage of such indirectness is that both the speaker and the hearer can avoid the responsibility for the speech act altogether. A hint has many possible interpretations. For example, the utterance *It is cold here!* can be interpreted in the following ways:

- The speaker wants to make a statement about an observed fact.
- The speaker is making small talk, trying to fill in the awkward pause.
- The speaker wants to ask the host to increase room temperature.

The addressee can choose any one of these possible interpretations (and plausible others), depending on the speaker's intonation, non-verbal communication, and social context. The point is that the addressee has an easy way out of performing the request. The speaker, in his turn, also can avoid taking the responsibility for making this request even after it was issued.

A different type of indirectness, a much more limited class of strategies, has to do with social conventions on language use. Searle (1975) proposed that the ability to comprehend the meaning of indirect speech acts comes from the speakers' shared knowledge of pragmatic functions conventionally assigned to certain language forms: "I am suggesting that *can you, could you, I want you to*, and numerous other forms are conventional ways of making requests, ... but at the same time they do not have an
imperative meaning" (1975, p. 76). H. Clark (1979) breaks down Searle's notion of 'convention of usage' further. He suggests that there are two types of conventions: convention of means and convention of form. The former determines the semantic 'device' that creates the request. Questioning the hearer's ability to perform an action or expressing one's need to have it performed are such socially agreed upon semantic means. 'Convention of form' refers to the exact wording associated with a specific semantic device. Hence, *Can you close the window?* is understood as a request while *Are you able to close the window?* is not. According to Clark, for conventional indirectness to take place, both types of conventions need to be observed.

Conventional indirectness has another important dimension. While direct strategies convey only one illocutionary meaning, indirect strategies have two: propositional (literal or locutionary) and intended (illocutionary). Blum-Kulka refers to this feature of indirect strategies as "pragmatic duality" and argues that the hearer can always interpret an utterance on either one of the two levels or on both levels. They can then respond according to their interpretation of the utterance by complying with the convention or ignoring (or not recognizing) it.

### 2.2.5. Politeness in Requests

The speakers' choice of a direct or indirect speech act (either conventional or non-conventional) is intimately connected to the notion of politeness. In the words of Searle, "politeness is the chief motivation for indirectness" (1975, p. 64). The most widely used system explaining politeness was developed by Brown and Levinson in 1987, and is often called the 'face-saving' theory of politeness (to differentiate it from other theories.

---

7 A better term would be 'convention of content', given the definition suggested by H.Clark.
explaining politeness in speech acts). It builds on Goffman's notion of face (Goffman, 1967) which Brown and Levinson (1978) redefine as something consisting of two parts: a positive face, which is understood as the positive self-image which the individual wants to have liked, appreciated and approved by others, and a negative face, which is defined as the individual's desire not to be imposed upon. Any interaction, according to Brown and Levinson, is a complex balancing act of attending to one another's face needs. Brown and Levinson further state that some speech acts are inherently face-threatening (as are, for example, requests, orders or even suggestions), and their weight depends on the combination of the three socio-cultural variables: power differential, social distance between speakers, and degree of imposition, which is related to the first two factors. Brown and Levinson suggest, after Goffman, that it is in every interlocutor's best interest to reduce the threat to both negative and positive face to the minimum. Therefore, speakers' politeness strategies stem from the desire and necessity to maintain the two types of face. Speakers can either support and enhance the addressee's positive face (which Brown and Levinson call 'positive politeness') or try to avoid violating the addressee's freedom of action and freedom from imposition ('negative politeness'). Brown and Levinson argued that positive politeness is free ranging while negative politeness is a specific and focused behavior that is subject to the conventions of a particular language.

Brown and Levinson further proposed a schema of language decisions, which speakers make in order to manage threats to face, organized in order from the greatest to the lowest degree. They applied this schema to requests (a speech act they focused on),
which gave them the following options, from the greatest estimated risk of face-loss to the addressee to the smallest degree of risk:

- go on record baldly with the request with no redressive action (*close the window!*)
- go on record with redressive action to satisfy positive face wants (*do you think you could close the window?*)
- go on record with redressive action to satisfy negative face wants (*can/could you please close the window?*)
- go off record and use hints (*It's kind of cold here.*)
- avoid making a request altogether.

According to Brown and Levinson, the idealized speaker first decides that he/she wants to minimize the threat and use a redressive action, then he/she makes the final decision of which face needs (positive or negative) to address with redressive action.

Next, Brown and Levinson demonstrate that the choices speakers make in producing requests are similar across languages and, therefore, are universal. They create a formula of a prototypical conventionally indirect request, which they apply to English, Tamil and Tzeltal, and claim that the formula is universal:

\[
\text{felicity condition} \pm \{ \text{question} \pm \text{subjunctive} \pm \text{possibility operator} \pm \text{please} \} \\
\text{or} \\
\text{felicity condition} \pm \{ \text{assertion} \pm \text{negation} \pm \text{subjunctive} \pm \text{possibility operator} \pm \text{tag} \pm \text{please} \}
\]

According to this formula, a speaker requesting an action must either assume that the hearer is unlikely to be willing/able to perform the action (i.e., assert his pessimism) or must show lack of assumption that the hearer will want to or be able to perform the action.
(and thus pose a question). Brown and Levinson insist that the two strategies are mutually exclusive and that assertions must be negated (to show pessimism) and should also have a tag whereas questions cannot be negated. They also attempt to show that these strategies are universal (or at least are independently developed by many languages). Much of research on politeness and (in)directness in various languages that followed Brown and Levinson’s work has attempted to either give additional support to their proposal of pragmatic universality or find proof that politeness and (in)directness are language specific. I will now turn to the discussion of cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatic studies, followed by an overview of Russian request studies, both native and non-native, and by the description of a singular study of requests in a heritage language (sections 2.2.6 through 2.2.9).

2.2.6. **Requests in Cross-Cultural Speech Act Studies**

Both cross-cultural and interlanguage speech act studies aim to establish a database of strategies available to speakers of different languages and different language varieties (including non-native languages), and ultimately to uncover pragmatic universals. A number of studies in cross-cultural pragmatics have generated empirical data that show areas of similarities and differences across languages. Three issues of cross-cultural investigation of speech acts have received particular attention: a) the value and function of politeness, b) the universal nature of politeness across languages and cultures, and related to it c) the level of indirectness in speech act realization (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989).
Since the seminal work by Brown and Levinson (1978), and Leech (1980), studies of various L1s and L2s have addressed these issues, although the majority have focused on English and ESL. It has been shown that speakers of some languages tend to be more direct: for example, Hebrew speakers in assents and disagreements (Levenston, 1968), and in requests (Blum-Kulka, 1982, 1983); or German speakers in requests (House & Kasper, 1981). Speakers of other languages prefer indirectness: for example, Greeks in Tannen's study (1981) who carry over this preference even when they completely switch to English and no longer speak Greek. These studies seem to suggest that each speech community has a set of forms/strategies that are routinely used to perform certain acts and that there is a cultural preference for a particular set of forms/strategies. They also show that social factors influencing the variation in the pragmalinguistic forms of specific speech acts in different language-cultures seem to be universal, but that they exhort this influence to a varying degree (Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Blum-Kulka, Danet & Gerson, 1985; Wolfson & Manes, 1980). Directness (expressed pragmalinguistically) seems to be universally connected with an increased degree of familiarity and social closeness between interlocutors, and with a higher degree of social equality. Likewise, indirectness and mitigation are connected to greater social distance, greater power differential between interlocutors, and greater degree of imposition.

Despite these findings, the debate over pragmatic universality vs. language specificity remains unresolved. As Blum-Kulka (1989) points out, the debate can be exemplified by two researchers with two opposing views. Fraser (1985) argues that strategies for carrying out speech acts and conveying politeness and indirectness are essentially the same across languages, but each community may have a preferred use.
Wierzbicka (1985, 2003) criticizes this view by saying that the study of pragmatics is under the spell of Anglo-Saxon ethnocentricity. Using Polish, Russian and English as examples, she links the differences in the realization of speech acts across these languages to the differences in the organization of cultural systems supporting these languages: "the crucial fact is that different pragmatic norms reflect different hierarchies of values characteristic of different cultures" (2003, p. 61). Wierzbicka argues that there exist 'cultural ethos', and that speakers place different importance on such social notions as individuality/respect for privacy vs. communality. Cultural ethos is reflected in various ways in specific linguistic realizations of social acts between people, such as requests, apologies, advice, suggestions, etc. As Blum-Kulka (1989) points out, to resolve this debate, more empirically based studies of speech acts across different languages need to be conducted.

Most of the research in the debate has focused on requests, which became the most widely studied speech act (House & Kasper, 1981; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Le Pair 1996; Arellano, 2000; Félix-Brasdefer, 2005 inter alia), for a number of reasons. First, requests are 'inherently imposing' (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989), and, therefore, require a considerable linguistic expertise on the part of the speaker to maintain face. Hence, the study of requests can shed light on the issue of universality in politeness and indirectness. Second, they belong to the ‘relatively well-defined’ acts in the sense that they are realized by means of a rather small set of easily recognizable linguistic elements, and in many languages they are highly formulaic (Ellis, 1994). Hence, requests are perfect 'subjects' for the study of conventionality of politeness and indirectness. Finally, their linguistic
realizations differ cross-linguistically in interesting ways, and therefore, lend themselves conveniently for use in the debate of universality vs. language specificity.

The largest and best-known study of requests is the "Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project" (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). This Project investigated "cross-cultural and intralingual variation in two speech acts: requests and apologies" (1989, p. 11). The goals of the project include the study of cross-cultural variation (i.e., uncovering differences and similarities in the realization patterns of the two speech acts), sociopragmatic variation (i.e., investigating the effect of social variables on the realization patterns), and intralingual variation (i.e., uncovering similarities and differences in the realization patterns for the two speech acts among native and non-native speakers of a given language). By exploring these goals, the Project aimed to re-examine notions of pragmatic conventions (directness and indirectness) on the basis of the two speech acts, and to establish a baseline of native norms in five languages (English, Canadian French, Danish, German and Hebrew) and three dialects of the same language (Australian, American and British English). CCSARP's non-native subjects consisted of English, German and Hebrew L2 learners. The Project also served as a research umbrella for a group of variously motivated researchers who worked to establish taxonomies of strategies used in requesting and apologizing.

With regard to requests, the Project showed that the only strategy that exhibits similarity across languages on all three dimensions of indirectness (convention of means, form and degree of conventionalization) is reference to hearer's ability: *Can you give me a lift home?* Blum-Kulka argues that ability questions are the best example of the universality of conventional indirectness across languages because they "maintain a
balance between the literal and the requestive interpretation" and, therefore, "can be trusted as efficient means for achieving the requestive goal while maintaining their face-saving optionality" (1989, p. 52). All languages of the CCSARP made extensive use of this strategy (40.9% to 63%) in both requests for a favor (e.g., borrowing notes from a friend) and requests for a justifiably demanded action (e.g., requesting to clean a dirty kitchen). Blum-Kulka shows, however, that the utterances based on this strategy were not equivalent across languages in other aspects, such as internal downgrading. For example, a change to the subjunctive (replacing 'can' with 'could') in English gives an utterance only one possible interpretation - that of a softened request. A similar change in Hebrew (using the formal equivalent of 'could') would weaken the force of the request, making the utterance sound as a hypothetical question about a past event.

In her analysis of conventional indirectness across the CCSARP languages, Blum-Kulka used the Australian variant of English (AE), and her findings support the arguments of Brown and Levinson regarding general English language conventions. For example, Blum-Kulka shows that AE speakers downgraded conventionally indirect requests twice as often as speakers of Canadian French, Hebrew, or Argentinean Spanish. At the minimal end of downgrading in English is the lexical politeness marker please, used in 20% of requests by AE speakers (more than any other group). At the higher end, there is the solely English strategy of multiple downgrading: e.g., "I was wondering if you could possibly present your paper next week, instead of the week after?" (emphasis in the original, Blum-Kulka, 1989). Finally, AE speakers used more speaker-oriented strategies than speakers of other languages. Blum-Kulka suggests that avoidance of naming the hearer might play culturally specific roles in contributing to politeness. In
English, it can be a politeness mitigating device: it reduces the perceived degree of coerciveness of the request.

To summarize, the Project made two important contributions to the study of requests (and apologies) and the universality of (im)politeness/(in)directness strategies: on the one hand, it established a baseline for requests in several major world languages, and on the other hand, the Project created an analytical schema that can be applied to all future studies of requests, whether in native or non-native varieties. The importance of this schema lies in the fact that it can be used for objective comparison of requests (and apologies) in order to uncover universal and language-specific patterns. This dissertation relies on the analytical schema created by the Project in order to continue the line of replicable and reliable cross-cultural and interlanguage research in the pragmatics of requests.

2.2.7. Requests in Interlanguage Pragmatics Studies

Studies of L2 requests provide a second important baseline for the exploration of requests in HS populations in the U.S., in addition to the baseline created for native speakers of English and other languages. Therefore, a brief overview of requests in L2 learners' interlanguage is in order.

As with the research on NSs, the majority of interlanguage pragmatics studies have focused on the acquisition of English requests by L1 speakers of various languages: Spanish, Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, Hebrew, Danish, German and others. Most of these studies investigated learners' ability to produce appropriate requests in the target language. One of the major differences between non-native speakers (NNS) and NSs that
was uncovered by these studies was verbosity of L2 learners. It was shown that intermediate and advanced NNSs tend to produce longer requests than NS (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986; House & Kasper, 1987) due to the over-supplying of various politeness markers, syntactic downgraders, and especially of supportive moves. One of the explanations offered for this phenomenon suggests a possible desire of NNS to 'play it safe' by making the illocutionary meaning and politeness value as transparent as possible. Other features that distinguish NNSs from NSs are the overuse of the lexical politeness marker please and a more extensive use of external pre- and post-request supportive moves.

The types of mistakes L2 learners' make in the target language are divided in the interlanguage pragmatics into two types: sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic (Thomas, 1983). The sociopragmatic mistake/failure refers to the inability to account for social factors influencing the production of a given speech act, hence making a social mistake. The pragmalinguistic mistake/failure refers to the inability to use language specific linguistic forms for expressing communicative intent. A number of studies showed that non-native speakers usually make pragmalinguistic mistakes, which suggests that sociopragmatic features of speech acts may be more universal while specific linguistic forms that encode ideas of deference and politeness are more language specific. In addition, L2 speakers tend to transfer mostly pragmalinguistic strategies from their native languages to their L2. Furthermore, a study of Japanese L1 learners of English by Takahashi and Beebe (1987) suggests that proficiency in L2 may influence the degree of negative pragmatic transfer. Higher proficiency learners seem to have acquired enough linguistic means to express themselves in L2, which allows them to translate strategies
for politeness from their L1 to the target language, and this results in deviations from the target norm.

Having reviewed cross-cultural and interlanguage studies of requests, we will now pay a close attention to Russian requests, both native and non-native.

2.2.8. Requests in Russian and Russian Interlanguage

As the analysis of Russian directives below will show, conventions governing illocutionary force carriers and the expression of politeness in Russian are quite different from the formula suggested by Brown and Levinson, and the patterns discovered by the CCSARP for the English language.

The handful of works describing the directive speech act in Russian can be divided into two groups: mostly prescriptive in nature and analytically descriptive. Works by Russian linguists (Akišina & Formanovskaja, 1986; Formanovskaja, 1987; Formanovskaja & Švecova, 1992; Zemskaja & Šmelev, 1993; Bulygina & Šmelev, 1997) either focus on prescriptive norms or on reasons for communicative failures, and are not based on naturally collected and statistically analyzed data. These authors postulate that the most frequent form of request in Russian is the imperative form of the verb in combination with the lexical downgrader požalujsta (Formanovskaja, 1987, p. 64), but note that requests can be posited as questions with the finite form of the modal moč’ or with the main verb in the perfective future. Formanovskaja (1987) also mentions the use of particles ne, li and by in Russian requests. However, her work lacks an analysis of how these particles may influence the politeness value of an utterance, nor is there a
discussion of the choice between the direct (imperative) and indirect (interrogative) forms.

The most analytical and descriptive study of Russian requests was conducted by Margaret Mills in the early 1990s and published as a series of articles. Since her work will be used in this dissertation as the foundation for establishing a taxonomy of features characteristic of Russian requests, it deserves a rather detailed review.

In the first article (1991), Mills discusses naturally occurring utterances (surface interrogatives and imperatives) made by native speakers of Russian (NSs) in natural speech production (and collected by the author in Moscow), and conducts a close contextual analysis, which focuses on identifying the illocutionary force of these utterances. Mills analyzes the continuum of various types of indirect acts anchored by two prototypical speech acts: the imperative directive and the information-seeking question. She explores the performance force of the interrogative in Russian and concludes that it is rather wide.

The study showed that the intermediate variants in the continuum may have diverse interpretations: request-reminder, request-reproach, a sarcastic or teasing request, request based on a surprising discovery, or a request with a hint of threat. The variation is caused by a combination of morpho-syntactic (word order, verbal aspect and negation) and intonational variables. In this article, Mills also argues that the accepted universal postulate, which states that an indirect speech act will almost always produce a more favorable outcome for the speaker, does not hold true in Russian. Basing her conclusion on native speaker opinions, Mills shows that direct requests in Russian can be just as
polite as indirect ones, depending on the intonation used: even bare imperatives sound polite if pronounced with the appropriate rise-fall polite intonation (IC-2): *Zakroj dver'!

In her second article (1992), Mills takes on the question of universality vs. cultural specificity of negative politeness strategies and argues that negative politeness represents not just a limited set of strategies, but that these strategies are highly culture/language-specific. Her goal is to establish a "formula" for conventionalized indirect requests in contemporary Russian. To this end, Mills compares English and Russian conventionalized requests, which she shows to be similar in logic (questioning hearer's ability to do action), but having different constrains on the linguistic realization of politeness. In fact, Mills points out that Russian politeness strategies are derived from an almost antithetical perspective: English uses positive interrogatives with or without the subjunctive (*Can/Could you close the window please?) whereas Russian prefers negative interrogatives with or without the subjunctive (*Vy ne možete/ne mogli by zakryt' okno?). What is a most polite conventionalized request in Russian is, in fact, a rude behavior in English: *Can't you/couldn't you close the window? She further notes that in Russian requests the verb is usually accompanied by (1) the negative particle, (2) the interrogative particle, (3) the subjunctive (conditional, as she calls it) particle or a combination of the above (1&3 or 1&2). Note that the use of *ne is treated as a constant value in these combinations. Furthermore, NSs in Mill's study perceived the combination of the negative and subjunctive particles as more polite (showing a greater degree of deference) than just the subjunctive particle, cf: *Vy ne mogli by zakryt' okno? and *Vy mogli by zakryt' okno? In addition, NSs considered combinations of particles (either 1&3 or 1&2) as hyper-polite. Of a particular interest to this dissertation is the fact that the NSs
in Mills' study deemed the negative particle (in combination with the rise/fall intonation) sufficient for conveying both the performance force and the politeness level of the request.

Mills argues that it is this negative particle alone that creates the directive performance force; without it, an interrogative becomes indistinguishable from an information-seeking question and opens itself up to a jocular response while its interpretation as a request becomes totally dependent on the situational factors:

- Vy možete zakryt' okno? (- V principe, mogu. A čto?)

This conclusion is supported by the analysis offered by Bulygina and Šmelev: "канонический" пример косвенного речевого акта - вопрос в значении побуждения... в русском языке понимается как побуждение лишь при наличии поверхностного отрицания9 (1997, p. 286). Zemskaja also notes that negation in interrogatives interacts with the performance force of the utterance and may lead to communicative failure when it is omitted. She cites the following example as an illustration point (a dialogue between two sisters):


9 Translation: "the canonical" example of an indirect speech act is a question with a requestive meaning; such interrogative is understood as a request in Russian only when there is negation."

10 Translation: ", Yesterday I bought butter, fish and kefir. Will you cook the fish? - I don't have time, I must study. - Fine then, don't cook it. The fish is not bad though. It's sea bass. - I already told you: I am wasting a lot of time. - And I am not asking you to cook. I only asked "will you cook the fish?" Are you aware of the difference between a question and a request?"
Bulygina and Šmelev agree that such positive interrogative utterance has only one illocutionary meaning - an information-seeking question whereas the addition of the negative particle unequivocally suggests requestive interpretation.

Mills further shows that Russian speakers have at their disposal two schemas for making conventionalized indirect and polite requests: sentences concerning the hearer's (H) ability to do the action (A): Vy ne možete/ne mogli by zakryt’ okno? and sentences concerning H doing A: Vy ne zakroete okno? In both schemas, the verb must be negated in order to carry the directive force and disambiguate the requestive illocutionary force of the utterance from that of an information-seeking question. Mills argues that the second schema (questioning H doing A) is completely antithetical in English and is wide-spread and characteristic of colloquial Russian.

In order to understand how specifically the primary illocutionary force (indirect) is distinguished by speakers from the secondary one (direct), Mills explores the effect of various morpho-syntactic modifications to the prototypical question-request (Vy ne zakroete okno?) on its primary illocutionary force. Specifically, she considers the progression along the continuum of speech acts between a prototypical imperative and a prototypical positive interrogative with a negative interrogative in between. Mill claims that in the absence of the negative particle, which "disarms" the threat to the H's negative face, Russian speakers have to rely on lexical means to soften the request, for example a hedge expressed by a possibility modal operator možet (or možet byt').

Mills points out that without the negative particle or a lexical hedge, positive interrogatives are more restricted in their use as requests, and their interpretation as directives becomes more context-dependent. According to NS raters, when positive
interrogatives are understood as requests, they carry the additional connotation of a reminder of the previously issued request: *Vy zakroete okno?* (i.e., I hope you were going to when I first asked you; or Will you be able to carry out the request? Will you need help?). It is important to point out that the NSs in Mill's study did not rate positive indirect requests as rude, but rather as lacking mitigation and deference.

Mills further looks at the effects of aspect and word order on the interpretation of interrogatives (positive or negative) as requests and their politeness level. In negative interrogatives, fronting the direct object *okno* did not have an effect on NS subjects' ratings; they still perceived the utterance *Okno vy ne zakroete?* as a polite request. However, aspectual shift to the imperfective created a range of implicatures from a delicate reminder to a surprised criticism, the exact interpretation depending on the intonation and social factors (such as age, familiarity with the interlocutor and social hierarchy): *Vy ne budete zakryvat' okno?/ Okno vy ne budete zakryvat'*? When the aspectual shift happens in positive interrogatives, it creates the interpretation of a reproach, complaint or criticism: *Vy budete zarkyvat' okno?* (how many times do I have to ask?)

In her comparative analysis of English and Russian conventionalized polite requests, Mills also points out the conspicuous absence of the lexical politeness marker *požalujста* in Russian indirect requests which is juxtaposed with its usage in English: *Vy ne možete/ne mogli by zakryt' okno?* vs. *Can/Could you please close the window?* She argues that it is the lexical marker *please* that marks the directive illocutionary force of the interrogative in English whereas in Russian it is done through the negative particle alone (or its combination with other particles).
The analysis brings Mills to conclude that English and Russian have significantly different strategies for creating conventionalized indirect polite requests, which do not transfer easily between the two languages. She predicts that a specific challenge for L2 learners of Russian would lie in "the ability to simultaneously perceive the politeness level and process the intended performance force of the indirect requests."

To summarize, Mills' research has made several significant contributions to the study of Russian conventions of form (after H. Clark) for indirect requests, which inform the current study. First, she established a formula for polite conventionally indirect requests in Russian: felicity condition + \{question ± negation ± finite future verb\}. Second, Mills created a baseline for prototypical conventionally indirect requests in colloquial Russian by defining the role various particles (negative, interrogative, and subjunctive), lexical downgraders and morpho-syntactic modifications play in creating the performance force of the interrogative and influencing the politeness value of the request. Specifically, she showed that the negative particle is the carrier of requestive illocutionary force in an interrogative, and not just a downgrader. This was supported by Zemskaja and Šmelev, and Bulygina (Zemskaja & Šmelev, 1993; Bulygina & Šmelev, 1997). Mills also showed that the negative particle has a dual pragmatic function: in addition to creating the requestive force, it also indicates a higher degree of deference on the part of the speaker. The two other particles, the subjunctive and the interrogative, add to the politeness value of a negative interrogative, but may be perceived as hyper-polite, especially in situations of (-) social distance/(-) hierarchy. Mills noted that the lexical politeness marker požalujsta is omitted in indirect requests in Russian, unlike its English counterpart please, which is used in both direct and indirect requests, and
intensifies the requestive performance force of English interrogative. In fact, Mills argued that *pożalujsta* is not a required politeness marker even in direct requests in Russian because a proper fall-rise intonation alone disarms the face-threat of a bare imperative.

Finally, Mills showed that modifications in word order and verbal aspect have pragmatic consequences for indirect requests: they may change the politeness value of the utterance and give it additional shades of meaning, ranging from reproach to threat. Mills also noted that a semantic modification (shifting from personal to impersonal modal) has influence on the interpretation of an utterance as a request for favor vs. as a request for permission. Although Mills’ research was not dedicated to the investigation of preferences for request orientation, she established that Russians tend to orient their requests to the hearer, contrary to the English strategy.

This review of work on Russian requests allows us to formulate a preliminary native-speaker baseline for this study and brings us to the discussion of differences between native and non-native requests in Russian. In the comparative study of Russian, Russian L2 and English requests (1993), Mills takes on the issue of pragmatic transfer from English in Russian requests. To establish the preferred interactional style for each group of native speakers, Mills first analyzes natural and elicited data from native Russian and English speakers. The analysis of these data showes that although both languages rely on indirect requests when asking for a favor, the conventional linguistic forms are quite different. The most striking difference between the two styles lies in the use of negative versus positive interrogatives: when requesting a ride from a friend or a colleague, Russian speakers preferred interrogatives which negatively question H's
intention or ability to perform A while English speakers produced a wide range of positive interrogatives questioning H's ability to do A. In addition, English NSs avoided imperative forms while Russians used direct requests (impositives in Mills) 17% of the time. Although Mills does not elaborate on the preferences for a particular orientation (perspective) of requests in Russian and English, she does point out one peculiarity. While both Russian and English interrogatives were primarily hearer-oriented, only English-speaking informants deemed speaker-oriented requests in English as the most polite (could I catch a ride with you?). Mills also points out that Russian requests were biased to solicit an agreement from H to do the action whereas the bias of English requests was to allow H to get out of performing A.

Mills next analyzes requests produced by 20 advanced American students and teachers of Russian, and pays particular attention to the instances of pragmatic failure in their speech. She shows that some of the most interesting cases of failure happen due to the combination of speakers' reliance on pragmalinguistic formulaic knowledge from their native language and incorrect assumptions about the meaning of the target form. The most typical mistake of L2 Russian speakers consisted of calquing the most prototypical conventionally indirect polite request from English: ty možeš menja otvezti domoj požalujsta? Mills points out that there are two 'abnormalities' in such utterances from the point of view of Russian interactional style: first is the lack of negation. In comparison, although positive interrogatives were present in the NS data, they were clearly not a preferred strategy. A more serious 'abnormality' of L2 speakers was the use

11 Although English speakers also used interrogatives questioning H's intention to perform A, it was not the most 'popular' option (11% in natural data and 20% in solicited data).
of the lexical marker *požalujsta* in the indirect request; according to Mills, its use in Russian is restricted to the impositives.

The second typical mistake of L2 speakers is the use of the modal *možno* to produce another positive indirect request: *možno poehat’ s toboj?* Mills points out that the use of the impersonal modal form instead of the finite form of *moč’* triggers a shift in the illocutionary force: instead of requesting a favor, the speaker appears to be asking for permission to ride with H. Although almost 45% (9 out of 20) of the L2 speakers in Mill's study managed to produce native-Russian-like conventionally indirect polite requests, using both negative and subjunctive particles (*ty ne mog by podvezti menja domoj*?), it is important to note that native speakers in the study consistently rated these requests as overly polite for a situation in which a favor is requested of a friend or colleague.

Finally, Mills shows that American learners of Russian tend to be much more verbose than native Russians when making requests. L2 speakers use a wide range of supportive moves (grounders, preparators, pre-requests, etc.) in an effort to mitigate even the most indirect requests. Mills concludes that the reliance on indirect speech acts when requesting a favor may be universal (at least, both the Russian and English data support this assertion); however, linguistic expressions of politeness and deference are culturally specific.

In addition to the research done by Mills, there are two other notable studies of Russian L2 requests: Ph.D. dissertations by Owen (2001) and Frank (2002). All three studies found similar patterns in requests produced by English L1 learners of Russian: the omission of the negative particle *ne*, the over-use of the subjunctive, and the over-
supplying of the lexical politeness marker pożalujsta in indirect requests. In addition, the learners over-relied on the impersonal possibility modal možno, which allowed them to avoid giving a reference point to the request (Frank, 2002). In utterances where reference to an interlocutor was required, Russian L2 learners preferred speaker orientation (Owen, 2001).

To summarize the description of various studies of requests in English, L2 English, Russian and L2 Russian, we can state that the differences between the most prototypical English and Russian requests lie in the pragmalinguistic domain. The conventions of form, which specify the linguistic material that is needed to create a polite request, are significantly different in the two languages. The main differences lie in the use of negation and lexical politeness markers please/pożalujsta in interrogative requests for favor. Another difference has to do with the choice of direct over indirect strategies: Russians do not shy from using the imperative, especially in situations of minimal social distance when pożalujsta is not even necessary, whereas English speakers avoid this strategy in favor of indirect requests even with friends. In addition, Russian has a more diverse combination of morpho-syntactic means to express requests: the impersonal modal možno in addition to the finite ability verb, verbal aspect, interrogative particle and word order, which create a range of illocutionary meanings in Russian requests. These differences collide in the speech of NNS so that L2 Russian requests show cross-linguistic influence from English.

Having reviewed the literature on cross-cultural, interlanguage and Russian-specific request studies, we can now delineate the background for speech act studies of heritage languages.
2.2.9. **Requests in Heritage Languages**

The only study of speech acts in any heritage language that has been done to date is the 2007 work by Pinto and Raschio. They investigated requestive behavior of adult heritage speakers of Spanish in comparison to two groups of monolingual native speakers - English and Spanish (Mexican). The most significant finding of the study is that HS avoided using direct strategy (i.e., the imperatives), resembling monolingual English NS (who never used it) and contrasting with monolingual Spanish NS (who used it 15% of the time). Although requests produced by HS did not differ significantly from those made by either NS group, the authors note that the HS group nevertheless showed a tendency toward differentiating itself from both monolingual groups. However, the authors do not elaborate on how precisely this differentiation is actualized. Their qualitative description of the differences between the HS group and the two monolingual groups reveals signs of interference from English in requests made by HS. They use formulas that are grammatically correct, but not conventionalized in monolingual Spanish. Specifically, there are four types of sentences that seem to be calques from English: 1) *quería saber si me harias el favor de prestarme tus notas* (I would like to know if you could do me a favor of giving me your lecture notes); 2) *puedo ver tus apuntes y copiarlos?* (Can (I) see your notes and copy them?); 3) *estaría bien si me las prestarias?* (It would be great if you could lend them to me) and 4) *es posible que me prestes tus apuntes de clase?* (Is it possible for you to lend me your notes?)

The authors note that HS are similar to Spanish L2 speakers in the use of strategies #1 and #4. The first similarity is in the fact that both HSs and L2 speakers tend to use multiple downgrading even when making requests addressed to peers. This
reflects a documented preference of English speakers as well (see Blum-Kulka, 1989). In fact, Pinto and Raschio suggest that strategy #1 with its multi-layered downgrading may reflect the intrusion of conventionalized indirect English requestive behavior into heritage or L2 Spanish. Strategy # 4 is already well documented for Spanish L2s and, according to Pinto (2005), may be an interlanguage formula for speakers who lack other, more native-like resources for downgrading. HSs seem to rely on this formula as well, which suggests that they may be unsure of their knowledge of proper (i.e., native-like) downgrading mechanisms.

Pinto and Raschio suggest that HSs may adhere more closely to the pragmatic conventions of English even when speaking Spanish because they live in an English-dominant culture. They argue that interference from English on the pragmatic level of heritage Spanish parallels other and well-documented language shift phenomena in heritage languages (such as borrowings and reduction of syntactic features).

Pinto and Raschio's study makes an important contribution to the study of speech acts by focusing attention for the first time on a population of HSs who are neither L2, nor entirely native, and therefore, advancing the debate between universalists and supporters of the language specific view. For example, Pinto and Raschio show that Spanish HSs lack Spanish-specific conventions for the expression of appropriate politeness/(in)directness and must rely on their knowledge of English communicative style when issuing requests in Spanish. Although their requests are well formulated and may still be interpreted as requests by monolingual Spanish speakers, they do not match the communicative style of Spanish NSs. However, without a broader and more detailed study of the HS requests in comparison to monolinguals, the role of the dominant
language in HS pragmatics cannot be understood. In addition, Pinto and Raschio do not discuss the ways in which incomplete acquisition, loss, and restructuring may affect the pragmatic competence of HSs. This dissertation attempts to close this gap by focusing attention on the pragmatics of requests in heritage Russian. The next section will state specific research questions and will discuss the experimental design, methodology and participants.

CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH EXPERIMENT

3.1. Motivation and Scope of the Study

There are only two studies that address the question of communicative competence of HSs to date: Pinto and Raschio's (2007) work on the speech act pragmatics of Spanish HSs and Laleko's study (2010) of the syntax-discourse pragmatics interface in heritage Russian. The former study gives a good point of comparison for the current study. Although Pinot and Raschio did suggest the existence of a unique intercultural style of requestive behavior for HSs that is different from either NSs of Spanish or of English, they did not look closely at the linguistic elements that create a request, such as illocutionary force carrier, specific imposition downgrading mechanisms, the use of politeness markers or the orientation of requests. In addition, the authors did not investigate HSs' comprehension of politeness in requests.

Laleko's study (2010) was the first to explore pragmatic competence of Russian HSs by looking at their sensitivity to pragmatically conditioned aspeectual choice. It is significant for a number of reasons: it looks at both comprehension and production; it
uses experimental data; and it bridges the gap that has formed in our knowledge of heritage Russian between the grammatical and pragmatic competence. Notably, Laleko's study concerns one type of pragmatic competence, namely discourse pragmatics. In order to understand what HSs can and cannot do with the language for communication, we need to do more research that focuses on the other type of their pragmatic knowledge.

The current study is a response to this call. It aims to describe pragmatic competence of Russian HSs, as exemplified by their ability to perform speech acts and recognize the illocutionary meaning of linguistic forms. More specifically, the study investigates the production and comprehension of requests by Russian HSs. The study focuses on pragmalinguistics, i.e., the linguistic phenomena under investigation are particular linguistic forms in full and in heritage Russian that convey the illocutionary meaning of requests, rather than the knowledge of social conditions determining their use. The study also attempts to uncover what happens to pragmatic competence of speakers in an impoverished acquisition environment through comparative analysis of requests produced by HSs and NSs of Russian.

Before proceeding to the description of the methodology, I will provide definitions for the essential concepts used in this study and an explication of some theoretical assumptions.

### 3.2. Definitions and Assumptions

The focus of the present study is requests, which are defined as utterances "that [are] intended to indicate the speaker's desire ... to get the listener to do something" (Becker, 1982, p. 1). Since the form of requests can vary greatly depending on a number
of social factors and their goals, an attempt was made to control some of this variation by choosing only requests for a favor, and specifically, requests for goods. Both notions require further definition.

According to Blum-Kulka et al. (1985), the goal of a request refers to the relationship between the speaker's intention and the hearer's compliance. A request for goods has its goal to obtain certain items from the hearer either by asking to deliver the item or by asking the addressee to grant the speaker a permission to have the item (Achiba, 2003). Whatever the context, only requests for a favor were selected for this study. Surprisingly, the literature on requests lacks a precise definition for requests for a favor even though many researchers use the phrase freely in their descriptions and with little regard to the characteristics that set such requests apart from other types of requests. For example, Pinto and Raschio (2007) elicit three types of requests in their study: "a request for notes, a request for permission, and a request for favor" (2007, p. 140). They do not define either the request for permission or for favor, and juxtapose the two as if they were on the opposing ends of some continuum. In addition, they use 'request for notes' as a category of its own even though it is merely a context-bound type of a request for a favor that can simultaneously be framed as a request for permission.

I propose the following definition of a request for a favor: it is a type of request in which the speaker appeals to the addressee's good will, and the addressee is driven to comply by the sole motivation to build up his/her positive face. The degree of imposition in such requests must be high enough to substantially inconvenience the hearer. Such requests may include those that ask for permission if granting such permission would again be viewed as a significant imposition and would be done out of the goodness of
one's heart, and for no other reason. Therefore, a request to clean the kitchen (used as a request for a favor by Pinto and Raschio) cannot be considered a request for favor since it is asking for a justifiable action, i.e., the hearer has the right to ask a roommate to clean up his/her mess. Similarly, a request for a cup of coffee at a cafe would not count as a request for favor because the addressee would not be complying out of the goodness of his/her heart and should not feel inconvenienced by the customer's request.

Certainly, the concept of 'favor' being tied to the notions of good will and imposition exists in some cultural environment, but I will assume that it is mainly universal. Therefore, I choose specifically requests for a favor in this study because the speaker would not need to have any special knowledge of cultural realities, such as what counts as part of a particular job description (in the case of asking for coffee) or cleanliness standards and roommate relations (in the case of the kitchen scenario).

The final definition concerns the notion of a requestive illocutionary construction, which I propose for this study. I suggest that requests are represented by particular illocutionary constructions, which can be considered abstract structures much like a sentence is considered an abstract construction with phonological, syntactic and semantic properties, but with a much more limited pool of choices in each property and with an additional category of illocutionary strategy type. In order to express a particular thought, speakers need to choose the most suitable lexemes, assign to them appropriate grammatical markers, and organize them into a cohesive utterance according to the syntactic rules of the language and in coordination with the contextual factors that influence syntax and morpho-syntax. In a similar way, speakers have to make multiple choices in the process of composing the best utterance to express their intended
illocutionary meaning for a particular social context. Describing these choices or steps, naturally, seems mechanical and does not reflect the real world decision-making processes that lead to the production of utterances. Such mechanical separation of steps is only necessary for the clarity of description.

Let us trace the choices speakers make, using requests as an example. Some choices will be mutually exclusive (for example, the choice of an imperative/hortative sentence type precludes the use of a modal) while others are compatible and can be considered building blocks comprising a requestive utterance. In a mechanical view of requestive utterance building, the first choice that speakers have to make concerns the strategy -- direct (mood derivable, performative, sincerity condition, need statements, etc.) or indirect, and further conventionally indirect (reference to the preparatory condition or speaker's future action) or unconventionally indirect (hints). Each of the strategies comes with a particular syntactic form associated with it: e.g., a conventionally indirect strategy may be expressed as an interrogative (query of the preparatory condition or of the hearer's action), mood derivable can only be expressed as a hortative sentence, and a performative, a need statement or sincerity condition are realized syntactically with the declaratives. Further, speakers must choose from a limited number of elements that are compatible or associated with a particular sentence type (which in its turn is associated with a particular requestive strategy type). For example, the choice of an interrogative with reference to the preparatory condition further guides a Russian speaker to decide on the use of a modal, which comes in two forms - personal or impersonal. Then the choice of a personal modal form independently triggers the use of a negative particle or the subjunctive (or both), whereas the choice of the impersonal modal will
make the use of the negation or the subjunctive downgrader impossible. Compare these choices:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
Ty \text{ možeš mne dat' konspekt?} & \text{Možno vzjat' u tebja konspekt?} \\
Ty \text{ ne možeš mne dat' konspekt?} & *\text{ne možno vzjat' u tebja konspekt?} \\
Ty (ne) \text{ mog by mne dat' konspekt?} & \text{možno bylo by vzjat' u tebja konspekt?}
\end{array}
\]

It is important to emphasize that the use of a modal in the interrogative that refers to the preparatory condition is required. The use of negation is compatible only with the personal modal and creates the directive performance force while the use of the subjunctive marker is optional. Therefore, modals and the negative particle can be treated as building blocks of a request, whereas the subjunctive has the status of an optional element.

An additional comment on the status of the negative particle in this framework is necessary at this point. According to NS informants in Mills' study (1992), the particle has a dual pragmatic function: it is both a necessary element and a mitigator. However, Russian linguists (Bulygina & Šmelev, 1997) argue that it is a mandatory element which imparts the requestive meaning onto an interrogative utterance, i.e., it disambiguates the information-seeking question from the requestive interrogative. For this study I chose to treat the Russian negative particle *ne as a required element of a request precisely for this reason.

I must admit to the difficulty of separating linguistic elements into those that are building blocks of a request and those that are its optional mitigating downgraders. Nevertheless, I think it necessary to make this separation (albeit forced at times) for the sake of increasing the analytical power of the study. I proceed on the assumption that
certain linguistic elements when inserted into an utterance lend it the interpretation of a
request, and that these elements are not optional in a given illocutionary structure while
others are optional choices which facilitate face work.

I must also admit that the notions of strategy type, sentence type and morpho-
syntactic structure are related to each other, but the important difference is that in the
latter notion, elements are viewed as formal, rather than functional (hence different from
strategy type), and being part of morphology rather than syntax (hence different from
sentence type): e.g., imperative verb form vs. mood derivable vs. hortative sentence.

The combination rules for these various semantic and morpho-syntactic choices
that are compatible with a particular sentence type (which in turn is linked to a particular
requestive strategy) constitute the grammar of requests in the same way that the choice of
a subject, and independently the choice of a predicate and its objects, constitute the
grammar of sentence-building. It is this combinatorics that is of interest to the present
study and the focus of my investigation. Each request produced by participants of this
study is analyzed in terms of strategy type employed, sentence type, required building
blocks, and optional mitigating devices.

3.3. Research Questions and Methodology

In any kind of communication, human beings play two roles: the interpreter of
speech and the producer of speech. In order to have a more complete picture of HSs
communicative competence, this study proposes to investigate their ability to both
produce and comprehend requests. Therefore, the experimental part of the study has two
components: production and comprehension.
3.3.1. **Production: Research Questions**

In order to evaluate HSs pragmatic competence with regard to the production of requests in comparison to the NSs baseline, the following research questions were posited:

1. Are there differences in the construction of requests between Russian HSs and NSs in a situation when a favor is requested of a peer? If yes, what is the exact nature of these differences? More specifically,
   
   a. Are there differences in the type of strategy used to create the requestive illocutionary force?
   
   b. Are there differences in sentence type?
   
   c. Are there differences in the grammatical structure of the utterance?
   
   d. Are there differences in the use of modals (if one is required by the structure of the request)?
   
   e. Are there differences in the use of morpho-syntactic and lexical downgraders?
   
   f. Are there differences in the orientation of requests?
   
   g. Are there differences in external supportive moves?

2. Are there differences in the construction of requests between Russian HSs and NSs in a situation with greater social distance between interlocutors? If yes, what is the exact nature of these differences? More specifically,

   a. Are there differences in the type of strategy used to create the requestive illocutionary force?
b. Are there differences in sentence type?

c. Are there differences in the grammatical structure of the utterance?

d. Are there differences in the use of modals (if one is required by the structure of the request)?

e. Are there differences in the use of morpho-syntactic and lexical downgraders?

f. Are there differences in the orientation of requests? And finally,

g. Are there differences in external supportive moves?

Given that the prototypical conventionally indirect request in Russian is quite different in its form from the prototypical English request, as was discussed in the Literature Review section, and given that HSs have impoverished morphology, a certain degree of divergence from the baseline is expected on all measures in 1a-1g and 2a - 2g, and especially in the use of morpho-syntactic forms to express conventionalized politeness.

3.3.2. Production: Data Collection Method

Data collection and analysis in the production part of this study are based on the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) with some modifications. CCSARP employed several role-play situations that called for the speaker to issue requests in various social contexts which since then have been used widely in research on requestives in a variety of languages. Two situations were chosen for this study to elicit requestives based on the criteria defining requests for favor and,
specifically, requests for goods. Therefore, the degree of imposition, the goal of the request, and the motivation for the speaker to comply were controlled. The social scenarios chosen to elicit data differed only in the degree of social distance created by the age difference between the speaker and the addressee, and by the social power differential. In the first scenario, a student needs to borrow lecture notes from a classmate with whom he/she is in a friendly, but not necessarily close relationship. The student missed a lecture and knows that his request comes only three days before a test. In the second scenario, a student needs to borrow a rare book that is not otherwise available from his/her professor in order to complete a presentation.

To elicit data for the production part of the study, I decided against using the discourse completion test, which was used in CCSARP. Instead, following Trosborg (1995), role enactment was used, which allowed participants to play out a social situation together with the interviewer and to produce speech samples that maximally resemble naturally occurring speech. An additional motivation to use role-plays was the necessity to collect data even from those HSs who are not literate in Russian.

Each role enactment was recorded, transcribed and then analyzed, using a modified version of the CCSARP taxonomy (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989).

3.3.3. **Production: Analysis Schema**

The act of requesting is represented linguistically as a sequence of utterances. Each sequence may consist of several components: alerters, the core of the request, pre- and post-core supportive moves, but only one component is essential for realizing the requestive. It is the so-called head act, which is defined as "the minimal unit which can
realize a request" (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 275). While alerters (or opening elements, such as terms of address or attention getters) and supportive moves (such as pre-commitment, grounder, imposition minimizer or promise of a reward) all contribute to the degree of politeness of a request, it is the head act that is of most interest, as we are trying to establish the baseline for request realization in heritage Russian and identify the differences between requests made by HSs and NSs.

Once a head act was identified, it was further analyzed in terms of the strategy used to create the illocutionary force, the sentence type (syntactic form), the morpho-syntactic structure of the utterance, the use of modals, the internal morpho-syntactic and lexical downgraders, and the orientation. These categories are based on the coding manual from the CCSARP project with certain modifications, which were called for by the realities of the elicited data and by the specifics of the conventionally indirect Russian requests (Mills). The modifications are explained in more detail under each category of analysis.

*Strategy Type*

Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) based their analysis of head acts on the theoretical assumption that there seem to exist three major levels of directness in request strategies: the most direct and explicit level (including imperatives and performatives), the conventionally indirect level (communicative norms conventionalized in a given language) and the unconventionally indirect level (strong and mild hints). The authors of the CCSARP taxonomy subdivided these three basic levels into more specific sub-levels which they called "strategy types." I modified their types based on the Russian
conventions for request (after Mills, 1992) and on the data elicited for this study. For example, I had to include "query action" since this is a wide-spread conventionally indirect form of request in Russian (Mills, 1992). I coded hints, but excluded them from the analysis as they were not of interest to this study.

1 – performative (e.g., *ja xotela poprosit’ u tebja konspekt.*) 
2 – preparatory (e.g., *ty možeš mne odolžit’ konspekt?*) 
3 – query action (e.g., *vy mne eë dadite na odin večer?*)
4 – hint 
5 – want statement (e.g., *mne nužna kniga.*) 
6 – mood derivable (e.g., *daj mne, požalujsta, na deněk!*)
7 – sincerity condition (e.g., *mne bylo by očen’ prijatno, esli by ty mne odalživala svoj konspekt.*) 
8 – locution derivable (e.g., *konspekt!*)

Sentence Type

CCSART does not have this category, but it was essential to the analysis of requestive strategies in my data. It allows us to separate the strategy type above (which is based on the essential conditions for the requestive speech act, i.e. on the functional aspect of language use) from the syntactic form of the utterance (which is based on the linguistic aspect). The values in this category are pre-determined by the realities of the elicited data and correspond to a particular requestive strategy type. For example, a hortative is the only possible sentence type for mood derivable requests.

1 – hortative: a sentence containing an imperative and pronounced with exclamatory intonation (e.g., *daj mne požalujsta na deněk!*) 
2 – interrogative (e.g., *ty možeš mne odolžit’ konspekt?*) 
3 – embedded interrogative (e.g., *ja xotel uznat’ esli ja mogu polučit’ konspekt.*) 
4 – simple declarative statement (e.g., *ja xotela poprosit’ u tebja konspekt.*) 
5 – complex declarative statement (e.g., *bylo by očen’ klassno, esli by ty mogla odolžit’ mne na noč.*) 
6 - stand-alone conditional if-clause (e.g., *požalujsta esli by ja mog odolžit’ u vas knigu.*)
Morpho-Syntactic Structure of Request

CCSARP combines the syntactic utterance type with morphological elements (such as the subjunctive) into one category, called "syntactic downgraders," which includes the interrogative, negation of a preparatory condition, the subjunctive, the conditional clause, and others. I find this approach not quite applicable to Russian and Heritage Russian requests, and needing significant modifications. First, I disagree with the treatment of the syntactic form (specifically the interrogative) as a syntactic downgrader in the CCSARP. According to Blum-Kulka et al., a downgrader is something optional in a given context, but the interrogative is not an optional choice to express the preparatory condition. It is rather the required syntactic form. Hence, I separate the category for the syntactic sentence type (see category #2 above) from the category for the morphological elements of a request.

Second, as I have explained in the section on definitions and assumptions, certain grammatical elements can be viewed as essential to a requestive utterance, and therefore, cannot be treated as downgraders. As Mills (1992), Bulygina and Šmelev (1997) argue, the Russian negative particle in fact creates the directive performance force and seems to have become a marker of conventionally indirect requests in Russian, while at the same time making them polite. Following their analysis, the negative particle in this study is viewed as an essential building block of a request, and not a downgrader.

Finally, I want to emphasize again that the categories of strategy type (#1 above), sentence type (category #2) and morpho-syntactic structure (category #3) are obviously related to each other, but the important assumption is that the last category (#3) consists of elements that are viewed as formal, rather than functional: e.g., the imperative verb
form vs. mood derivable (vs. syntactically a hortative sentence); embedding under
performative vs. preparatory condition (vs. syntactically an embedded interrogative); or
conditional vs. sincerity condition (vs. syntactically a stand-alone if-clause).

Based on such reasoning, instead of having one large CCSARP category of
"syntactic downgraders," I use separate measures for syntactic type (category #2 above),
morpho-syntactic structure of requests (category #3), and morpho-syntactic downgraders
for politeness (category #5), and keep them separate from strategy type (category #1
above). The category of morpho-syntactic structure consists of those grammatical
elements which are necessary to lend an utterance a requestive illocutionary force.
Values 1 and 4 are based on Mill's studies and are supported by the data, whereas values
2 and 3 came from the realities of the data.

1 – negative particle (e.g., *ty ne mogla by mne tam dat' konspekt?*)
2 – embedding under performative (e.g., *xotela sprosit' esli ja mogu vzjat' eë tam na den’*)
3 – conditional clause (e.g., *bylo by očen' klassno, esli by ty mogla mne odolžit' na noč*)
4 – imperative form (e.g., *daj mne, požalujsta, na deněk!*)

*Use of Modals*

This category was created for this study and does not exist in the CCSARP. It is
based on the assumption that a conventionally indirect requests which address the
hearer's ability to perform the action have modal semantics, and that Russian offers its
speakers a choice of modals. It was expected that solicited requests could involve either
a finite form or an impersonal form of the possibility modal, and preliminary analysis of
the data showed that there would be significant differences between HSSs and NSs use of
the modals.
Morpho-Syntactic Downgraders for Politeness

As was already mentioned, downgraders are those elements of the head act that are optional in the given context (CCSARP definition), i.e., a given illocutionary construction. According to Mills, the most common morpho-syntactic downgrader in Russian is the subjunctive particle. Another popular downgrader is the interrogative particle li. Tense modifications to the head verb were observed in the HSs data at the preliminary analysis stage and, therefore, were included in the analysis schema.

1 – subjunctive (e.g., vy ne mogli by mne odolžit' na paru večerov?)
2 – interrogative particle (e.g., mogu li ja u vas eë vzjat’?)
3 – past tense (e.g., ja xotela poprosit' knigu.)

Lexical Downgraders for Politeness

The most common lexical marker of politeness in Russian is the word požalujsta; however, other downgraders are possible - various types of minimizers of imposition, hedges, and other expressions of mitigation. These downgraders can occur within or outside the head act. Only internal downgraders were included in the analysis of the head act; all external downgraders were coded as supportive moves.

1 – internal minimizer (or understater) (e.g., na paru časov, na nemnožko)
2 – hearer binding (e.g., ty dumaš čto ty smožeš?)
3 – hedge (možet byt'; tol'ko; prosto)
4 – politeness marker požalujsta
5 – subjectivizer (e.g., mne bylo by očen' prijatno)
6 - appealer (e.g., esli ne trudno)
7 - combination of moves, which includes požalujsta
8 - combination of moves without požalujsta
The Use of Požalujsta

Mills (1992) has shown that the lexical politeness marker has a different distribution in Russian requests in comparison with English. She argues that Russian allows the use of požalujsta only in direct strategies, although even there it is not required to make a request polite (a proper intonation makes constructions with bare imperatives polite). In contrast, English routinely uses please in both direct and indirect requests. In fact, Mills argues that English please serves as the illocutionary force carrier in interrogatives, serving as the ultimate disambiguating marker that separates information-seeking questions from requestive interrogatives. In Russian this function is performed by the negative particle ne, as Mills argues, and požalujsta is excluded from interrogatives (1992). In addition, Mills (1993), Owen (2001) and Frank (2002) showed that English-speaking L2 learners of Russian overused požalujsta in indirect requests they produced in Russian.

The CCSARP taxonomy did not have a separate category of analysis that focused only on the use of the lexical politeness marker please and its equivalents in the Project's many languages. I added this category based on the realities of Russian requests (as shown by Mills) and on the expectation that HSs may mirror the behavior of L2 Russian speakers when creating indirect requests. The category consists of only two values: 1 - the head act contains požalujsta, and 2 - the head act does not have požalujsta.

Orientation of Requests

Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) call this category a "point of operation" or a "perspective" of the request. They note that request realizations include reference to
either of the two actors (requestor or requestee) or can assume an impersonal perspective (when neutral agents, impersonal constructions or passivation are used). The data supported all three of these possibilities; hence this category consists of three values:

1 – speaker oriented (e.g., *ja mogu tvoj konspekt posmotret' do zavtra?*)
2 – hearer oriented (e.g., *ty ne možeš mne dat' perepisat' lekciju?*)
3 – impersonal (e.g., *možno požalujsta vzjat' u tebja na poldnja?*)

A note must be made about assigning orientation to head acts. The impersonal modal *možno* in Russian gives the entire sentence an air of impersonality. A different point of view may argue that its use alone does not create an impersonal perspective. An utterance may still have an orientation if the finite verb form that follows the impersonal modal makes reference explicitly or implicitly to the addressee or the requestor: e.g., *možno mne uvidet’ tvoju konspektu?* or *možno požalujsta vzjat’ u tebja na poldnja?* The first sentence contains a first-person pronoun (in an oblique form), which diminishes the impersonal interpretation of the entire sentence: the request acquires the speaker's perspective. In the second utterance, the verb *vzjat’* implies the agent - “I” and the sentence perspective again could be argued to be centered on the speaker. I chose to combine these two positions in coding the orientation of requests. If the impersonal modal in an utterance was accompanied by a personal pronoun in one of the two functions - as a nominative agent or as a dative experiencer - the pronoun was treated as an indicator of orientation. If an utterance contained the impersonal modal *možno* and had no personal pronouns or had personal pronouns in other functions, the request was rated as having no particular orientation (impersonal).
3.3.4. **Comprehension: Research Questions**

In order to evaluate HSs' pragmatic competence in comprehension of illocutionary meanings in comparison to the NS baseline, the following research questions were posited:

1) Are HSs as sensitive as NSs to the morpho-syntactic changes (verbal aspect) that affect the interpretation of interrogatives as requests?

2) Are HSs as sensitive as NSs to the morpho-syntactic changes (word order and subjunctive) that affect the interpretation of politeness in indirect requests?

3) How do HSs and NSs react to the presence or absence of the lexical politeness marker *požalujst* in direct requests?

4) Are the two groups (NSs and HSs) similar in their treatment of the hedge *možet* that may influence the illocutionary force of an interrogative and/or its politeness value?

5) Are the two groups similar in their treatment of ellipsis as requests?

3.3.5. **Comprehension: Data Collection Method**

The comprehension part of the study is based on Mills' 1992 study of Russian requests with some modifications. Mills did not base her conclusions on statistically analyzed data; rather she worked with several native speaker informants who expressed their opinions about possible shades of meaning for each utterance. Since I needed statistical evidence for NSs' and HSs' sensitivities to various factors affecting the pragmatic meaning of an utterance as a/an (im)polite (non-)request, I modified Mills' research method so that the questionnaire would include pairs of utterances contrasted in
the use of aspect, word order, the subjunctive, the presence of the lexical politeness marker, and ellipsis.

Participants in this study were asked to rate a number of utterances that potentially could be considered requests, using two scales: directness (and typicality of request) and politeness. Participants had the following options on the directness scale:

- This is a direct and straightforward request; I would not mistake it for anything else.
- This phrase does not look like a typical request, but I would still interpret it as a request.
- I would not have understood this phrase as a request.

If participants viewed the phrase in question as a request (straightforward or not, typical or non-typical), they proceeded to rate it on a politeness scale, choosing one of the following options: very rude, rude, impolite, slightly impolite, polite, and too polite. They also had an opportunity to comment on any additional shades of meaning the phrase had in their opinion: for example, they could indicate whether they felt a particular request to be impatient, threatening, a reminder to a previously issued request, or have some other 'flavor'.

The sentences for rating were chosen from Mill's 1992 study. The following utterances were used in the experiment:

- *Zakrojte, požalujsta, okno!*
- *Vy ne zakroete okno?*
- *Okno vy ne zakroete?*
- *Vy ne mogli by zakryt' okno?*
- *Vy ne budete zakryvat' okno?*
- *Esli vas ne zatrudnit, zakrojte okno, požalujsta.*
- *Vy ne zakryli by okno?*
- *Okno vy не budete zakryvat’?
- *Možet, vy zakroete okno?*
- *Zakrojte okno!*
- *Okno zakrojte!*
• Vy budete zakryvat' okno?
• Okno vy budete zakryvat'?
• Zakroete, a?
• Zakroete?

Before administering the questionnaire, participants were given social parameters of the situation: "on a crowded bus, a middle-aged man approaches you with the following words..." Participants were also told that the situation was 'normal' in that no unusual or anti-social behavior was expected, and that they should assume a neutral tone of voice on the part of the speaker. The gender of the imaginary speaker was controlled (it was always a male), but the utterances were adjusted to the gender of the participant. Each utterance included an attention getter. For male participants, it was molodoj čelovek, and for female participants it was devuška.

3.4. Participants

The study involved 48 heritage speakers of Russian, between 18 and 22 years of age, all college students with at least some reading proficiency in Russian, and 31 native speakers of Russian. HS participants were recruited for the experiment through an advertisement at a college in the Northeastern U.S., and NSs were invited to participate through a network of acquaintances in Moscow, St. Petersburg and Pskov. The latter group is very homogenous, consisting of monolingual Russian college students and recent graduates who have never spent any significant amount of time in a foreign language environment. An average heritage speaker in this study immigrated to the U.S. at the age of 3.5 (62% left Russia before the age of 6 and 21% were born in the U.S.). Most of the HSs did not have formal or informal education in Russian when they were
growing up (89%), but an overwhelming majority of them had taken a specialized beginning literacy course for heritage speakers by the time of this study. Most of them claim to use mostly Russian with their parents (85% with the mother and 83% with the father), only Russian with grandparents (95%) and mostly English with siblings (Russian only 19% of the time). Half of the heritage participants consider Russian to be their native language, but speak it at a much slower rate than their native speaker counterparts: 88 words per minute in this study, in comparison to an average Russian native speaker’s rate of 105 words per minute (in Polinsky & Kagan, 2007). They are also significantly slower speaking in Russian than in English: their average speech rate in Russian is 88 wpm (min – 36, max – 199 with SD = 26), whereas in English it is 148 wpm (min - 76, max- 198 with SD = 29).

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

4.1. Findings in Production Data

The main part of this research consists of data elicited through role-plays in which participants needed to make a request. The first research question for the production part of the study concerns the construction of requests by HSs and NSs of Russian: Are there differences in the construction of requests between HSs and NSs of Russian? Since two request scenarios were tested that differed in the degree of social distance between interlocutors, this question was asked twice: first for the situation where request is addressed to a peer (scenario 1) and then for the situation where the request is addressed to a social superior (scenario 2). Also, since research question # 1 for production of
requests has seven sub-questions, which are aimed to uncover specific areas of difference or similarity, these sub-questions are asked with relation to each request scenario.

4.1.1. **Scenario 1**

In scenario 1, participants were asked to play the role of a student who missed a class and wants to borrow notes from a female classmate. The two students are not close friends, but are on good terms with each other. According to the scenario, both students will have an exam in this course in three days.

*Research question 1a (Scenario 1): Are there differences in the type of strategy used by NSs and HSs to create the requestive illocutionary force?*

Both groups seem to rely mostly on an indirect strategy, specifically on reference to the hearer's ability to perform the requested action (Fig. 1a):

*Figure 1a: Scenario 1 Strategy Type*
As evident from Figure 1a, there are, however, interesting, albeit statistically non-significant, differences between groups. NSs have a bigger repertoire of strategies that include mood derivable and locution derivable illocutionary force. HSs do not use these two strategies at all. Statistical analysis showed no difference between groups; therefore, there are no statistically significant differences in the type of strategy used by NSs and HSs to create the requestive illocutionary force in the situation with minimal social distance between interlocutors.

Research question 1b (Scenario 1): Are there differences in sentence type of the utterance?

NSs and HSs use different types of sentences to produce requests. The majority of participants in both groups (83%) use interrogatives, which corresponds to the most popular requestive strategy - reference to the preparatory condition. However, there are important and statistically significant differences between the groups.

Figure 1b: Scenario 1 Sentence Type
First, NSs use hortative sentences, which correspond to the mood derivable illocutionary force, while HSs do not. On the other hand, some HSs (6%) use embedded interrogatives, which is something NSs never do. An example of an embedded interrogative for a request situation with a peer is: *ja xotel uznat' esli ja mogu polučit' konspekt na paru časov*. Finally, four HSs (or 9%) use complex declarative sentences of the following type: *mne bylo by očen' prijatno esli by ty mne odalživala svoj konspekts of the class*. The observed difference between the groups had statistical significance (p = .034); therefore, the research question is answered affirmatively: requests produced by two groups of Russian speakers do differ in sentence type.

*Research question 1c (Scenario 1): Are there differences in the grammatical structure of the requestive utterance?*

As the graph in Figure 1c shows, there are significant differences in the grammatical structure of requests between the two groups.

---

12 The code-switching is part of the participant's utterance.
Following Mills studies, which assert that the negative particle lends an utterance its requestive force and serves as a marker of request, it was expected that the negative particle would be used in most, if not all, indirect requests. Results show that NSs indeed rely on this particle heavily (63%). In fact, out of 31 head acts produced by NSs, 25 were interrogatives, and 21 of them used a personal modal. This means that there were 21 chances to use the negative particle, for example: *ty ne mogla by mne konspekt odolžit’?* NSs used *ne* in 19 out of 21 interrogatives that support its use (or 90.5% of the time). There were only two interrogative sentences questioning the ability of the hearer to perform the action that used a personal modal without negation: *ty mogla by mne dat’ lekcii perepisat’?* and *možeš dat’ mne lekcii?*

The other four interrogatives (25 total minus 21 with the personal modal) used the impersonal modal where the use of the negative particle would not be possible. The category "no marker" (in the Figure 1c) includes all cases where no special grammatical
structure is present that makes an utterance a request. This happens either because the sentences type/illocutionary force does not support the use of negation or other request markers, or because speakers chose not to use them. For NSs, "no marker" in this analysis refers to the two interrogatives that could use the negative particle, but did not, and to several sentences that are performatives or hints (i.e., where negation is not possible). These account for 27% of all head acts produced by NSs.

In comparison, 79% of HSs did not use any specific grammatical marker of request. The category "no marker" for HSs includes many utterances where speakers could, but chose not to use the negative particle. Out of 48 head acts produced by HSs, 39 were interrogative utterances and 21 of them used a personal modal, and therefore, could be negated. Yet, only two HSs used the negative particle; in other words, the particle was used 9% of the time in utterances that support its use, in comparison to 90.5% of similar NS utterances.

A remarkable difference between groups lies in the HSs' use of embedding under performative as a grammatical strategy to create requests: *ja xotel uznať esli ja mogu polučit' konspekt na paru časov* (4% of HSs); and the use of the imperative form by NSs (10%), which is tied to the mood derivable requestive strategy and hortative syntactic construction. The difference between groups was statistically significant, with $p = .000$. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no difference in the grammatical structure of requestive utterances was rejected.

*Research question 1d (Scenario 1): Are there differences in the use of modals (if one is required by the structure of the request)?*
Since the majority of head acts in both groups receive their illocutionary force from referring to the preparatory condition (either questioning or stating it), extensive use of the possibility modals was expected. What was not clear is what type of modal would be preferred by each group: finite forms of the personal modal *moč’* or the non-finite impersonal *možno*?

**Figure 1d: Scenario 1 Use of Modals**

As Figure 1d above shows, NSs preferred using the personal modal (68%); only 13% relied on the impersonal *možno*. Although HSs also showed a preference for the finite modal (54% of all utterances), they used the non-finite impersonal *možno* much more frequently than NSs did: 40% for HSs vs. 13% for NSs. The difference was statistically significant, with p. = 004, and therefore, the null hypothesis of no difference in the use of modals between the two groups was rejected.
Research question 1e (Scenario 1): Are there differences in the use of morpho-syntactic and lexical downgraders?

Russian, like any other language, has several linguistic devices to mitigate the face threat when issuing a request. Some of these devices are grammatical (the interrogative particle or the subjunctive), and others are lexical. There are a number of hedges (e.g., *možet*, *možet byt*) that are routinely used by NSs, but the primary lexical softening device is the word *požalujsta*.

NSs and HSs seem to use opposite mitigating strategies. NSs favor the subjunctive (mitigating with the help of a grammatical device) while HSs rely on the lexical politeness marker *požalujsta*.

Figure 1e.1: Scenario 1 Morpho-Syntactic Downgraders and the Use of *požalujsta*
Statistical significance was found for both measures: $p = .003$ for morpho-syntactic downgraders and $p = .028$ for the use of požalujsta.

Since lexical downgraders are an open class in comparison to a limited number of grammatical mitigating devices, they warrant a closer look. The results of the statistical analysis are presented in Figure 1e2 below.

*Figure 1e.2: Scenario 1 Lexical Downgraders*

![Figure 1e.2: Scenario 1 Lexical Downgraders](image)

Although statistically not significant, the most salient difference between groups is that NSs do not use lexical downgraders (63% in Figure 1e.2 above). When they do, the most popular device is an imposition minimizer within the head act, such as na deněk, nenadolgo, na polčasika. Only 10% of NSs use požalujsta (Figure 1e.1 above) and do so mostly in direct, mood-derivable requests: *esli možeš daj mne požalujsta na deněk.* Only
one native speaker (3%) used the lexical marker *požalujста* as part of an indirect request: *ne mogla by ty lekcii odolžit' požalujsta na deněk?*

HSs, in comparison, employ a repertoire of lexical downgraders that include imposition minimizers, the politeness marker *požalujsta*, hedges (*možet or možet byt*), hearer binding, subjectivizers or a combination of moves with or without *požalujsta* (Figure 1e.2 above). An example of hearer-binding used by HSs is *ty dumaeš čto ty smožeš dat' mne konspekt?* Typical subjectivizers in the HSs group are *ja budu očen blagodarna* or *bylo by klassno.*

The most interesting fact about HSs mitigating strategies is that they use politeness marker *požalujsta* in indirect requests: *ty mne možeš požalujsta dat' konspekt?* The marker was present in 15 out of 48 utterances produced by HSs, and all 15 were interrogative head acts. This amounts to 38% of all indirect requests (15 out of 39). These 15 head acts include 8 interrogatives that used the impersonal modal *možno: tak možno požalujsta odolžit' u tebya konspekt?*

*Research question 1f (Scenario 1): Are there differences in the orientation of requests?*

As Figure 1f below shows, there are significant differences in the orientation of requests between NSs and HSs.
In fact, the two groups used almost completely opposite strategies: NSs tended to the hearer (80%) while HSs focused on themselves (62%). Only four NSs and six HSs (13% in each group) used truly impersonal utterances, such as *možno u tebja sdelat' kopii iz konspekt?* (HS) and *možno u tebja konspekt poprosit’?* (NS). The difference has a statistical significance, with \( p = .000 \).

*Research question 1g (Scenario 1): Are there differences in external supportive moves?*

External supportive moves could occur on either side of the head act: before or after. The graph in Figure 1g illustrates the use of both types of supportive moves by the two experimental groups.
There was no significant difference between groups on the use of either pre- or post-head act supportive moves. The two groups used similar strategies. For the pre-head act support, the most popular move was a combination of a preparator and a grounder. After the head act, both groups relied on a combination of an imposition minimizer, disarmer and/or a grounder.

4.1.2. **Scenario 2**

In the second scenario, participants were asked to play the role of a student who requests a rare book from a professor. The book is needed for a presentation and is not otherwise available. The research question was: are there differences in the construction of requests between HSs and NSs of Russian in a situation with greater social distance.
between interlocutors? If yes, what is the exact nature of this difference? To answer this question more specifically, seven sub-questions were posited.

**Research question 2a (Scenario 2): Are there differences in the type of strategy used to create the requestive illocutionary force?**

As can be seen from Figure 2a below, there was no significant difference between groups on strategy type.

**Figure 2a: Scenario 2 Strategy Type**

Both NSs and HSs overwhelmingly referred to the preparatory condition. It is noteworthy to mention that even in the situation of significant social distance between interlocutors, one NS used a mood derivable strategy.
Research question 2b (Scenario 2): Are there differences in sentence type?

Even though both groups made reference to the preparatory condition in order to create a request, they did it in different ways, as Figure 2b illustrates.

Figure 2b: Scenario 2 Sentence Type

NSs used interrogatives to question the condition (94%) while HSs employed four different sentence types: interrogatives (59%), embedded interrogatives (29%), declaratives (8%) and stand-alone if-clauses (4%). The differences were significant, with p = .000, and the null hypothesis of no difference was rejected.

Research question 2c (Scenario 2): Are there differences in the grammatical structure of the utterance?

There were significant differences in the grammatical structure of requests between the two groups: 55% of NSs used negation while only 8% of HSs did. In fact,
NSs produced 29 interrogative utterances; 21 of them used the personal modal and one used a perfective future verb. Hence, 22 interrogatives could potentially have the negative particle; ne was used in all but three of these interrogatives. This means that negation was used in 86% of utterances that support its use. The remaining 7 interrogatives used the impersonal modal and, hence, could not use negation.

In comparison, HSs produced 16 interrogatives that used the personal modal and that could potentially have the negative particle, but only four of them chose to use it. This means that ne was used only in 25% of cases. HSs also used such morpho-syntactic carriers of the illocutionary force as embedding under performative, as in: ja prosto xotela uznat' esli ja mogu vzjat' tvoju knigu and conditional, as in: kak-to budet vozmožnost' esli ja mogu na neskol'ko dnej eë vzjat'?

Figure 2c: Scenario 2 Morpho-Syntactic Structure of Requests

The difference between the two groups was significant, with p = .008, and the null hypothesis of no difference between groups was rejected.
Research question 2d (Scenario 2): Are there differences in the use of modals (if one is required by the structure of the request)?

As with scenario 1, extensive use of the possibility modals was expected in both groups since the most popular strategy type was reference to the preparatory condition. The two groups were identical in their use of modals in scenario 2.

Figure 2d: Scenario 2 Use of Modals

Research question 2e (Scenario 2): Are there differences in the use of morpho-syntactic and lexical downgraders?

None of the NSs used the lexical politeness marker požalujsta in their requests while 17% HSs relied on it in a variety of sentence types. Since HSs did not use mood derivable requests, the politeness marker appears in interrogatives, embedded interrogatives, and even conditional if-clauses. The following utterances serve as examples of the use of the marker in each sentence type:
The difference between the two groups was statistically significant, with $p = .015$.

Therefore, the research question concerning the difference between groups in the use of lexical downgraders was answered affirmatively with regard to the use of the politeness marker požalujsta (Figure 2e.1):

*Figure 2e.1: Scenario 2 Use of požalujsta*

There was no significant difference between groups in the use of all lexical/phrasal downgraders (Figure 2e.2), and the null hypothesis of no difference was retained. There is one interesting, although not statistically significant difference between the groups that concerns specifically the use of hedges: only 3% of NSs (one speaker) used a hedge, in comparison to 22% of HSs. The types of hedges were also
different. The NS used modal operator *možet byt'*, whereas HSS used a variety: *možet byt', tam, prosto, and tol'ko*.

**Figure 2e.2: Scenario 2 Lexical Downgraders**

Finally, although statistical tests did not show significance for the difference between groups on the measure of morpho-syntactic downgraders, a few details are noteworthy. First, only 26% of HSs used the subjunctive to soften their requests, half of the number of NSs (58%). Second, another 20% of HSs used past tense as a downgrader, whereas NSs did not exhibit this strategy at all. Past tense was used by HSs in embedded interrogatives, such as *ja tol'ko xotela sprosit' esli ja mogu na odin den' eë vzjat';* in performative declaratives, such as *ja xotela prosto poprosit' knigu, kotoraja mne nužna*
dlja moej prezentacii; and in declaratives with reference to the preparatory condition, such as i ja dumala možet byt' vy smožete odolžit' mne vašu knigu.

**Figure 2e.3: Scenario 2 Morpho-Syntactic Downgraders**

The null hypothesis regarding the use of morpho-syntactic downgraders was retained: the two groups did not have a significant difference in the use of such downgraders.

*Research question 2f (Scenario 2): Are there differences in the orientation of requests?*

There were significant differences in the orientation of requests between the two groups (p = .017) and the null hypothesis was rejected.
NSs continued to adopt hearer's perspective (65%) while HSs continued to use speaker-oriented strategies (61%). A comparable number of NSs (10%) and HSs (13%) chose an impersonal orientation.

*Research question 2g (Scenario 2): Are there differences in external supportive moves?*

The null hypothesis of no difference with regard to external supportive moves was retained. Both groups used a variety of pre- and post-head act supportive moves, and the differences between them did not have statistical significance. The most popular pre-head act moves were either a grounder or a combination of moves that included a grounder and a preparator. 50% in both groups avoided using any supportive moves after the request was issued.
4.1.3. **Summary of Findings in Production Data**

Due to the large number of categories of analysis, I will summarize the findings in the production part of the study in the form of a table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of analysis</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy type</td>
<td>Both groups relied on reference to the preparatory condition to create the illocutionary force.</td>
<td>Both groups relied on reference to the preparatory condition to create the illocutionary force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic type</td>
<td>Although the majority of participants in both groups (83%) used interrogative sentences, there were significant differences between groups in other types of sentences used. Embedded interrogatives (6%) and complex declaratives (9%) were specific to HSs while hortative sentences</td>
<td>Interrogative continued to be preferred by NSs (94%), but HSs diversified their sentence types. They referred to the preparatory condition by questioning it in interrogatives (59%) and in embedded interrogatives (29%), and by stating it in declarative sentences (8%) and stand-alone if</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were unique to NSs (10%).
clauses (4%). The difference between groups was significant.

| Morpho-syntactic structure | There were significant differences between groups. 63% of NSs used the negative particle while HSs (79%) avoided using it. Out of 21 possible uses of *ne* NSs used it 19 times. HSs also produced 21 interrogatives where the use of *ne* would be possible, but only 2 HSs chose to use it. | There were significant differences between groups. 55% of NSs used negation, in comparison to 8% of HSs. It was used in 18 out of 21 constructions where the use of *ne* was possible (or in 86% of cases) by NSs. HSs used it only in 25% of cases (4 out of 16 possible). A unique structure specific to HSs was embedding under performative (21% of HSs). |
| Use of modals | If the use of a modal is possible, NSs prefer to use the personal modal (68%). The impersonal modal was used by 13% of NSs. Similar preference for the personal forms was observed for HSs (54%), but they relied on the use of the impersonal modal much more heavily (40%). The difference was statistically significant. | The two groups showed identical use of modals (61% chose the personal form and 26% chose the impersonal modal). |
| Morpho-syntactic and lexical downgraders | 60% of NSs used the subjunctive to mitigate their requests in comparison to only 22% of HSs. The data show that HSs rely on the lexical politeness marker to soften their requests: 32% of HSs used *požalujsta*, in comparison to 10% of NSs. HSs did not produce any hortatives, and the use of politeness marker was observed only in the interrogatives. In fact, HSs used *požalujsta* in 38% of all interrogatives they produced. The differences between groups on the use of the morpho-syntactic downgraders and the use of *požalujsta* were | There was no significant difference between groups on the use of morpho-syntactic downgraders, but some tendencies are noteworthy. 58% of NSs used the subjunctive, in comparison to 26% of HSs. In addition, HSs used past tense as a mitigator (28%). NSs did not use *požalujsta* in any of their requests while 17% of HSs used it in interrogatives, embedded interrogatives and even in stand-alone if clauses. The difference was significant. |
There was no significance for the difference between groups on the use of other internal lexical downgraders, such as hedges, understaters, minimizers, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre- and post-head act supportive moves</th>
<th>There was no significance for the difference between groups on the use and type of pre- or post-head act supportive moves.</th>
<th>There was no significance for the difference between groups on the use and type of pre- or post-head act supportive moves.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation of requests</td>
<td>The two groups seem to have almost diametrically opposite strategies in orienting their requests. 80% of NSs focus on the hearer when issuing a request. In comparison, HSs prefer to adopt speaker orientation - 62% (only 26% focus on the hearer); 13% of speakers in each group used impersonal orientation.</td>
<td>The two groups displayed different preferences in orientation: 65% of NS requests were hearer oriented while 61% of HSs utterances focused on the speaker. 10% of NSs and 13% of HSs requests were impersonal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Findings in Comprehension Data

Comprehension Research Question #1

The first research question in the comprehension part of the study was: are HSs as sensitive as NSs to the morpho-syntactic changes (verbal aspect) that affect the interpretation of utterances as requests? To answer it, two utterances were selected from the questionnaire list that contrasted only in the verbal aspect: Vy ne zakroete okno? vs. Vy ne budete zakryvat’ okno? The two groups reacted differently to the change in aspect:
As is evident from these graphs, HSs do not have the same understanding of the pragmatic force of verbal aspect as NSs do. The switch from the perfective to the imperfective verb signaled a change in the communicative intent of the speaker for the control group: 52% of NSs said that the utterance *Vy ne budete zakryvat' okno* does not constitute a request (whereas the perfective utterance was rated 100% requestive, whether typical or not typical). Only 21% of HSs agreed with NSs, not recognizing the imperfective sentence as a request. Additionally, 49% of HSs treated the utterance as a non-typical request, in comparison to 37% of NSs. A non-parametric test (chi-square) showed that the difference was statistically significant, with $p = .005$, and the null hypothesis was rejected: HSs are not as sensitive to the changes in verbal aspect that affect the interpretation of interrogative utterances as requests.
Comprehension Research Question #2

The second research question in the comprehension part of the study aims to uncover whether HSs are as sensitive as NSs are to morpho-syntactic changes, such as inverted word order or the use of the subjunctive that affect the politeness value of a request. To answer this question, I analyzed participants' ratings of three pairs of utterances: sentences in the first two sets had different word order, and utterances in the third pair differed in the use of subjunctive. The first two sets represented different requestive strategies: direct (mood derivable) and conventionally indirect (query action). Let us start with a pair of indirect requests, differing in the verb-object order: *Vy ne zakroete okno?* (VO) and *Okno vy ne zakroete?* (OV).

**Figure 3b Comprehension: Word Order in Indirect Requests**

![Graph showing comprehension of word order in indirect requests for Heritage and Native speakers](image-url)
The graphs in Figure 3b Comprehension show that while some HSs have at least some understanding of the pragmatic meaning of word order, as a group they are not as sensitive as NSs are to the inversion of the verb-object order that results in a lower politeness value of a request. NSs' reaction to the change is telling: if 52% of the group thought that the VO utterance was a polite request, only 13% thought so about the OV utterance. The most popular politeness rating among NSs for the OV order was that the utterance was "impolite." HSs also reacted to the change, but not as dramatically as NSs: the OV order triggered only a slight decrease in the politeness rating - from 41% "polite" for the VO to 33% for the OV order. The most popular HSs' rating for the OV request was "slightly impolite" (53%), which was a slight increase from the 41% for the VO order. This indicates that HSs are in general more accepting of the OV indirect request than NSs, even if they think it is somewhat less suitable for polite conversation than the VO request. Interestingly also, both utterances had the "too polite" rating in the HSs' group, which was not true for NSs. The OV request was rated as "too polite" by 2% of the HS participants. A chi-square test of independent samples showed that the difference in the groups' responses to changes in word order was statistically significant, with \( p = .000 \), and the null hypothesis was rejected: HSs are not as sensitive as NSs to the changes in word that affect the politeness value of an indirect request.

Participants' responses to the open-ended question about additional shades of meaning they sense in each utterance are also revealing. Although both groups agreed on the types of possible additional meaning, the number of "votes" for each type was different. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of NSs said that the inverted word order request indicated impatience on the part of the speaker while only 38% of HSs thought so.
Fifteen percent (15%) of HSs thought the utterance could be a friendly reminder (in comparison to 3% of NSs), and 6% in both groups found the OV request to carry a hint of threat.

Another pair of utterances that was tested for the effect of word order on politeness represented the direct requestive strategy: hortative constructions with the imperative and no lexical modifiers of politeness: *Zakrojte okno! vs. Okno zakrojte*¹³!

The graphs below (Figure 3c Comprehension) indicate that although neither group thought the mood derivable request to be very polite regardless of word order, there are differences in the degrees of opinion. The typical (VO) word order was viewed by NSs as mostly impolite (43%) and possibly rude (25%) while HSs thought that the request was mostly rude (39%), and perhaps impolite (28%) or slightly impolite (24%). When the word order changed to OV, NSs reacted by increasing the rating of "rude" to 44% and "very rude" to 20% (from 7% for VO order). Some NSs (20%) rated the OV as simply "impolite." HSs did not seem to have much of a reaction to the change in word order: the "rude" rating went up by only 5% (from 39% to 44%), the rating "impolite" remained at 28% as did the rating "very rude" (4%). The rating "slightly impolite" decreased insignificantly from 24% to 22%.

¹³ Mills points out that the lexical marker is not necessary in Russian even in direct requests when they are pronounced with normal falling intonation.
A chi-square test of independent samples showed that the treatment of the VO direct requests by the two groups was similar ($p = .624$). The distribution of responses to the change in word order (OV) between the two groups was also not statistically significant, with $p = .098$, and the null hypothesis was retained: the two groups are equally sensitive to the changes in word order that affect the politeness value of a direct request.

Finally, responses to two requests that differed in the use of the subjunctive were compared.
Interestingly, the tendency in the NSs group was to regard the use of the subjunctive as an agent of impoliteness. Twenty-three percent (23%) of NSs rated the subjunctive sentence as impolite (an increase from 7% rating for the indicative sentence). The "polite" rating went down from 52% to 37% because of the use of the subjunctive. Four percent (4%) of NSs even thought that the utterance with the subjunctive sounded rude. Their comments on the additional shades of meaning reveal that 50% of NSs find the utterance to have the air of a sarcastic and impatient request.

HSs also reacted to the change in the mood, but somewhat differently. In their view, the use of the subjunctive increased the level of politeness, albeit by a small percentage. The "polite" rating increased (from 41% for the utterance in the indicative mood to 50% for the subjunctive) while the "impolite" and "slightly impolite" ratings decreased (from 13% to 9% and from 41% to 37% respectively). None of the HSs
thought that the utterance with the subjunctive was rude, and 4% thought that it was even too polite (4% also gave the same rating to the indicative utterance). However, these differences in opinion were too small to show statistical significance (p = .089), and the null hypothesis was retained: HSs and NSs do not differ in their treatment of the subjunctive as an agent of politeness in requests.

Comprehension Research Question #3

The third research question in the comprehension part of the study concerned the lexical politeness marker požalujsta: does its presence or absence in an utterance influence HSs' ratings of politeness in comparison to NSs? Responses to two utterances were compared. The utterances represented the prototypical Russian direct request (according to Mills and Formanovskaja), the imperative, and differed in the use of the lexical politeness marker: Zakrojte, požalujsta, okno! vs. Zakrojte okno!

Figure 3e Comprehension: Požalujsta in Direct Requests

Zakrojte, požalujsta, okno!          Zakrojte okno!
The ratings for the mood derivable request with the marker požalujsta are practically identical across the two groups, and the responses are cohesive within groups. The overwhelming majority in both groups found the utterance polite: 81% for HSs and 77% for NSs. However, the participants were not in absolute agreement both within and across groups regarding the utterance Zakrojte okno! As was already mentioned, NSs thought that the utterance was mostly an impolite request (43%) and possibly even rude (25%) while HSs thought that it was mostly rude (39%), and possibly impolite (28%) or slightly impolite (24%). What is clear is that both groups reacted to the absence of the lexical politeness marker: the rating "polite" dropped by 66% in the NSs group and by 77% in the HSs group. However, it is also clear that HSs treated the absence of požalujsta as a bigger problem than NSs did. Although the difference in the rating of the bare imperative between groups was not statistically significant (p=.624), there is an indication that HSs may be less forgiving of the absence of the politeness marker požalujsta in direct requests.

**Comprehension Research Question #4**

Research question # 4 concerned comprehension of the pragmatic meaning of a hedged utterance: are the two groups similar in their treatment of the hedge možet that may influence the illocutionary force of an utterance and/or its politeness value?

Mills claims (1992) that colloquial Russian has a commonly used hedge - možet - which helps mitigate the directive. She lists the utterance možet, vy zakroete okno? (pronounced with polite contour of IC-3) as a "fine example" of a polite request. In her view and according to her informants, this utterance accomplishes simultaneously two
functions: it politely inquires about the hearer's ability and willingness to perform the action. The data from NSs in this study do not support this conclusion.

Figure 3f Comprehension: The Hedge možet

NSs in this study could not agree on whether this was a typical request: 39% thought so, 45% thought that this was not a typical request and 16% would not recognize this phrase as a request. Moreover, the 84% who thought the phrase to be a request (albeit atypical) did not find it polite at all. The group's opinions were split almost equally between "rude" (35%), "impolite" (35%) and "slightly impolite" (31%).

Opinions expressed by HSs were vastly different from the baseline group: 75% of HSs thought this utterance was a typical straightforward and direct request, 16% rated it as a non-typical request and only 8% would not recognize it as a request. As a group, HSs found the phrase mostly polite (41%). A third of those who treated the utterance as a request thought that it was a slightly impolite one, and 23% thought that it was impolite. Only two percent found it rude (and another two percent saw it as very rude).
The differences on both measures - directness/typicality and politeness were significant: \( p = .002 \) and \( .000 \) respectively, and the null hypothesis was rejected. The two groups are indeed different in their treatment of the hedge *možet* which may influence the illocutionary force of an utterance and its politeness value.

The groups also differed in their assessment of additional shades of meaning evoked by this utterance. The majority of NSs (58%) thought that this was an impatient request, in comparison with 21% of HSs who thought so. Another 27% of NSs felt a hint of threat whereas only 14% of HSs noticed it. In addition, 19% of HSs decided that the phrase was a friendly reminder to perform the action whereas NSs did not report this at all. The difference between the groups was statistically significant, with \( p = .005 \).

*Comprehension Research Question #5*

Finally, comprehension research question # 5 concerned the pragmatic value of elliptical utterances: are the two groups similar in their treatment of ellipsis as requests? Both NSs and HSs saw the two elliptical utterances - *zakroete?* and *zakroete, a?* - as requests and as mostly impolite requests, and the difference between groups did not have statistical significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained: the two groups do not differ in their treatment of ellipsis as requests.
Figure 3g Comprehension: Ellipsis

Zakroete? (accompanied by a hand gesture toward the window)

Zakroete, a?
4.2.1. **Summary of Findings in Comprehension Data**

Overall, HSs tend to agree with NSs in their interpretation of requests in Russian with three important exceptions: their views on the effects of aspect and word order on indirect requests, and on the use of the hedge *možno*. First, HSs are significantly less sensitive to the pragmatic force of the verbal aspect (*p* = .005). The majority of NSs (52%) thought that a shift from the perfective future to the imperfective future removed the illocutionary force of a requestive from the utterance whereas only 21% of HSs noticed this. Second, HSs appear to be less sensitive to the effects of word order (VO vs. OV) on the politeness level of indirect requests: they were much more accepting of the OV order than NSs even if they thought it less suitable for a very polite conversation (*p* = .000). However, in direct requests represented by bare imperative constructions, HSs did not seem to have much of a reaction to the change of verb-object order whereas NSs had a noticeable negative reaction. Still, both groups thought that bare imperatives regardless of word order were not a polite way to ask for a favor.

Finally, HSs and NSs differed in their treatment of the hedged utterance *možet, vy zakroete okno?* While NSs seemed to be confused about its illocutionary force (some thought it to be a typical request, others - a non-typical one, and still others - not a request at all, HSs saw it mostly as a typical request. The politeness ratings for this utterance seemed to be almost opposing in the two groups: what NSs saw mostly as a rude or impolite request, HSs saw as polite or slightly impolite.

The analysis showed no significant differences between the two groups in their treatment of the subjunctive (in indirect requests) or of the lexical politeness marker *požalujsta* (in direct requests) as the mitigating force. However, a closer look reveals
some interesting, albeit statistically insignificant nuances. HSs tend to view the subjunctive as increasing the politeness value of an indirect request, whereas NSs treat it largely as an agent of impoliteness, sarcasm and impatience. There is also an indication that HSs may be less forgiving of the lack of \textit{požalujsta} in direct requests in comparison to NSs.

\textbf{CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION}

The current study has a descriptive orientation with the main goal to create a baseline for the pragmatic competence of speakers who acquire Russian under the less-than-perfect conditions that characterize language contact in immigrant populations. However, some preliminary theoretical analysis can be made, specifically of the findings in the production part of the study, and I will attempt to offer an explanation for the observed phenomena.

I will approach the discussion in a chiastic manner by starting with the interpretation of findings in the comprehension part of the study because they show less difference between groups than the findings in the production part. The main part of the discussion will focus on the production part as it contains richer material for interpretation and analysis.

\textbf{5.1. Interpretation of Comprehension Data}

Not surprisingly, HSs show more similarities with NSs in comprehension than in production of requests. The research goals for the comprehension part of the study did
not target comprehension in general, but rather the sensitivity of HSs and NSs to certain morpho-syntactic elements that affect the illocutionary force and/or politeness value of utterances. Specifically, the two groups were compared in their treatment of verbal aspect, word order, the subjunctive, the lexical politeness marker *požalujsta*, the hedge *možet*, and the ellipsis.

The analysis of the comprehension data also allowed to draw important conclusions about monolingual speakers's tendencies in the interpretation of pragmatic meanings of various formal elements, which do not always support Mills' claims about Russian requests: language opinions expressed by NSs in this study differed from those expressed by NSs in Mills' earlier studies (at least with regards to some of the linguistic elements tested). This difference was an unanticipated discovery and deserves a brief discussion for each pair of utterances where NSs ratings from the two studies diverge. Because NSs' responses provide the benchmark for comparison with the HSs data, a reconciliation of findings for NSs will be done before the discussion of the HSs data whenever it is necessary.

The data show that HSs and NSs react differently to changes in verbal aspect and word order. Prior research on heritage Russian indicates that HSs lack the full range of discourse meanings of aspect, specifically, the pragmatically based functions of the imperfective (Laleko, 2010), and avoid using verb-subject word order as a narration strategy (Isurin & Ivanova-Sullivan, 2008). The present study shows that Russian HSs also lack sensitivity to the roles these linguistic elements play in illocutionary constructions. If the majority of NSs (52%) treated an interrogative with a future imperfective verb (*vy ne budete zakryvat’ okno?*) as a non-requestive utterance, only a
small portion of the HS group reacted the same way. For the most part, HSs still interpreted this utterance as a non-typical request (49%), and a third of the group continued to treat it as a straightforward request (30%).

NSs in Mills' study (1992) reported that the aspectual shift in a negative interrogative created a range of implicatures from a delicate reminder to a surprised criticism. In this study, NSs and HSs provided a slightly different interpretation. Those NSs who did sense the directive illocutionary force in the utterance agreed with NSs' in Mills' study that such construction sounds like an impatient request, and possibly carries a hint of threat. It is remarkable that despite the fact that HSs missed the change in the illocutionary meaning triggered by a switch in verbal aspect, they did register the change in the politeness value of the utterance, and their ratings were very close to those of NSs: 45% of HSs and 53% of NSs who considered this utterance a request said it was impatient. This suggests that HSs have at least some understanding of the illocutionary meaning of verbal aspect: if not as a factor in the creation of the illocutionary force, then at least as an agent in imparting (im)politeness.

Mills (1992) argues that a change in verb-object word order affects the politeness value of a requestive interrogative. Her native informants suggested that the exact interpretation depends more on the intonation, and that word order, in fact, is only secondary. According to these informants, the utterance 'okno vy ne zakroete?' could be inferred as a polite reminder to a social superior. NSs in this study reacted differently and rated this utterance as mostly impolite and possibly rude, and by all means impatient. The difference between the two groups of NSs is likely to be due to the difference in methodology. Mills provided her native informants with utterances that she selected
from a continuum of a prototypical information-seeking question and prototypical imperative, and discussed these utterances orally. Therefore, her NSs had a chance to try out various intonation contours and express their opinion based on both, the utterance in print and its possible phonetic realizations. They provided Mills with a variety of possible implicatures of the sentence that arise out of the interplay between the intonation and word order. When pronounced with only one intonation center on the stressed syllable of the verb, the utterance *okno vy ne zakroete?* can certainly sound polite. However, the more typical intonation would have two centers *okno (2) vy ne zakro(3)ete?* - which would emphasize the inverted OV order and would decrease the politeness reading of the utterance.

Unlike native informants who worked with Mills, the NSs in this study were asked to fill out a written questionnaire where intonation was not controlled. The NSs could imagine the intonation that would be most suitable to the utterance in question, although they were instructed to assume a 'normal' social setting: i.e., the hypothetical speaker addressing them was a very ordinary person. It is telling that the NSs rated the OV interrogative utterance as an impolite and possibly rude request. Most likely, they acted on their first association of this construction with the intonation that has 2 centers: *okno (1) vy ne zakro(3)ete?* Therefore, their ratings of politeness for this utterance were more unequivocally impolite/rude than those of Mills' NSs.

The ratings of HSs differed from the NS baseline, but only by a degree. For the most part, HSs saw this construction as a slightly impolite or possibly impolite (but not rude) request, and only 38% of them considered it an impatient request (in comparison to the 58% of NSs). Although the difference between groups was not significant, the more
generous politeness rating of the OV interrogative by HSs suggests that they are less sensitive to the effect that word order has on the politeness value of an utterance than NSs are, at least in indirect requests.

The subjunctive can also be used to mitigate the performance force of a requestive interrogative, according to Mills. In fact, her native informants rated utterances with a combination of the negative and subjunctive particles as hyper-polite. They felt that such utterances created too much emphasis on the favor. The NSs in this study seemed to agree with Mill's native-speaking informants. They treated the addition of the subjunctive to the negative interrogative with a future perfective verb as a politeness-decreasing agent: vy ne zakryli by okno? Such a high level of politeness was deemed 'unjustified' in the given social context and led some NSs to believe that the speaker was being sarcastic and impatient.

Although the difference between groups did not have statistical significance, HSs showed a tendency to accept the subjunctive as a politeness enhancer and did not see the sarcasm. HSs' treatment of the subjunctive seems to indicate a possible effect of cross-linguistic influence. The subjunctive is regularly used in English indirect requests as a mitigating force that increases politeness ratings (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). In comparison, Russian NSs may be content just with the negative particle in requests that are not characterized by a high degree of imposition on the speaker (Mills, 1992). The social context set in the questionnaire implied only a modest degree of imposition, and therefore, NSs rated the subjunctive as 'unjustified' politeness. HSs tended to treat the subjunctive in the same utterance as a 'normal' politeness-enhancing device. As the discussion section on production data will show, HSs did not carry this
treatment of the subjunctive over to the production of requests, a result that for now evades explanation.

The ultimate example of the effect of transfer in the comprehension of requests comes from the analysis of HSs ratings of the utterance with a hedge možet: možet, vy zakroete okno? Mills argues that in the absence of negation, when Russian speakers try to observe the Gricean maxim "Don't assume that the hearer is willing to perform the action," they sense the need for an additional semantic operation to help mitigate the directive. Mills claims that a positive interrogative with a hedge pronounced with the polite contour IC-3 is a polite request that exhibits "pragmatic duality" (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989) because "it manages to politely inquire both as to H's ability and willingness to perform the action" (Mills, 1992, p.74). NSs in this study did not agree with Mills' assessment. First, they were not sure how to treat this utterance and were split in their decision about whether it is a canonical or non-canonical request or whether it is a request at all. Second, if they thought it was a request (canonical or not), they rated it as rude or impolite. Again, the difference between two groups of NSs (in Mills' study and this dissertation) may be attributed to methodology. NSs in this study had to imagine the intonation that would frame each utterance on their own, and they must have rated the utterance based on the intonation that is associated most often with this particular combination of words. While several intonation contours are possible for this utterance, NSs picked the first variant that came to mind which is probably the most frequently used and most probable.

HSs' opinion of the same utterance was exactly the opposite of the NSs'. Most of them thought that this utterance was a request and that it was polite or only slightly
impolite. The explanation may lie in the HSs' notorious inattentiveness to morphological details. They see only the metaphorical forest, but not the individual trees. Therefore, they may not have noticed the ending on the word *możet* which is very similar to the word *możete*. Hence, they may have read the utterance as a question about the hearer's ability to perform the action. Without the negative particle, this sentence then can be seen as a literal translation of a prototypical English request: *Can you close the window?* Furthermore, the "impolite" and "slightly impolite" ratings of the utterance may have been caused by the fact that HSs felt a lack of mitigation in this request: the utterances lacked a subjunctive form or the lexical politeness marker *please*. This mitigation would have been expected in an English request, but if HSs viewed the Russian utterance as a literal equivalent of the English directive, they may have transferred their English-based expectations about mitigation. In addition, HSs may not have access to all possible phonetic realizations of this utterance (and others in this study) and, as a result, may not imagine the intonation that is most frequently associated with this particular combination of words. Therefore, imagining a possible intonation cannot guide HSs through the choice of ratings.

HSs' treatment of direct requests did not differ much from that of native speakers. Neither group liked the bare imperative construction with either VO or OV word order, and both groups appreciated the lexical politeness marker *pożalujsta*. However, there was a remarkable tendency for the HS group to have a more defined reaction to the lack of *pożalujsta*: 39% of HSs rated an imperative construction without *pożalujsta* as rude, in comparison to 25% of NSs. Although not statistically significant, this tendency to prefer
the overt lexical politeness marker is remarkable, and is manifested dramatically in the
production of requests, as the discussion of production data will show.

There are two important final points that need to be made in the discussion of
comprehension of requests by HSs. First, as I already mentioned in relation to the ratings
of the hedged interrogative, HSs cannot rely on intonation when interpreting written
utterances in the same way as NSs can. As Mills points out (1992), interpretation of
interrogative utterances depends to a large degree on intonation. In fact, she cites her
native informants who claim that word order comes secondary to intonation in
interpretation of politeness value of an interrogative request. Since HSs are usually not
exposed to Russian outside their homes and the immediate family environment, they lack
the important experience in interpreting pragmatic meaning of various combinations of
morphological elements and intonation.

The second point has to do with a possible and unexpected influence of the data
collection method on the findings. When the questionnaire was first designed, it was
tested on two native speakers who immediately commented that utterances without any
attention getters, such as a term of address or the handy izvinite, automatically sound
rude. To address this problem, a gender-specific attention getter was added before all
utterances in the questionnaire: molodoj čelovek or devuška. During the experiment, a
few HS participants commented that they were bothered by the terms of address, which
sounded rude to them, but it was not until the data were collected, analyzed and presented
at the First International Heritage Language Conference in Los Angeles, that it became
clear that such terms of address may have skewed the politeness ratings of some HSs in
all or most utterances. A proficient Russian heritage speaker at the conference, who had
spent a significant amount of time in Russia, pointed out that the English equivalents of these terms of address could make even the most carefully constructed request sound condescending for a heritage speaker who had not spent a substantial time in Russia, and that some HSs may have translated Russian terms of address into English when filling out the questionnaire. This would undoubtedly influence their politeness ratings of all the utterances in the experiment. While the methodology was reliable and the language of the questionnaire was appropriate, some HSs may have been biased by English in assigning lower than expected politeness ratings to these requestive utterances.

To summarize the discussion of findings in the comprehension part of the study, several points need to be stressed. First, there seems to be little evidence of cross-linguistic influence. There are indications in the data that HSs may transfer the expectation of request-mitigating devices, such as the subjunctive and the lexical politeness marker. However, there is no robust statistical evidence to support this claim. Overall, HSs do not seem to differ much in the comprehension of the pragmatic meaning of utterances and their politeness value. They are shaky on interpreting correctly the pragmatic meaning of aspectual or word-order change, but overall they understand that they are being asked to perform an action and can differentiate between polite and impolite requests. What they miss are the nuances of interpretation. On a bus in Russia filled with native Russian speakers, they will occasionally misread the speaker's irritation hidden behind the imperfective verb or an interrogative with an OV word order. On the other hand, they will tend to feel uncomfortable when addressed with an imperative construction, especially without pożalujsta. The literature on HSs shows that their comprehension is usually good and can match that of native speakers (Benmamoun et al.,
This study suggests that while understanding words correctly, HSs may miss some important nuances of pragmatic meaning, such as the illocutionary force or politeness value of an utterance. Still, as the next section will discuss, HSs are much better at the comprehension of requests than at their production, which is characterized by greater deviation from the native speaker baseline.

5.2. **Interpretation of Production Data**

5.2.1. **Descriptive analysis**

The production data suggest that despite important similarities, there are significant differences between requests made by heritage speakers and native speakers of Russian. As was shown in the Findings section, some of the requests produced by HSs have unique and non-conventional features in several units of analysis. These features merit detailed discussion because they diverge so vividly from the NS norm described in previous studies and observed in the data for native Russian participants in this study. I will identify salient tendencies in HSs' requests and attempt to explain their unique features and their prevalence.

Before I begin to describe these unique features, it is important to point out one important similarity between NSs and HSs. In both scenarios both groups of speakers showed a universal tendency to use indirect strategies when asking for a favor: NSs and HSs relied on reference to the hearer's ability to perform the action. However, the utterances produced by HSs in each scenario reveal several notable tendencies in all components of the requestive illocutionary structure that point in the directions of cross-linguistic interference, incomplete acquisition, and a possible restructuring of the
pragmatic meanings of some Russian forms. Specifically, these components include the syntactic sentence type, the 'required' morpho-syntactic elements, the morpho-syntactic downgraders, the use of modals, the lexical politeness marker, and the orientation of requests. I will now discuss each of these tendencies separately.

**Sentence Type: Evidence of Transfer**

Since both groups opt for the indirect strategy (specifically, reference to the preparatory condition), they rely mostly on the interrogative: 83% in each group in scenario 1, and 94% of NS requests vs. 59% of HS requests in scenario 2. However, the statistically significant difference between groups lies in the use of the other requestive strategies (the other 17% in scenario 1, and 41% in scenario 2). First, in scenario 1 where the social distance between interlocutors is minimal, some native speakers use the hortative (mood derivable), which is in line with what has been argued by previous researchers (Mills, 1992; Dong, 2009) who identify imperative constructions as a preferred realization of requests addressed to a peer. The data in this study did not support this conclusion, but did show that the hortative (mood derivable) is a viable option for some native speakers (10% in this group).

In comparison, heritage speakers never used the hortative, but rather employed a unique strategy that has no counterpart in the NSs data: an embedded interrogative (6%). This syntactic form occurs even more frequently in scenario 2 where the social distance between interlocutors is increased: 29% of HSs use this construction. This pattern suggests that in heritage Russian the embedded interrogative may be the marker of a higher degree of deference that is reserved for formal situations. This syntactic form is
conditioned by the use of embedding under a performative verb, a conventional form for realization of indirect requests in English. I will discuss this form in more detail in the following section.

Another interesting syntactic realization of requestive strategies by HSs is the use of complex declaratives of the type:

1) bylo by očen' klassno, esli by ty mogla odolžit' mne na noc'.

This type of syntactic construction is also absent from the NSs data, but is used by 9% of HSs in scenario 1 and by 8% in scenario 2.

Both constructions seem to be the result of a pragmalinguistic transfer from English. As we know, the socialization of Russian heritage speakers happens primarily in the English language context outside of home. Therefore, they lack the necessary exposure to the variety of possible syntactic realizations of requests in full Russian, especially when it comes to formal situations. They sense the need to show a higher degree of deference when requesting something from an addressee whose social status is higher than that of their own, but are not sure about how to do this appropriately in Russian. Consequently, HSs use what is readily available to them - their knowledge of English, and they calque English syntax onto Russian. In other words, they have the convention of means, i.e. to use indirect strategy when asking a social superior for favor, but at least some of them lack the Russian convention of form (H. Clark, 1979).

*Morpho-Syntactic Structure of Requests: Evidence of Transfer and Incomplete Acquisition*

This section compares only those utterances where the use of the negation would be structurally possible; most of these are interrogatives with the personal modal. HSs
seem to miss the negative particle as a 'required' element of conventionally indirect requests in Russian almost entirely. In scenario 1, out of 21 possible uses of *ne*, all in interrogatives with the use of a personal modal, only two HSs (or 4%) used it. In comparison, NSs used it 19 times (out of 21 possible) or 91% of the time. HSs also used non-native grammatical means to construct a request, such as embedding under performative -

2) *ja xotel uznat' esli ja mogu polučit' konspekt na paru časov*

- and conditional clauses in complex subordinate sentences (as in #1 above). Both were minimal (4% each), but their use increased as the social distance between interlocutors increased. Notably, in scenario 2, embedding under performative was used by 21% of HSs while another 8% used the conditional. In sentences where the use of the negative particle would be possible, HSs continued to avoid the negative particle. Out of 16 interrogatives produced by HSs where the use of the negation is possible, *ne* is present only in four (or in 25% of cases), and only in two utterances it negates a personal modal. In the other two interrogatives, *ne* was not used with a finite modal or a future perfective verb, which would be the most conventionalized ways to ask for a favor. Instead, the two HSs who produced these utterances used the highly formulaic expressions *u vas slučajno netu* and *ne budete tak ljubezny*, which created additional undesirable and misleading connotations of which the speakers were probably unaware:

3) *U vas slučajno netu lišnej kopii čtoby ya mogla odolžit' na paročku dnej?*

4) *Ne budete tak ljubezny otdat' mne ètu knigu na neskol'ko dnej?*

The HS in # 3 appears to be familiar with a highly conventionalized polite formula for asking for things, which is so common in colloquial Russian that it is an
obvious member of the group *gorodskie stereotipy*, a term introduced by Lapteva for formulaic expressions that are used and understood as ready-made formulas for daily interactions. The application of this formula trivializes the imposition in the situation where a student asks a professor for a rare book (cf. *u vas slučajno netu lišnej sigaretki?*).

The HS in #4 creates an exaggerated degree of politeness by using an old-fashioned and also highly conventionalized formula *ne budete tak ljubezny*. This exaggeration is incompatible with the social parameters of the situation: asking a professor to be *nice* and lend a book is not the same as showing deference and a lack of presumptions. The effect of such 'hyper' politeness on a NS hearer is that the request comes across as an almost intentional mockery. If we remove these two formulaic expressions from the statistical count of HSs requests with negation, then the percentage of such requests is reduced to 12%. In comparison, NSs employed negation in 86% of cases when its use was possible (18 out of 21 interrogatives), and in all cases the negative particle was used to negate a personal modal.

What could be an explanation for the stark difference between the two groups in the use of the negative particle, and in the high use of embedding under performative by HSs in scenario 2? The use of embedding and conditional clauses is clearly the result of language interference from English. These constructions do not appear in the Russian data and have not been reported by Mills, Formanovskaja, or Lapteva. The omission of the negative particle deserves closer attention.

There are four possible and interrelated explanations for the lack of the negative particle in indirect requests produced by HSs. First, its omission can be the result of transfer from English. As Brown and Levinson (1987) note, English indirect requests do
not use negation in an interrogative. Its use is possible only in assertions, and the simultaneous employment of a positive tag is obligatory. In addition, the subjunctive, as an additional downgrader, is preferred: *You can't/couldn't possibly give me your notes, can/could you?* Since negation is not used in requestive interrogatives in English, HSs may transfer the English positive structure to Russian. In other words, they may not even imagine that the negative particle has a place in a requestive utterance that is framed as an interrogative.

Another and related explanation could be that as speakers of English, HSs are intuitively aware that the use of a negation in a requestive interrogative would turn a polite English request into an utterance that has an attitude and could be insulting to the hearer: **Can't you give me your class notes? (what's wrong with you?!)** Since the socialization of HSs into Russian conversational conventions is never comprehensive and becomes drastically reduced with the onset of schooling, HSs may not realize that the negative particle has the opposite effect on a requestive interrogative in Russian, and avoid what they view as a terrible insult to face by intuitively omitting the particle in Russian.

A third possibility related to the previous two explanations takes into account the formulaic nature of the negative particle in Russian requests. Since the use of this particle in requests is a feature of convention, rather than a morpho-syntactic requirement, it can be said to be formulaic. Because formulaic language use is the product of extensive language socialization through schooling, reading, and active participation in oral culture on all levels of discourse, HSs whose socialization into Russian speech conventions is deficient, may not acquire the formulaic meaning of the negative particle in Russian. On
the other hand, there is evidence that some HSs may know not just the formulaic meaning of the negative particle, but entire formulaic expressions - as in #1 and #2 above. There is a question, however, of whether the two HSs who used formulaic expressions ne budete tak ljubezny and u vas slučajno netu are aware of the pragmatic force of the negative particle. Considering the fact that both HSs misused these formulaic expressions, it is possible that they exist in the language of these HSs only as unanalyzed lexical chunks.

Finally, there is some preliminary evidence that the negative particle as a simultaneous marker of request and deference in indirect requests may appear late in the order of acquisition for monolingual children. A search of the CHILDES database produced a number of sentences in child-directed speech that indicate that indirect requests that children hear at home do not contain the negative particle. None of the indirect requests containing a personal modal addressed to a 2-year-old Tanya by an adult were negated. One explanation for this may be that the negative particle in Russian not only imparts the requestive meaning onto the interrogative, but is also a marker of deference (Mills, 1992). Deference is a social concept and is related to social distance and social hierarchy. Since the relationship between a care-taker and a child is characterized by a minimum distance and a negative power differential, its use in indirect requests may be rendered unnecessary and even infelicitous in interactions between children and members of the immediate family/close family friends.

The adult in Tanya's transcripts (CHILDES: Tanya) issued interrogative requests using positive interrogatives that could be interpreted both as information-

---

14 Here I use the transliteration adopted in CHILDES database, which differs from the transliteration method I've been using throughout the dissertation.
seeking interrogatives and as directives. Perhaps, the adult speaker felt that there was no need to disambiguate the request from the information-seeking interrogative in the context of interacting with a child, and therefore, the duality of pragmatic function was intentional: *Tanečka, ty možeš pokazat' mne Tanyu?* The utterance was meant to be both a question about Tanja's ability to do this action and prompting of the action. At the same time, there was also no need for extensive face-work and, therefore, for a show of deference, on the part of the speaker since the addressee was a two-year-old child.

If CHILDES Tanya's transcripts can serve as a reliable example of child-directed speech\(^{15}\), we can draw a preliminary conclusion that monolingual Russian children do not always hear negative interrogatives used as requests in early childhood. In heritage language acquisition, by the time monolingual Russian-speaking children learn the concept of deference and the linguistic means to express it, they are already deeply immersed in socialization in the English language, having never acquired the convention of the negative particle in Russian.

---

\(^{15}\) It is noteworthy that the adult speaker (Eva Bar-Shalom) who interviewed Tanya is bilingual in Russian (native language) and English. It is possible that Eva exhibits signs of cross-linguistic influence from English in her requestive strategies, and that is the reason why she uses positive interrogatives as requests. Transcripts of the other Russian child (Varja) in the CHILDES database did not contain examples of either positive or negative interrogatives used as requests and addressed to the child. Varja was growing up in a monolingual Russian environment whereas Tanya was growing up in America and was obviously exposed to English (she used some English words in her Russian speech). If Eva's Russian indeed is influenced by English, it will undermine the explanation offered for the lack of negation in requests of HSs. On the other hand, it may support this explanation as Eva may be representative of bilingual Russian-speaking parents in the U.S. The models of requests that HSs hear in their homes may already deviate from the Russian language norm because their parents' Russian is affected by English.
Morpho-Syntactic Downgraders: Evidence of Transfer

HSs fail to use the morpho-syntactic means of softening the request available in full Russian: namely, the subjunctive and negation. In scenario 1, negation was used by HSs in 4% and by NSs in 91% of cases when its use was possible (i.e., in interrogative utterances with personal modal). The subjunctive was used by 22% of HSs and 60% of NSs. The trend continued in scenario 2: negation was used in 12% (by HSs) vs. 86% (by NSs) of cases where its use was possible, and the subjunctive was used by 26% of HSs vs. 58% of NSs.

The lack of negation as a marker of request and deference in the speech of HSs was already explained in the previous section. The underuse of the subjunctive is harder to explain. It is possible that HSs have not acquired the subjunctive, as is suggested by Polinsky (1995). Polinsky shows that speakers of American Russian (i.e., heritage speakers) tend to use more past tense forms of the verb without the particle by in lieu of the full subjunctive form. The data in this study do not fit this observation. When HSs use the subjunctive in their utterances, they use the full form: past tense + the particle by. When they use just past tense forms, they are not meant to be the subjunctive (as in # 5 below). Therefore, the HSs in this study exhibit full knowledge of the subjunctive form, but for some reason do not use this form to upgrade the politeness level of their requests.

This behavior runs contrary to the expectation that HSs would transfer the English politeness strategy to Russian by over-supplying the subjunctive forms. After all, the subjunctive has been shown to be the major mitigating element in English requests

---

16 Even though I treat the negative particle as a crucial element in the grammatical structure of requests that are based on reference to the preparatory condition, ne is also a mitigating element in Russian requests that imparts a greater degree of deference.

17 This is the adjusted percentage which excludes 2 negative construction that were misused by HSs.
(Brown & Levinson, 1987; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Mills 1992). Instead, HSs seem to have chosen a different strategy for mitigating threat to the speaker's face.

Heritage speakers have an impoverished repertoire of morpho-syntactic strategies to make indirect polite requests in Russian (specifically, the negative particle), they compensate by relying on English pragmalinguistic means, which they transfer to Russian. In the formal situation when they have to ask a social superior for a favor, HSs seem to lose confidence in their ability to create the necessary degree of deference and politeness with Russian constructions and start to calque English morpho-syntax. Hence, there is an increase in the usage of embedding under performative (from 4% in scenario 1 to 21% of all requests in scenario 2) and of the past tense (from 6% to 28% of all requests):

5) *ja dumala* vy možet byt' dadite mne vašu knigu na dva dnja. (past tense)

6) *ja xoču sprosit' esli ja eë mogu odolžit' požalujsta.* (embedding under performative)

7) *ja xotel sprosit' esli mog na paru dnej eë ispol'zovat'.* (past tense and embedding under performative)

While the NS participants also manipulated tense to increase politeness level (3% of NSs used past tense in scenario 1 and 3% used future tense in scenario 2), constructions with embedding (either under performative or not) were present only in the HSs data. I hypothesize that for HSs embedded interrogatives with embedding under performative may be becoming a conventionalized way to formulate polite requests for favor which express a greater degree of deference. This construction may be even more preferred than the use of the lexical politeness marker *požalujsta* in indirect requests, as its use
decreases in formal situation. A more detailed use of the Russian lexical politeness marker is presented in the next section.

Use of Požalujsta: Evidence of Transfer

In the informal situation, 32% of HSs used požalujsta in comparison to only 10% of NSs, and in the formal scenario 17% of HSs employed the marker while NSs never used it. It is also remarkable that HSs use požalujsta in almost all sentence types they produce: interrogatives (#8), embedded interrogatives (#9), and even stand alone if-clauses (#10):

8) Vy možete mne požalujsta odolžit' etu knigu?
9) Ja xoču sprosit' esli ja eë mogu odolžit' požalujsta.
10) Požalujsta esli ja by mog odolžit' u vas knigu...

In comparison, two out of the three NSs who used the politeness marker in both situations combined it with the imperative, and only one speaker used it in the interrogative. This difference between two groups merits an extensive analysis.

There are two possible and interrelated explanations for the overuse of požalujsta by HSs. The first explanation is that using this marker must seem like a safe choice to heritage speakers. Unsure of their Russian language abilities, but aware of the social requirements for politeness and minimization of face threat, they use the easiest strategy available: požalujsta will indicate that the request is meant to be polite if all else fails.

The second explanation points to the effect of cross-linguistic influence from English. To HSs, the Russian požalujsta and the English please must seem absolutely synonymous. However, as similar as they may be semantically, a closer look at the
conditions of use for please and požalujsta reveals that the English word has a somewhat different, wider distribution. It is preferred and almost required in direct requests, which employ the imperative, and it is permitted and even preferred in indirect requests, i.e. interrogatives. A search in the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MiCASE) found 159 utterances with please: 67% of these were direct requests, while 30% were interrogative indirect requests. In comparison, a search in the spoken sub-corpus of the Russian National Corpus (RNC) which contains almost 9 million words yielded 10,124 occurrences of požalujsta, of which 5,647 are within two words, and 6,057 are within five words of an imperative verb: i.e., more than half of the utterances used požalujsta with an imperative. A tighter search of the same sub-corpus for utterances where požalujsta occurs within a few words of a question mark, and without an imperative yielded only 59 occurrences of požalujsta. A closer analysis of these utterances showed that the Russian lexical politeness marker is for the most part ruled out of requestive interrogatives. One exception to this rule is a laconic elliptical construction, which serves as a request for goods (as opposed to a request for action) or a person (#11). This construction includes the impersonal modal možno, lacks a verb, and requires the noun phrase referring to the requested goods/person to be in the accusative or partitive-genitive. A personal pronoun in the dative case is also often used in this construction.

11) a. Možno (mne) (požalujsta) knigu?

b. Možno (mne) (požalujsta) čaju?

---

18 The two corpora, of course, are not fully comparable. The Russian National Corpus is a giant of almost 9 million words whereas the MiCASE contains only about 2 million words. In addition, RNC includes examples from both public scripted and spontaneous unscripted speech, and is much more varied both in the age and background of the speakers. MiCase is limited to speech samples from native speakers of American English who are all college students, professors, and staff at the University of Michigan.
c. Požalujsta, Elizavetu Petrovnu možno? [on the phone]*

When elliptical constructions of the type in #11c that represent this systematic exception to the rule were eliminated from the 59 interrogative utterances with požalujsta, there remained 36 utterances where požalujsta indicated a turn-taking function of the type in #12 (a-c) below:

12) a. Julja/ požalujsta/ čto/ Vy sčitaete/ bylo glavnym na etoj nedele?
   c. Požalujsta/ kakie voprosy u kogo est’?

and only three occurrences of požalujsta in true indirect requests for favor:

13) a. Možno menja togda izolirovat’ zdes’, požalujsta?
   b. Požalujsta, my možem pojti v restoran, kafe, bistro?
   c. Tanečka, požalujsta, čajku organizovat’ nel’zja?*

It is notable that the position of požalujsta as the initial word in #13b and 13c (after eliminating the alerter Tanečka from the head act) and as the last word in #13a suggest that požalujsta may be treated as a modifier that is peripheral to the head act. It may be used almost as a separate utterance following or preceding the interrogative, akin to the English pretty please!, which serves as a follow-up to a request contained in a separate utterance. In fact, in #13b and c, požalujsta would carry a separate intonational center and would be separated from the rest of the utterance by a pause. In addition, moving požalujsta to a different position in the utterance would lower its felicity.

Thus, in the entire spoken sub-corpus of the RNC I found only one bona fide example of požalujsta in an indirect request, expressed as a full interrogative sentence -

---

19 * indicates that the example was taken from the RNC.
#13a. It is noteworthy that this request has a dual pragmatic function: it could be interpreted as a request for a favor or a request for permission due to its use of the modal *możno*. But even in this utterance, the use of the lexical politeness marker is peripheral. We can therefore make a fairly sound conclusion that *pożalujsta* is not normally permitted in indirect requests for favor in Russian.

Over-reliance of HSs on this marker suggests a transfer from English, but what is the mechanism for this transfer? To answer this question, I employ the interface hypothesis, which suggests that morphosyntax is particularly vulnerable in domains regulated by pragmatic or semantic factors (Sorace & Serratrice, 2009). This hypothesis suggests that it is partial structural overlap between the two languages of a bilingual speaker that drives cross-linguistic influence in bilingual acquisition. Although this hypothesis suggests that "for cross-linguistic influence to take place, the distribution of the morpho-syntactic construction must be regulated by the interface with discourse pragmatics" (Sorace & Serratrice, 2009, p. 196), I propose that it can also be regulated by the interface with speech act pragmatics, and the use of the overt lexical politeness markers in English and Russian may serve as an example. Such syntax-illocution interface involves pragmatic conditions that determine the emergence of the illocutionary force and interpretations of politeness and deference. Similar to the syntax-discourse interface, violations in the syntax-illocution interface would result in a gradient of acceptability of a speech act and its appropriateness in the social context, rather than clear ungrammaticality.

If we continue with the notion of an illocutionary construction that I propose in this dissertation, then we can say that there exists structural overlap of requestive
constructions between English and Russian. *Please* in English can be used in both hortative constructions with the imperative and in interrogative requestives referring to the preparatory condition. In fact, according to Brown and Levinson, the lexical politeness marker is almost obligatory in differentiating threats from requests in the case of the imperative. It also aids in the requestive interpretation of an interrogative with *can/could* (Mills 1992):

*Can you open the window?* vs. *Can you open the window, please?*

The Russian lexical politeness marker *pożalujста* can be used overtly with the imperative, but it is not normally permitted in the interrogative indirect requests where politeness and deference are created by morpho-syntactic means, such as negation or a combination of negation and subjunctive. There is one systematic exception to this general rule, described earlier: interrogative requests with the elided verb and the impersonal modal, which ask for goods or a person (see #8 above). The structural overlap then is in the use of the overt politeness marker: it is specified in both languages only in the imperative constructions. In indirect requests (interrogatives), it is specified in English, but is underspecified in Russian. This results in the transfer of rules for the use of *please* from English to Russian and, therefore, in a redundant (inappropriate) use of *pożalujста* to maintain politeness in Russian indirect requests.

It is notable, however, that in the formal situation when HSs had to address a social superior, they reduced the usage of *pożalujsta* from 32% in scenario 1 to 17%. Still, they used the marker not only in surface interrogatives, but also in embedded interrogatives, and in stand alone *if*-clauses. One explanation for the decline in the use of *pożalujsta* could be that HSs, fearful of not being polite enough in a very formal situation
using their Russian, may feel that syntactically more complex structures show more
dereference in requests. Hence, they begin to rely on the English pragmalinguistic strategy
of embedding requests under performatives or otherwise. The decline in the use of
pożalujsta accompanied by the increase in embedding supports the conclusions I made in
the section on Morpho-Syntactic Downgraders: embedding under performative may be
emerging in heritage Russian as a conventionalized way to formulate a polite request for
a favor with a greater degree of deference, which is higher on the politeness scale than a
conventional interrogative even when it is used with pożalujsta.

Use of Modals: Evidence for Incomplete Acquisition and Restructuring

As the section on sentence type shows, the most frequent requestive strategy
used by both groups of speakers is reference to the preparatory condition realized
syntactically as an interrogative (or embedded interrogative in the HSs group), i.e.,
questioning the hearer's ability to perform the action. This type of indirect requests has,
by its very definition, modal semantics, and therefore, modals are a 'required' element in
such requests. Russian has a complicated structure of modals. On the one hand, there is
the personal finite modal moć' and the impersonal form możno. On the other hand, the
impersonal form can potentially express either alethic or deontic modalities,\(^20\) depending
on whether it is followed by an imperfective verb or a perfective verb. Both forms of the
modal can be used in an indirect request that makes reference to the hearer's ability to
perform the requested action, and indeed both groups of speakers in the study used both

\(^{20}\) Alethic modality includes notions of possibility, impossibility and necessity, whereas deontic
modality is concerned with obligation, permission and related concepts.
forms. There are, however, significant differences between the two groups, especially in the use of the impersonal modal *možno* in scenario 1.

Although the majority of requests made by HSs and NSs in the informal scenario contained the personal modal (54% and 86% respectively), HSs used the personal modal significantly less frequently and the impersonal modal significantly more frequently than NSs did (40% vs. 13% for the impersonal modal respectively). This pattern was not observed in scenario 2 where the two groups were identical in the use of modals (the personal modal was used in 61% and the impersonal modal in 26% of requests). This poses an interesting question of why HSs overuse *možno*, but only in the situation of minimal social distance with the interlocutor. To answer this question, we first need to investigate the uses and meanings of the impersonal modal in full Russian.

As was pointed out earlier, the modal interpretation of the impersonal *možno* depends on the aspect of the main verb. The relation between Russian modals and verbal aspect is not undisputed in the literature. The hypothesis that directed much of the research before the 1970s and suggested that the imperfective aspect prevails in modal constructions or that the imperfective is used to express alethic modality, whereas perfective aspect renders deontic meanings, has been shown not to hold for Russian data. It has now been recognized that the Russian perfective is used more frequently in modal constructions in general (cf. Rassudova, 1968; Forsyth, 1970) and that the imperfective aspect is preferred in deontic contexts (Padučeva, 2010; Šmelev & Zaliznjak, 2006). Šmelev and Zaliznjak show that the standard modal interpretation for a perfective verb is alethic while the standard modal interpretation for an imperfective verb is deontic by comparing two sentences: *Zdes’ mozhno perejti* (perf.) *ulicu vs. Zdes’ mozhno perexodit’*
The first sentence, they argue, expresses a general idea of a possibility, whereas the second sentence has the reading of permission: it would not be a violation of traffic rules to cross in this spot. However, they point out that these interpretations of modal-aspect interactions represent tendencies, not rules, and that both perfective and imperfective aspect may express alethic and deontic modal logic in certain conditions. One of these conditions has to do with the (un)controllability of the action. Šmelev and Zaliznjak use the following example in the imperative constructions: Ne budite (imperf.) otca ‘Don’t wake father’ vs. Ne razbudite (perf.) otca ‘Be careful not to wake father’. The former utterance can be understood as a warning not to perform the intentional (i.e., controllable) action (deontic interpretation) whereas the latter is understood as a caution against unintentional (i.e., uncontrollable) action (alethic interpretation). Although Šmelev and Zaliznjak do not treat možno in interrogative sentences, the important conclusion for this dissertation is that the impersonal modal is ambiguous, allowing readings of both possibility and permission. Therefore, features of the main verb may create the reading of requesting permission or the interpretation of asking about a possibility of having the action done/goods delivered, i.e., closer to the meaning of requests for favor.

To my best knowledge, there are no studies specifically addressing the role of možno in Russian requests. Mills mentions in passing in her 1993 article that requests produced by some L2 speakers of Russian sounded like requests for permission rather than requests for favor because L2 speakers utilized the impersonal modal. Formanovskaja and Švecova (1990) state that expressions containing the modal možno are reserved in Russian for requests for permission and provide its equivalent English
expression - *may I*. They also list several phrases with *možno* in the section on formulaic expressions used to get someone's attention (*možno vas sprosit’*? or *možno vas na minutočku*) or pre-empting a congratulatory expression (*možno vas pozdravit’*?). Formanovskaja *et al.* (1989) also assert that the modals *možno* and *nel’zja* in interrogative utterances (often in combination with the interrogative particle *li*) indicate a request for permission (*zapros razrešenija*), for example: *Možno vojti?*

As Forsyth (1970), Padučeva (2010), and Šmelev and Zaliznjak (2006) show, *možno* may express both meanings - permissibility and possibility. Therefore, requests with the impersonal modal cannot be treated automatically as requests for permission. In addition, my personal observations of NS behavior allow me to argue that the impersonal modal *možno* has a variety of pragmatic functions in contemporary Russian. Most requests with the impersonal modal indeed produce the implicature of asking for permission, particularly when combined with perfective infinitives: *možno vyjti?* (a request for a permission to leave a classroom), *možno sprosit’*? 21 However, when *možno* is combined with nouns in an elliptical interrogative with a verb missing, it unambiguously creates a request for goods that is interpreted as a client order, rather than request for permission: *Možno kofe?* Such phrases are often heard at stores, cafes and restaurants, and could be considered members of a group called *gorodskie stereotipy* (Lapteva, 1976) reserved specifically for ordering goods, especially food. These impersonal requests used in client-service provider interactions do not have the interpretation of asking for permission, and the expectation on the part of the speaker is an immediate compliance from the hearer.

21 I am grateful to researchers at several Summer Heritage Language Research Institutes organized by the National Center for Heritage Languages at UCLA for their input in the discussion of the role of *možno* in full Russian.
Možno is also used as a formulaic preparator for an imminent request or question rather than being a request for permission per se: *A možno tebe eščě takoj vopros zadat'*? The utterance was used by a journalist on the radio station "Echo of Moscow" who was interviewing a historian, and was immediately followed by the question she had in mind.

Finally, *možno* can be used to request a favor, as in this observed utterance: *A možno otvetit' na oba voprosa?* The question was addressed to a guest on a radio talk show by a prominent radio journalist (on "Echo of Moscow"). Without context, the immediate intuitive interpretation of the phrase suggests a request for permission to answer both questions by the speaker. However, the journalist was asking the guest (the hearer) to answer both questions instead of choosing one. The context unambiguously frames the utterance as a request for a favor. Here is another example of using the impersonal modal in requests for a favor: *Možno vsem ljudej vmes postavit', i potom uže ja otvedu?* The phrase was heard on a YouTube video and was uttered by a young male who was organizing a group of people to go on 'carousel'[^22] voting in the recent presidential election. Again, the context supplies the interpretation of asking for a favor rather than permission.

The interpretation of requests with *možno* also depends on social variables, and not just on the formal properties of the main verb, and specifically, on the power differential between speakers. As Gordon and Ervin-Tripp (1984) point out, permission requests imply that the hearer has control over the speaker and that speaker's wishes are subject to the hearer's approval. Therefore, such requests may be more expected in situations of greater power difference, such as the interactions between children and

[^22]: Carousel voting is one of the clever techniques that was used to rig the votes in favor of V. Putin in the recent presidential election. A group of people were driven around Moscow to cast ballots several times.
adults or between subordinates and superiors. When permission requests are used in situations of greater equality, they may serve as a strategy to facilitate face-work as they serve as a means to avoid the appearance of trying to control or impose on the interlocutor (Gordon & Ervin-Tripp, 1984).

To substantiate the claims I make above about the usage of *možno*, I analyzed non-public unscripted spontaneous speech in the spoken sub-corpus of the Russian National Corpus. A search for the impersonal modal at a distance of one to 12 words from the question mark and with no *wh*-words within two slots before the modal (to control for rhetorical questions about possibility such as *kak možno tak postupat’ s ljud’mi?*) produced 1,705 instances of *možno*. The analysis of the first 215 instances of *možno* showed that some of the utterances were true information-seeking questions about a possibility of the following type: *to est’ možno prijti v konce sentjabrja?*; and a large number of utterances (53 or 25%) were verbless requests for goods or people, as in #14 and 15 below:

14) *Možno Grigoroviča?*

15) *Seryoga, možno tja na minutku?*

Another 15 interrogatives could not be classified as either asking for permission or a favor, as they asked for an action that was part of the hearer’s job (such as asking a salesperson to see goods being sold). The majority of interrogatives with *možno*, 108 in total, were interpreted as requests for permission (#17-20) although many of them could also be interpreted as requests for a favor (#16). Only some utterances unambiguously expressed seeking a favor, specifically #21 and 22:

16) *Možno, ja u vas Bulgakova voz’mu?*

17) *Možno, ja povedu efir?*
18) Možno, ja skažu?
19) Možno pozvonit’?
20) A možno odin vopros?
21) Slav, sejčas možno kak-to ne korčit’ roži?
22) A možno kak-nit’ ne sejčas?

It is notable that despite the use of the perfective verb after možno in # 16, which according to Šmelev and Zaliznjak, should produce the alethic reading, permission is a much stronger interpretation although certainly not the only possible one. I would argue that this particular utterance is a case of modal indeterminacy, specifically a merger (Coats, 1983). Both permission and possibility are plausible interpretations; they are not mutually exclusive and can coexist. Requests with the impersonal modal can either seek permission or present the question in such a way that seeking permission would also look like seeking favor: the person in # 16 is asking for a favor to borrow a book, but is also seeking permission to have that favor. Utterances in # 17-20 are clear examples of request for permission while # 21 and 22 are definite requests for a favor framed as surface permission-seeking interrogatives, perhaps as a mitigating strategy described by Gordon and Ervin-Tripp. Therefore, the data from the RNC support my observations that the impersonal modal in indirect requests can be used to fine-tune the directive speech act: it may be used to ask for permission, to request goods, to ask for a favor or to blend seeking permission and favor.

Returning to the question of why HSs overuse možno, but only in the situation of minimal social distance with the interlocutor, I hypothesize that the impersonal modal may be the most familiar way for HSs to create a general request in situations where minimal face work is needed. It is probably the first form they acquire for indirect requests in the context of minimal social distance that characterizes family interactions.
Searching the CHILDES database did not produce any results on indirect requests made by the two children whose speech was recorded, most likely because the girls were too young (Varya was 2 years 10 months, and Tanya was 2 years 11 months) and because the interactions were between the children and their immediate family members (only in the case of Tanja, there was also a researcher present). All of the requests produced by the two children in the search were hortative constructions with the imperative. The most frequent form used by adults in the CHILDES transcripts was also the imperative, although the researcher Eva working with Varya, a girl who was growing up in the U.S., also used several positive interrogatives, questioning ability: možeš pokazat’ Tanju dinosavriku? Russian data in CHILDES contain only extremely rare instances of adults modeling requests with the impersonal modal specifically to ask for permission: Mne možno s paketikom poigrat’? (Varya transcripts). Therefore, a search in the CHILDES database did not produce any evidence of Russian-speaking children acquiring indirect requests by the age of almost three. This result is surprising if we consider that English-speaking children can produce requestive formulas Can I, Can you, and May I by the age of two and a half although the percentage of these forms is still very low even at the age of four (Gordon & Ervin-Tripp, 1984). Since there are no studies known to me on the childhood acquisition of requests in Russian, I can offer only a speculative hypothesis at this point, which can be tested as future research on the subject becomes available. The hypothesis will proceed in several steps.

Step 1: I reasonably speculate that at some point in early childhood, Russian-speaking children learn how to ask for permission to have or to do something. It is also reasonable to assume that learning how to ask for favor must follow the acquisition of
asking for permission since it requires a more developed ability to navigate social
landscape, to know how to determine an interlocutor's social status or to assess the degree
of imposition, and then to use linguistic forms strategically to maintain one's own and the
interlocutors' face. Although literature on the childhood acquisition of requests by
English-speaking children does not discuss requests for permission specifically or in
comparison to other types of request, there are multiple indications that the earliest (by
the age of two) linguistic forms expressing deference are *please, May I*, and *Can I/Could
you* convention formulas (Ervin-Tripp, O’Connor & Rosenberg, 1984). These
researchers call *May I* a request for permission, but *Can I/Could you* - 'polite' requests.
However, the 'Can I' formula could also be used to ask for permission, especially
considering that *may* and *can* are often used interchangeably in English even by children.
The study by Ervin-Tripp *et al* did not specify whether only *May I* or both *May I* and *Can
I* are used by children to ask for permission or if there is an order in the acquisition of the
two convention formulas. However, there are studies that suggest that children begin to
show verbal awareness of imposing on others when making requests and to employ
deviousness in linguistic expressions to do face-work only by the age of seven or eight
(Gordon *et al*., 1980). This supports my suggestion that requests for a favor would come
later in the pragmatic acquisition, and that permission requests are among the earliest
expressions of deference acquired.

Step 2: In Russian, *možno* can be used both to express requests for favor and to
seek permission, but the latter is probably acquired first (following the arguments in step
1). From the acquisition point of view, the impersonal modal is linguistically convenient
(it is a frozen form that does not require agreement or conjugation) and can create a
request for permission rather laconically (see # 27 below). Such typical phrases can probably be heard in any Russian-speaking family with children:

23) Mama, možno, ja pojdu na ulicu?
24) Možno mne pečen'ku?
25) Možno, my pojDEM poigraem k Vane?
26) Možno, ja ne budu segodnja kupat'sja?
27) Mam, možno? (pointing to a candy bar)

Note the fact that often možno is not an integral part of the interrogative utterance. In fact, the utterances # 23, 25 and 26 have two intonational centers: IC-3 (yes/no question intonation) on the stressed syllable of možno, and IC-1 (falling intonation characteristic of assertions) on one of the words in the rest of the utterance which contains the actual content of the request. Notably, the word možno is taught specifically as a single word to express request for goods to beginning Russian L2 learners (Russian Stage One: Live from Russia 2009). Another telling fact is that several HSs in this study had false starts, all of which contained možno: e.g., možno... ja xotel uznat' esli ja mogu polučit' konspekt na paru časov? or možno u vas... esli vy ne *dolžnite... možno etu knigu vzjat' počitat'? These facts suggest that možno can serve as a stand-alone marker of a request, and specifically, a request for permission. It can also be added to a proposition that is the object of request without any specific syntactic rules. The acquisition path must be, therefore, fairly easy, and this leads us to the hypothesis that možno may be one of the earliest acquired pragmatic elements used for influencing others in Russian.

Step 3: Since the average age of immigration for HSs in this study is 3.52 years (with 21% who were born in the U.S.), we can assume that their socialization in Russian
was interrupted very early and continued primarily in the English language context. Because HSs in this study came to the U.S. as very little children or were born here, they may have acquired only the formula for permission requests in Russian. As Bryant (2009) points out, the expanding social worlds of older children and adolescents "enable and pressure them to display more sophisticated pragmatic skills" (2009, p. 346).

Communicating with a great variety of interlocutors of various social status and age for various goals and in a wide range of social contexts enables older children to learn how to use language more strategically and to expand their repertoire of linguistic means to do so. In addition, children are exposed to more language forms from reading and schooling (Berman, 2007). Russian HSs do not have access to such language practice and enhancement in Russian; hence, their knowledge of linguistic strategies for influencing others remains at the level of young children.

Step 4: The necessity to ask for permission must be fairly pervasive in the lives of HSs when they were little, because as children they had to ask for permissions a lot more often than for favors from their parents and grandparents. Furthermore, interrogatives with možno may sometimes be interpreted as requests for a favor or carry a dual pragmatic function, serving both as requests for a favor and permission, as I showed in my observations and analysis of the RNC data. Therefore, HSs may hear this form used in a variety of ways by their parents and grandparents whom they consider to be language authorities, and assume that it is suitable for any type of request. At the same time, having little opportunity to speak Russian outside of the immediate family environment and in formal situations, HSs probably never find themselves in situations where they have to ask for favors in Russian. All of this brings me back to the
speculative hypothesis I put forward: the impersonal modal may be the most familiar way for HSs to create a general request because this is the form that they acquire first for indirect requests in the context of minimal social distance which characterizes family interactions.

To sum up, HSs must have learned how to ask for favors mostly in English. They learn to use the impersonal modal in requests addressed to family members and friends in early childhood, and do not realize that these requests are likely to be interpreted as requests for permission. As a result, they may treat možno as a conventional and polite way to ask for some thing or some action in an informal situation. Since in the first scenario, the request needs to be addressed to a peer, some HSs use the 'reliable' and convenient možno, without realizing that their utterances sound like requests for permission, rather than a favor. However, as the distance between the interlocutors increases and HSs have to address a social superior, they begin to feel unsure of the politeness value of constructions with the impersonal modal. They may realize intuitively that a greater social distance calls for more strategic linguistic work to eliminate the face threat, and the old formula that was suitable for parents and peers no longer seems to be a safe choice. To compensate for this lack of pragmatic competence in Russian, HSs turn to English strategies that can help them formulate a non-threatening polite request for favor from a superior. One of these strategies is the use of embedding under performative that was described in the section on Morph-Syntactic Downgraders. Another strategy may be the use of the lexical politeness marker požalujsta, which is another area of great difference between the two test groups. Certainly, the decrease in

23 The present study updates the earlier examination of the same issue, published in 2010 (see Dubinina, 2010).
the use of *możno* in the formal scenario may be a factor of changes in the syntactic sentence types used: there is an increase in the use of embedded interrogatives, stand-alone *if* clauses and complex declaratives. But the use of the impersonal modal is possible in embedded interrogatives, and two HSs do create such constructions: *ja prosto xotel vam sprosit' esli mne možno vzjat' knižku na odnu noč*. Therefore, the decrease of the impersonal modal still seems telling.

In comparison, NSs increased the use of the impersonal modal in scenario 2: they employed it 13% of the time in interrogatives addressed to peers, but 26% of the time in interrogatives addressed to a professor. This increase can be explained as a mitigating strategy suggested by Gordon and Ervin-Tripp (1984). By employing the impersonal modal with its predominant meaning of permission, NSs indicate that the hearer (professor) has more control, that in no way do they try to influence the hearer's compliance, and that they in fact surrender themselves to the hearer's will.

The fact that HSs use fewer sentences with *možno* (even after taking into account the change in sentence type) suggests that they may not treat the impersonal modal in the same way as NSs do. For them, *možno* is simply a form that marks utterances as requests in situations of minimal social distance. If this presupposition is true, this may indicate restructuring of the pragmatic meaning of the linguistic form in heritage Russian under the influence of stalled first language acquisition and a lack of exposure to interaction in Russian.
Orientation of Requests: Evidence of Transfer

The final point in the descriptive analysis is the orientation of requests made by NSs and HSs in this study. The two groups seem to have almost diametrically opposite strategies in orienting their requests. In both scenarios, NSs addressed their hearer (80% in scenario 1 and 65% in scenario 2) while HSs mostly focused on themselves (62% in scenario 1 and 61% in scenario 2). A few speakers in both groups made truly impersonal requests, which can be viewed as a mitigating strategy (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989).

There are abundant references in the literature to the fact that Russian tends to use hearer-oriented language and is different in this regard from English (Mills, 1992, 1993; Owen, 2001; Frank, 2002; Wierzbicka, 1991, 1997; Davidson, 2004). In his research on word associations for a Russian-English bilingual associative dictionary, Davidson provides supporting documentation of the differing orientations and views that American and Russian youth have of themselves, their friends and families, and the notion of success. He notes how American responses to the stimulus word "success" reflect an idiocentric (self-focused) view that gives more weight to individualism, independence, and personal perseverance as the key to success in business. In contrast, the responses of the Russians to the corresponding word reflected a larger role for others in a person's life, defining success as achieving harmonious relationships. In other words, the Russians in the study tended to view themselves allocentrically (focusing on their relationships with others). Davidson indicates that the nexus of control for Americans in achieving success is internal to the speaker, whereas for the Russians it is more likely to be external to the speaker (Davidson, 2004, p. 43-44; also in Matsamuto & Kupperbush, 2001, p. 113).
The data in this study show that Russian HSs tend to make requests idiocentrically, especially in the informal scenario. Their requests mirror the preferences of a typical English NS and diverge from the requests made by their Russian NS counterparts. This seems to be a transfer effect, and if so, the data indicate that cross-linguistic influence can touch even those "soft" areas of linguistic knowledge that are very vague, subconscious, and unregistered even by linguistically savvy native speakers. Yet, when compromised, these areas could be the reason for why native speakers sometimes judge the speech of high-proficiency non-native speakers (such as HSs in this study or advanced L2) as "not quite right" and "a little off."

5.3. Preliminary Theoretical Analysis

I will now offer a preliminary theoretical analysis of the observed tendencies through the prism of linguistic convergence framework.

The term 'convergence' is used by various researchers differently. SLA deals with the convergence of L2 forms toward L1 norms (e.g., in Sorace, 2011), and the studies of bilingualism and code-switching look at the convergence of two languages with each other. For this analysis, I adopt the definition of Myers-Scotton who is best known for her work on convergence in the context of language contact. She defines convergence as both a mechanism and an outcome of language contact. As a mechanism, convergence is a process "that promotes splitting of abstract lexical structure in one variety and its combining with such abstract lexical structure from another variety, often resulting in a restructuring of grammatical relations and even surface-level grammatical morphemes" (Myers-Scotton, 2002, p. 164). In this sense convergence is a step toward attrition.
As an outcome of language contact, convergence is viewed by Myers-Scotton as a composite Matrix Language, which is defined as an abstract morpho-syntactic frame consisting of a combination of features from both languages. Whereas in monolingual varieties the source for Matrix Language is one variety, in language contact, the abstract structure combines features of two or more languages. This composite Matrix Language is what makes convergence and attrition very similar and possibly identical if they are viewed as outcomes of language contact, according to Myers-Scotton. In both convergence and attrition all surface morphemes come from one language, but the Matrix Language comes from two or more linguistic codes involved in language contact.

Different researchers of language contact emphasize different sides of convergence. Some stress the loss of forms incongruent with the other language in a contact situation, and others focus on innovations, i.e., introduction of new forms from another language. Myers-Scotton emphasizes the idea that both processes are involved. In her understanding, convergence means that new features are added and existing ones are modified or removed.

The direction of convergence has also created some disagreements between scholars. Many argue that it is bidirectional, and the best examples of convergence can be found in the so-called Sprachebund areas, where the two languages in contact move structurally toward each other. Thomason (1997) suggests that convergence can be either one-way or mutual, and that social factors of a particular language contact situation determine the direction. Myers-Scotton insists that the asymmetric influence of one language on another is a characteristic feature of convergence and that convergence, therefore, is largely a one-way phenomenon. To differentiate convergence from transfer,
Myers-Scotton points out that convergence does not need to have any visible other-language material, and that influence happens at the abstract level and results in a composite Matrix Language that frames surface level clauses. Therefore, at the surface level, a language that is subject to convergence in a language contact situation may look like the monolingual variety that entered into contact, but it will have structural differences. These structural differences come from the structurally unique Matrix Language of the bilingual that is no longer uniform, but combines elements of morpho-syntax from both languages.

If we assume that there is a universal structure of requests (like there are universal principles of grammar), then we can also assume the existence of an abstract pragmatic matrix frame, by analogy with the abstract Matrix Language (i.e., morpho-syntax) proposed by Myers-Scotton. Each language supports a particular pragmatic matrix frame that expresses conventions of that particular language community. Fundamental features of the frame are based on universal principles of speech acts and politeness, just like the general Matrix Language is based on universal language principles. For example, requests have certain felicity conditions, among them preparatory and sincerity conditions are the most widely referenced in directive speech acts. Reference to the preparatory condition is universal, but how this reference is expressed syntactically is language specific: it may be stated, questioned directly, or questioned indirectly by embedding under a performative. In a language contact situation, the abstract pragmatic matrix frame no longer comes from one language/speech culture, but rather becomes a composite, incorporating elements from all the contributing languages. As Myers-Scotton points out, in convergence, surface morphemes (lexical items) come from one language,
but the frame which projects these morphemes comes from two sources. So in speech acts, lexemes may come from one language, but their organization into an utterance with the illocutionary force of a request will not follow the rules of that same language. Instead, features of both contributing languages will influence the creating of the illocutionary force, (in)directness, and politeness of an utterance.

The notion of a composite pragmatic matrix frame may help explain the patterns observed in the data in this study. HSs use the same words as NSs do to create requests; they also rely on the same universal principle - referencing the hearer's ability to perform the action requested; but the 'grammar' of their illocutionary constructions is different from Russian and shows a strong influence from English conventions and formulas. It is the composite pragmatic matrix that allows HSs to embed requests under performatives or use stand-alone if clauses, and avoid imperatives all together. This dissertation has already advanced certain explanations for the omission of the negative particle (transfer and/or incomplete acquisition) and the over-supplying of the lexical politeness marker požalujsta (transfer explained by the Interface Hypothesis), but they could also be subsumed under this general theoretical framework of the abstract pragmatic matrix frame. Požalujsta is overused in indirect requests (even in embedded and stand-alone if clauses) because it is a projection of the composite pragmatic matrix that allows its use in both direct and indirect requests. Similarly, ne is avoided because there is conflicting information in the matrix frame regarding its use: it is permitted in expressions like u vas slučajno netu lišnej kopii (in # 3 above) and ne budete tak ljubezny (in # 4 above) because these expressions exists as unanalyzable chunks in the matrix; but not permitted in the interrogatives questioning speakers or hearer's ability because this information comes to
the matrix frame from English. Therefore, only some HSs produce negative interrogatives with the personal modal, but in general most HSs do not allow interrogative requests. Finally, the composite pragmatic matrix frame also projects conventions regarding the use of request orientation as mitigating factors. Both English and Russian allow hearer, speaker and neutral orientations, but preferences differ between languages. The composite pragmatic matrix frame reflects English preferences, causing HSs to produce requests that are grammatically well-formed interrogatives, but are oriented in a way that is for the most part incompatible with NSs' preferences.

A final note must be added regarding the fact that the acquisition of Russian by HSs happens in the context of language contact, i.e., the language they acquire is itself a language in contact with English. As was noted in Section 2.1., HSs are exposed to a particular variety of the home language that is spoken by their parents who, regardless of their proficiency in the majority language, often engage in code-switching. In addition, their language may exhibit the effects of transfer at the lexical, grammatical, and even discourse pragmatic levels (see Polinsky, 1997; Andrews, 2001; Pavlenko, 2003; Isurin, 2011; Laleko, 2011 *inter alia*). We can hypothesize that the production of various speech acts by these speakers may also be influenced by English. For example, Dubinina (1998) reported on the use of *sorry* by adult Russian-English bilinguals dominant in Russian. These bilinguals tended not to use Russian *izvini(te)* or *prosti(te)* and preferred the ubiquitous English *sorry* in situations where an apology would not be expected from the speaker, according to the Russian communicative norm, but would in fact be anticipated in the context of the American English interactional style. Therefore, there is evidence to suggest that not only the abstract Matrix Language (grammar), but also the pragmatic
matrix frame of Russian-speaking immigrants, who are parents of HSs, becomes an amalgam of Russian and English. This frame accelerates in the direction of convergence in the 1.5/2 generation of speakers (i.e., HSs) because of additional social factors that lead to a greater influence from English. As HSs grow up and go through socialization and schooling in the context of the majority language, they encounter many more opportunities and demands for the use of English with a variety of interlocutors, while the quality and quantity of input in Russian become significantly reduced. With a decreased input in Russian and the expansion of the domain of English use, the pragmatic matrix frame of HSs moves farther away from Russian and becomes more and more influenced by English.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

6.1. Conclusions

Tying together the multiple levels of analysis of experimental data in the comprehension and production parts of this study gives us a snapshot of the pragmatic competence of HSs. More specifically, the study establishes a baseline of HSs’ abilities to comprehend the pragmatic meanings of linguistic forms addressed to them and to make their own linguistic attempts at manipulating the behavior of others in relevant, polite and effective ways. Assuming the existence of an illocutionary structure that can be analyzed on several levels at once allowed me to capture small details in the pragmatic competence of HSs that are different from the NSs’ pragmatic competence, which was used for comparison. For example, although HSs mostly equaled NSs in their
comprehension of the performance force and politeness level of requestive utterances addressed to them, they lacked the skills necessary to calculate correctly the illocutionary effects of verbal aspect and word order on indirect requests. This means that when faced with 'real-life' conditions, rather than the experimental setting, HSs may misread nuances of the communicative intentions of speakers or degrees of their irritation and impatience.

The analysis also suggests that in situations of (-) social distance HSs tend to be more apprehensive about direct strategies than NSs, especially if a bare imperative construction is used with no lexical mitigation. This tendency is manifested more visibly in the production of requests where HSs avoid direct requests regardless of social factors and over-rely on the lexical politeness marker požalujста.

Furthermore, the assumption of an illocutionary construction allowed me to fine-tune the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) taxonomy (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989), which is widely used in research on requests, in order to produce a more detailed and crystallized analysis of various elements that come together to create the requestive force and desired politeness level in a requestive utterance. This assumption allowed me, on the one hand, to separate syntax from morphological and lexical elements and, on the other hand, to differentiate between required elements that create the illocutionary force and optional features that mitigate this force. This enhancement of the CCSARP analytical schema revealed features of HSs requests that otherwise would have been hidden from the researcher’s view. For example, although HSs were similar to the control group in choosing indirect strategies (namely, reference to the preparatory condition) to formulate requests in both formal and informal scenarios, they differed in their choices of syntactic realizations of this strategy. The surface
interrogative was the only syntactic form employed by NSs for indirect requests, whereas HSs used complex sentences in which interrogatives were embedded as subordinate clauses, or in which references to the hearer's ability to perform the action were embedded as a conditional clause. The mechanism of embedding usually employed a performative verb:

28) *Ja xoču sprosit' esli ja eë mogu odolžit' požalujsta.*

This embedding mechanism seemed to be used by HSs as a face management device, especially in the situation of (+) social distance/ (+) power differential. The use of embedding seems to be the result of transfer from English: *I wonder if I could borrow your book for a couple of days.*

In addition to calquing English syntactic constructions, HSs transfer the rules for the use of the overt lexical politeness marker *požalujsta.* They use it not just in interrogatives (# 8 above), which is already infelicitous in full Russian as the analysis of the corpus data shows, but also in embedded interrogatives (as in #28 above) and even stand alone *if*-clauses (# 29 or #10):

29) *Esli b vy mogli mne požalujsta nu otdat' tam na paru dnej...*

The existence of this transfer from English can be explained by a structural overlap in the usage rules of lexical politeness markers in English and Russian. Violations of the rule for the overt use of *požalujsta* at the proposed syntax-illlocution interface, where illocutionary force and politeness emerge, result not in strict ungrammaticality, but in a gradient acceptability (Sorace, 2005 qtd. in Laleko, 2011). In fact, two native informants whose opinions were solicited for the analysis of the data rated requests produced by HSs in this study as acceptable, but a little 'off", commenting
that the use of *pożalujsta* was 'unjustified' and 'bothersome'. Their judgments were supported by the analysis of the spoken sub-corpus of the Russian National Corpus, which showed that *pożalujsta* for the most part is ruled out of Russian interrogative requests.

In addition to transfer, requests made by HSs show signs of internal restructuring of the usage rules for modals. Due to interrupted acquisition, HSs lack experience in formal contexts outside of the immediate environment of family and close friends. One of the possible outcomes of such incomplete acquisition may be the re-analysis and re-structuring of the specifically Russian impersonal modal *możno*, which in heritage requests loses its primary implicature of a permission-seeking device and becomes generalized as a marker of any type of request.

The pragmalinguistic transfer of the usage of the lexical politeness marker *pożalujsta* and a possible internal restructuring of the meaning and usage of *możno* sometimes result in a combination of # *możno pożalujsta*, which is often followed by a verbal clause: #*Możno pożalujsta ja voz'mu tvoi notes'y?* or #*Możno mne pożalujsta posmotret' konspekt uroka?* Such combinations are unacceptable, or at least undesirable, to native speakers. In fact, for the two native speaker informants who noted that the use of *pożalujsta* in indirect requests was 'unjustified', the combination of *możno* and *pożalujsta* preceding verbal clauses was especially troublesome.

The combination of the impersonal modal and the lexical politeness marker was used by 20% of HSs in all surface interrogatives in the informal scenario. Such high frequency in the experimental data suggests that this combination may be emerging as a new convention for indirect requests among HSs, reserved specifically for informal
situations, in addition to interrogatives that employ a personal modal and the overt lexical marker *požalujsta*.

When HSs use personal modals in requests, they deviate from the NS baseline in the orientation of their utterances. In both scenarios HSs consistently overuse the 1st person singular form *mogu*, thus orientating requests toward the speaker, whereas NSs usually employ 2nd person singular *možeš*, focusing on their addressee. This pattern is found even in requests with the impersonal *možno*. HSs often add a dative experiencer to the utterance, hence giving it a speaker-focused orientation: *Možno mne požalujsta posmotret' konspekt uroka?* This deviation from the baseline may be another transfer effect. While English admits the use of both speaker and hearer oriented strategies (as well as impersonal orientation), focusing on the speaker is preferred. Blum-Kulka (1989) hypothesizes that this can be a mitigating strategy in English that serves as a face-saving and imposition-minimizing device. Whether HSs transfer this strategy or simply calque the English syntax using the 1st person singular modal verb form, the result is that their requests sound wrongly oriented to a Russian NS, even when they are perfect grammatically:

30) *Ja mogu tvoj konspekt posmotret' do zavtra?*

The two native informants solicited for this study reported feeling resentful of such a request, interpreting it as being too presumptuous on the part of the speaker about what he/she can do.

Once the social factors of a situation shift in the direction of (+) power differential, HSs become weary of their abilities to do appropriate face work using only Russian resources. Correctly sensing that such work is in order, they increase the use of
conditional clauses, the past tense, and especially embedding under performative to mitigate the performance force of their requests, while at the same time slightly decreasing the use of požalujsta. This pattern suggests that embedding may be viewed by at least some HSs as being higher on the politeness scale than even a surface interrogative with požalujsta. The frequency of such constructions in the data is enough to indicate that in heritage Russian embedded constructions may be emerging as a conventionalized way to ask for a favor in situations of great social distance and power differential which is preferred even over an interrogative with požalujsta.

The most dramatic difference between requests made by HSs and NSs was found in the use of the negative particle ne in indirect requests expressed syntactically as interrogatives. This study adopted the view that ne serves primarily as a required disambiguating request marker, and only secondarily as a mitigating device, and the data from HSs' requests indicate that they lack this required request element almost entirely. This absence of the negative particle may be explained by transfer from English or by interrupted acquisition, or both. What is notable is that the lack of the negative particle in an interrogative may have several consequences, including communicative failure. For example, the addressee may jokingly respond to # 30 above with the following: "V principe možeš, a čto? A more likely consequence, however, is imparting the request with an unintended implicature that may irritate the addressee. Since positive interrogatives resemble pure information-seeking questions more closely than negative constructions do, they are more likely to be interpreted as "... requests which hope to confirm H's intention to perform the action (as opposed to S presenting the request as new information)" (Mills, 1992, p. 74). Upon hearing such a 'request', a native speaker
may feel a certain degree of resentment: there was no show of non-compliance, so why the reminder?

To sum up, while relying on the same request strategy as NSs (reference to the ability to carry out the act), HSs often give it a different syntactic shell and stuff it with word combinations that cause infelicity (as is *możno* + *pożalujsta*, or the use of *pożalujsta* in other indirect requests), create unintended connotations (the use of *możno* to ask a peer for a favor, orientation on speaker or lack of negation), or do not exist in the NS baseline at all (embedding). However, the picture of pragmatic competence of HSs that emerges from this study points to the lack of knowledge of Russian-specific conventions, not to the lack of ability to get the hearer to cooperate or to understand when such cooperation is requested of them.

H. Clark argued that two types of convention shape what speakers can do to signal requestive force: first, a convention of means, which calls for the use of a particular strategy; and, second, a convention of form, which specifies the exact wording used for a particular indirect request (H. Clark, 1979). For conventional indirectness to take place, both types of convention must be observed. HSs' performance suggests that they do not control the convention of form in Russian. In an experimental setting that called for a Russian-only rule, they struggled to find the appropriate forms in Russian and compensated by transferring English conventions of form to Russian. It is important to note, however, that transfer is working hand in hand with the mechanism of internal restructuring, forming a two-sided process that has documented parallels in the morpho-syntax of heritage languages. While identifying signs of transfer in heritage language pragmatics is facilitated by the studies of both Russian and English conventions for polite
requests, as well as by interlanguage pragmatic studies of L2 Russian learners, tracing the process of incomplete pragmatic acquisition in Russian is more difficult because there are no known studies on the acquisition of requests specifically by Russian-speaking or Russian-English bilingual children. In my exploration of possible patterns in the childhood acquisition of requests and expression of politeness relevant to the scenario of incomplete acquisition, I relied on language acquisition studies of English-speaking children.

These studies show that children can demonstrate quite early their sensitivity to the dimensions of power and social distance by adjusting linguistic forms they use (Corsaro, 1979; Ervin-Tripp, 1977; Gordon & Ervin-Tripp, 1984; Shatz, 1982). For example, they are more likely to produce imperatives with peers (or with submissive puppets) and use more indirect strategies with adults, such as "May I have X?" or "Do you have X?" However, as Gordon and Ervin-Tripp (1984) point out, the choice of such indirect requests is based on children's assumption of whether the hearer is likely to be sympathetic to their concern, and not on conventional usage that takes into account the degree of imposition and disruption to the hearer's plans. Becker (1982, 1986) also showed that when asked to make requests that sound polite, young children simply add please to their utterances, and that only after the age of five do they begin to choose such indirect forms as "do you mind if" or other mitigators of directness. Moreover, learning which members of society require the show of deference in a language, which can be treated linguistically as equals, and which forms are appropriate for various combinations of social and contextual factors is a product of extensive language socialization outside of the home (Ninio & Snow, 1999). In fact, Ninio and Snow point out that the social
concepts of politeness and deference are acquired before the linguistic structures that express them, and that the biggest challenge for children in becoming polite lies in the acquisition of subtle and variable linguistic strategies to express social dimensions.

If we can assume that the same pattern holds in Russian, we can hypothesize that immigrant children who receive their education in English starting in elementary school never acquire the Russian conventions for expressing deference and mitigating the performance force of requests, and are not skilled in adjusting to changing social dimensions linguistically, using only Russian resources. To compensate, they rely on safe formulas acquired in early childhood, such as the use of požalujsta and/or možno, and on English conventions of form that they know very well.

A theoretical framework that explains the mechanism of such a combination of conventional forms from both languages is the concept of linguistic convergence in situations of language contact. In convergence, surface morphemes come from one language, but the abstract structure (Matrix Language) that projects these morphemes is a composite of features of both languages. In this dissertation, I suggest that there exists a pragmatic matrix frame that combines conventions of means and forms from both Russian and English. But while conventions of means are characterized by universal pragmatic principles, such as essential conditions, conversational maxims and universals of (in)directness and (im)politeness, conventions of forms are more language specific. Hence, requests produced by HSs rely on universal strategies to create indirect requests and have no visible other-language material at the surface, but show signs of cross-linguistic influence at the abstract level, which is caused by this composite pragmatic matrix. Since convergence is always asymmetric in favor of the stronger language,
requests produced by HSs contain more English pragmalinguistic features. Further research could show if this framework can be used to predict the pragmatic behavior of HSs in performing other types of speech acts that are heavily based on conventions, for example, apologies.

6.2. Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

The conclusions presented here make an important contribution to our understanding of heritage grammars and Russian pragmatics, and have implications for heritage language pedagogy. As Hymes (1974) argued, the picture of a speaker's linguistic competence is not complete without a description of his communicative competence, i.e., his ability to use language appropriately, relevantly and effectively in specific social settings. This study is the first to address the speech-act-pragmatic competence of Russian HSs, and together with Laleko's (2011) work on their discourse-pragmatic knowledge, adds a new piece to the mosaic of scientific descriptions of heritage Russian. From studies on the structure of heritage Russian (Polinsky, 1997, 2000, 2005, 2006, 2008a,b,c, 2011; Pereltsvaig, 2008; Isurin, 2005; Isurin & Ivanova-Sullivan, 2008 inter alia) we know that HSs do not control complex grammatical features that are fully acquired in late childhood and as a result of schooling. However, up until very recently, we did not have any evidence for HSs' control of pragmatic features. Laleko's study (2011) showed that HSs' linguistic knowledge is vulnerable at the syntax-pragmatics interface, and that HSs exhibit evidence of reduction in the pragmatic functions of the imperfective aspect. Isurin and Ivanova-Sullivan (2008) show that HSs have deficiencies in discourse structure, specifically that they lack control of word order.
as a narration strategy available in full Russian. The current study contributes evidence that HSs also have inconsistent knowledge of linguistic conventions and fine-grained combinatorics of formal elements, which prevents them from comprehending finer nuances, from expressing the illocutionary force of a directive speech act properly and from encoding politeness adequately. The important question that is being asked in this study is - how do HSs manage to perform in a language that has gaping lexical lacunae and numerous structural deficiencies? The answer to this question lies in their ability to combine pragmalinguistic knowledge from their two languages to compensate for their lack of knowledge of conventionalized forms in Russian. They tend to use Russian forms acquired in early childhood (such as *możno*) for requests addressed to peers, and employ complex syntactic constructions with embedding when trying to solicit favors from social superiors. The study also shows how incomplete acquisition of linguistic conventions together with linguistic convergence in language contact situations may lead to the emergence of new communicative norms in heritage language. For heritage Russian in the U.S., these emerging new norms seem to be *możno + pożalujsta* (reserved for informal situations) and embedding under performative often with *pożalujsta* (used in more formal situations). A larger data set could show if these tendencies indeed lead to preferences. Further research on Russian requests in the context of other dominant languages, such as Hebrew or German, for example, would show if these emerging norms are universal for heritage Russian.

In addition to producing empirically based data on heritage Russian pragmatics, this study provided a more sound baseline of the pragmatics of requests in full Russian than was available before. Although Mills' research served as the important foundation
for the current study, her conclusions had to be treated as somewhat tentative because they were mostly qualitative and not statistically analyzable. This dissertation has made a contribution to the study of requests in full Russian by applying statistical tests to empirically collected NS data and by investigating naturally occurring unscripted speech in the Russian National Corpus. The result was a more robust and detailed description of requests in full Russian that can be used in future studies of the directive speech act.

Finally, the study served as a proof of principle for the CCSARP taxonomy of elements in the directive speech act. Modifications that were made to this taxonomy and the assumption of an illocutionary construction allowed a more detailed analysis of Russian requests. The modified system could be used for future studies of requests in other heritage languages, which will hopefully lead to a pool of comparable research of heritage pragmatics.

In addition to implications for the fields of pragmatics and heritage linguistics, this work also makes an important contribution to heritage language pedagogy. Through experimental work, this study presented a systematic analysis of the pragmatic form-function relationship in heritage Russian and compared it with its counterpart in full Russian. This allows us to identify specific deficits in the pragmatic competence of heritage speakers. Once these deficits are known, teachers can make heritage learners conscious of the difference between their forms and those used by native speakers, and with practice, bridge the gap between heritage and native speaker competencies. By identifying deficiencies in the pragmatic competence of HSs, this study makes an important contribution to an already existing list of suggested heritage Russian teaching practices (Bermel & Kagan, 2000). The newest study of HSs' proficiency gains during a
year-long Flagship capstone program in the Russian Federation shows that HSs are highly likely to reach the superior level of proficiency on the ACTFL scale across all four modalities (Davidson & Lekic, 2012) even when they start the program at the advanced- mid level. The study suggests that heritage Russian is not necessarily a static system and that it can be developed to native competence. Ultimately, targeted instruction in Russian pragmalinguistic forms will help HSs develop native forms for the expression of illocutionary meanings and reach native fluency in Russian, a need identified by Martin at the Sixth Heritage Language Research Institute (2012), and will put them at greater ease in communication with NSs in or out of the metropoly. This study is the first step in this direction.
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APPENDIX 1

Questionnaire for Collecting Comprehension Data24

Пожалуйста, поделитесь Вашиими суждениями о данных высказываниях.

1. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: Молодой человек, закройте, пожалуйста, окно.

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Эта просьба прямая</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | СТОП!

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая______ грубая______ невежливая______ слегка невежливая______
вежливая______ даже слишком вежливая______

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Это просьба содержит угрозу
___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл? ____________________________
___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

2. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: Молодой человек, Вы не закроете окно?

24 This questionnaire is for male participants; a questionnaire for females has only one difference: the words molodoj čelovek are replaced with devuška.
Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Эта просьба прямая.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

СТОП!

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая____ грубая ___ невежлива___ слегка невежлива___
вежлива___ даже слишком вежлива___

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Это просьба содержит угрозу
___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл? _____________________
___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

3. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: **Молодой человек, окно вы не закроете?**

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Эта просьба прямая.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

СТОП!
Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или № 2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая____ грубая___ невежлива____ слегка невежлива____
вежлива____ даже слишком вежлива____

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
___ Это просьба похож на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Это просьба содержит угрозу
___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл? ________________________
___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

4. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: Молодой человек, Вы не могли бы закрыть окно, пожалуйста?

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

1. Эта просьба прямая.

2. Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.

3. Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.

СТОП!

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или № 2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая____ грубая___ невежлива____ слегка невежлива____
вежлива____ даже слишком вежлива____

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
5. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: **Молодой человек, если Вас не затруднит, закройте окно, пожалуйста.**

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

1. Эта просьба прямая.

2. Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.

3. Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.

**СТОП!**

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая____  грубая____  невежлива____  слегка невежлива____

вежлива____  даже слишком вежлива____

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением

___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание

___ Это просьба содержит угрозу

___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл? __________________________

___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

6. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: **Молодой человек, Вы не закрыли бы окно?**
Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Эта просьба прямая.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

СТОП!

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая___ грубая ___ невежливая___ слегка невежливая___
вежливая___ даже слишком вежливая___

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Это просьба содержит угрозу
___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл? _________________________
___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

7. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: **Молодой человек, если Вам не трудно, вы не могли бы закрыть окно, пожалуйста?**

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Эта просьба прямая.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

СТОП!
Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или № 2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая _____ грубая _____ невежливая _____ слегка невежливая _____
вежливая_____ даже слишком вежливая_____

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Это просьба содержит угрозу
___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл? __________________________
___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

8. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: Молодой человек, Вы не будете закрывать окно?

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Эта просьба прямая.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

СТОП!

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или № 2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая_____ грубая_____ невежливая_____ слегка невежливая_____
вежливая______ даже слишком вежливая______

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:
9. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: **Молодой человек, окно закройте.**

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Эта просьба прямая.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Если вы поставили галочку на №1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая ___  грубая ___  невежлива ___  слегка невежлива ___  вежлива ___  даже слишком вежлива ___

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Это просьба сказана с нетерпением</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Это просьба содержит угрозу</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: **Молодой человек, окно вы не будете закрывать?**
Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

1. Эта просьба прямая.

2. Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.

3. Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.

СТОП!

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая_____ грубая____ невежливая____ слегка невежливая____
вежливая____ даже слегка вежливая____

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Это просьба содержит угрозу
___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл?
___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

11. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: **Молодой человек, может, Вы закроете окно?**

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

1. Эта просьба прямая.

2. Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.

3. Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.

СТОП!
Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая____ грубая ___ невежлива___ слегка невежлива___

вежлива____ даже слишком вежлива____

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Эта просьба содержит угрозу
___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл? ______________________
___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

12. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: Молодой человек, закройте окно.

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Эта просьба прямая.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
<td>СТОП!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая____ грубая ___ невежлива___ слегка невежлива___

вежлива____ даже слишком вежлива____

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Это просьба содержит угрозу
Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл?

НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

13. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: Молодой человек, закроете? (жест к окну).

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

1. Эта просьба прямая.

2. Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.

3. Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.

СТОП!

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая  грубая  невежлива  слегка невежлива  вежлива  даже слишком вежлива

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
Это просьба содержит угрозу
Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл?
НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

14. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: Молодой человек, закроете, а?
Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Эта просьба прямая.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

СТОП!

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или № 2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая _____   грубая _____   невежливая _____   слегка невежливая _____
вежливая_____   даже слишком вежливая_____

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Это просьба содержит угрозу
___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл? ____________________________
___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

15. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: Молодой человек, Вы будете закрывать окно?

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Эта просьба прямая.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

СТОП!
Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая   грубая   невежлива   слегка невежлива   вежлива   даже слишком вежлива

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Это просьба содержит угрозу
___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл?
___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

16. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: Молодой человек, окно Вы будете закрывать?

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

1. Эта просьба прямая.

2. Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.

3. Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.

СТОП!

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая   грубая   невежлива   слегка невежлива   вежлива   даже слишком вежлива

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением

СТОП!
___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Это просьба содержит угрозу
___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл? ______________________
___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

17. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: **Молодой человек, окно!**

Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Эта просьба прямая.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**СТОП!**

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая____  грубая ___  невежлива___  слегка невежлива__
вежлива___  даже слишком вежлива___

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Это просьба содержит угрозу
___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл? ______________________
___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций

18. Вы едете в автобусе, Ваше место около открытого окна. Какой-то мужчина средних лет обращается к вам со следующими словами, произнесенными с нейтральной интонацией: **Молодой человек, Вы могли бы закрыть окно!**
Отметьте галочкой одно из трех:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Эта просьба прямая.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Это непрямая просьба, т.е. на самом деле, это вопрос или</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>утверждение. И все же, я бы воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Я бы не воспринял эту фразу как просьбу.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>СТОП!</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Если вы поставили галочку на № 1 или №2, оцените фразу по шкале вежливости:

очень грубая___  грубая ___ невежлива___  слегка невежлива___
вежлива___ даже слишком вежлива___

А теперь подумайте, есть ли в этой фразе какой-то дополнительный скрытый смысл, дополнительные коннотации:

___ Это просьба сказана с нетерпением
___ Это просьба похожа на дружелюбное напоминание
___ Это просьба содержит угрозу
___ Какой-то другой дополнительный смысл? ______________________
___ НИКАКИХ дополнительных значений или коннотаций
APPENDIX 2

Description of Role Plays for Production Data

Scenario 1:
You had a pretty bad headache yesterday and had to skip a math lecture. In three days you have an exam in this class. This is a very difficult course and exams are pretty brutal usually. You are worried that you missed an important lecture right before the exam and you want to ask a fellow student for her lecture notes. The student’s name is Sophia. She is a straight A student and takes good lecture notes. You are not very close, but have always had a good relationship. You approach Sophia and say...

Scenario 2:
Ты должен(на) делать презентацию по одному из курсов через 2 дня, но не можешь найти одну редкую книгу, которая просто необходима для этой презентации. Ее нет ни в одной из библиотек, к которым у тебя есть доступ, и ее невозможно достать по межбиблиотечному займу. Ты знаешь, что эта весьма редкая книга есть...
у твоего преподавателя. Ты хочешь попросить преподавателя одолжить тебе эту книгу. Давай разыграем эту ситуацию: я преподаватель. Ты заходишь ко мне в кабинет и говоришь...?

You are preparing a presentation for one of your classes and need a rare book to make your point. This book is old and rare and is not in your library. You cannot get it through the interlibrary loan or find it anywhere else. However, you know that your professor has this rather rare book in her office and you want to ask the professor to lend you the book for a couple of days. Let's enact this situation: I am the professor. You walk into my office and say...?